

**Appendix 5c:
Table of Forum
Engagement Activity
Challenges**

Contents

1. Table of Yorkshire Forum for Water Customers Engagement Challenges

1. Table of Yorkshire Forum for Water Customers Engagement Challenges

Date	Who	Project	Category	Challenge	Decision / Action
09/08/2016	Adrian McDonald	PR19 Valuing Water	Brief	My first thoughts are that recent political outcomes will influence the cost of access to capital given the UK's new (v low) credit rating and we need to know if customers have any views, significance etc. relative to, other challenges. I say this as another large company has already requested a first analysis of this challenge which might influence populations which the brief already cites as a challenge. That company sought a view within 24 hours of referendum. I also wonder if any customers understand the business retail far less the possible customer retail implications? All looks good as a first draft in changing times.	No action required
13/01/2017	Joanne Volpe	PR19 Valuing Water	Quantitative stage questionnaire	What are the proportion of older people who will be questioned as part of the engagement?	Demographics presented to Customer Forum members at January 2017 meeting
13/01/2017	Joanne Volpe	PR19 Valuing Water	Quantitative stage questionnaire	The way Q7 is worded makes me think that Yorkshire Water is thinking of stopping delivering some services. I'm assuming from the priorities listed that YW are not stopping any of these and that it's about how the priorities are	Wording changed to reflect challenge following discussion at Customer

				weighted, but that's not how the questions come across to me.	Forum meeting at January 2017 meeting
13/01/2017	Joanne Volpe	PR19 Valuing Water	Quantitative stage questionnaire	I'm interested to know what this question will inform (Q13)? What you will do as a result?	This was discussed further with Customer Forum members at January 2017 meeting
19/01/2017	Dave Merret	PR19 Valuing Water	Quantitative stage questionnaire	Review and amend wording on some of the technical terminology in the stimulus	Wording changed to reflect challenge following discussion with the Customer Forum at January 2017 meeting
20/02/2017	Joanne Volpe	Comparability Study	Brief	The objectives look comprehensive to me. My main comment is that this seems to be a huge task, which your average customer is going to have to be walked through very carefully! They're going to need a lot of pre-information to be able to respond to some of the objectives you list.	No action required
20/02/2017	Joanne Volpe	Comparability Study	Brief	I'm assuming you'll seek a number of proposals from customer research companies, and I thought the Customer Forum would be interested to know why YW choose the proposal (research company) that you do.	Discussed the YW procurement and assessment process

20/02/2017	Joanne Volpe	Comparability Study	Brief	Small point: I wasn't sure how the table on page 3 was to be used?	Responded with explanation of table and the context behind it
22/02/2017	Janine Shakleton	Comparability Study	Brief	CCWater has had a look at this spec and have made a few comments/observations. The main thing about this research is that we think it seems to prime customers to expect that bills will have to increase in order to get an improved level of service. This isn't necessarily the case, especially if customers only want a 'small' improvement as opposed to a 'step-change'. If the outputs of this research are to be used as an indication of customer service priorities for PR19 then we are not sure that framing the research objectives around step-changes in service and potential bill-increases is the way to go - seems a bit leading? What happen if customers want a service which isn't in the list improved?	Wording amended in brief to reflect comments
22/02/2017	Janine Shakleton	Comparability Study	Brief	Could this lead customers into 'expecting' a higher bill in return for a higher service? It so happens that YW has a lower bill than most companies so this is how it could be interpreted. But is this a fair interpretation – maintaining/improving services is about trade-offs and efficiencies so it should be possible that services could improve but without a bill increase – at least in some cases.	Wording amended in brief to reflect comments

22/02/2017	Janine Shakleton	Comparability Study	Brief	It doesn't have to be the case – could this statement be better qualified to explain that bills *may* increase when a service improves, but not always – it depends on the level of investment needed for other services and is also offset against the development of technologies which can make it more cost effective to deliver the service level.	Wording amended in brief to reflect comments
22/02/2017	Janine Shakleton	Comparability Study	Brief	Customers will have their own experiences of YW service which will influence their views. It's not clear how well people can detach from their actual experiences to base their views purely on comparisons of performance on paper. Would it be helpful to find out what personal experiences people have to set some context, then 'park' these to discuss performance on paper?	Comment considered as part of the discussion guide and research material development
22/02/2017	Janine Shakleton	Comparability Study	Brief	Not clear how effective this objective will be. Presume that for some service measures YW will have higher performance than other companies, and for others lower? In which case what conclusions on the impact would it be possible to draw other than a lower than average bill doesn't necessarily mean lower than average services – is this the kind of finding you would expect?	Comment considered as part of the discussion guide and research material development
22/02/2017	Janine Shakleton	Comparability Study	Brief	If this is an 'aspirational' service standard then would it be useful to know what priority customers give as to when this	Comment considered as part of the discussion guide and

				standard should be reached? What if customers would like a small service change – less than a 'step change'?	research material development
13/04/2017	Joanne Volpe	HH Retail Services	Brief	I've added a comment about the approach. My main thought was that the first phase seems to have an emphasis on what YW is already offering, and is there anyway of having a more open / co-imagining phase? Whilst fully appreciating that people need something to push back against, and giving a blank canvas is very difficult!	Wording amended in brief to reflect comments
25/07/2017	James Copeland	Customer Valuation	Scoping document	In the document you say "the visitor survey work package will provide a more in-depth look at the value of river water quality in Yorkshire in order to cross check the estimates of value from the other work package and to inform the development of a freshwater investment portfolio". I can see that a visitor survey of people with an interest in water will come out high towards a need for investment. What the proposed methodology will do is to balance this view with the wider customer base through the 'Stated Preference' and 'Experimental Techniques' work?	The wider stated preference study presents the non-use value customers place on River Water Quality
27/07/2017	Janine Shakleton	Customer Valuation	Scoping document	There is no reference to earlier research e.g. valuing water to identify priorities for inclusion in valuation research. A reference to how the outputs of this have been triangulated with contact data and other relevant external data to identify	The service areas selected for the study have been chosen based on Ofwat

				<p>services which customers prioritise for investment (alongside anything required by regulators) and so for inclusion in valuation research would be helpful. It feels like the bigger picture is missing from this document.</p>	<p>guidance and our valuing water study</p>
27/07/2017	Janine Shakleton	Customer Valuation	Scoping document	<p>Pg2 second para - trust survey: You appear to be attempting to identify the monetary value to Yorkshire Water of trust. Will you also be finding out what is driving trust overall? because without this, you would not be able to prioritise activities to help increase trust and so realise the monetary value of this. Trust is linked to a whole range of factors, some of which will be very context specific, and these will need isolating from the role that (lack of) trust plays in non-payment.</p>	<p>The scope of works for WP6 aims to look at whether there are particular service measure failures which impact on customer trust. This will provide insight in terms of which service measures are most important in terms of determining customer trust levels in YW and where to prioritise investment. It is recognised that there are a wide range of factors impact on trust and this will be a first step in developing a better understanding.</p>

27/07/2017	Janine Shakleton	Customer Valuation	Scoping document	In the Design (July-August 2017) para on P2 it says that the Forum will be consultedon the selection of attributes and measures to be tested. What evidence does Yorkshire have of customer views to help inform this process?	The service areas selected for the study have been chosen based on Ofwat guidance, our valuing water study and customer service data.
27/07/2017	Janine Shakleton	Customer Valuation	Scoping document	P2 Implement August-September 2017 - running the surveys in parallel. This is probably driven by wider timescales, but if the research isn't staggered it limits the potential for the research to adapt in response to initial findings/reactions from customers. If there is a bit of flexibility to take stock of the research design, process, experience and topline findings then it would be beneficial to capture learning points and feed these into later surveys to help produce outputs with the highest possible levels of validity.	We were restricted by timescales to address this challenge. This was fed back to the Customer Forum.
27/07/2017	Janine Shakleton	Customer Valuation	Scoping document	P3 Synthesise - Will the Forum get to see each primary research output and values or just the overarching report setting out how the values can be used in the DMF? If the values are filtered down for the overarching report then the triangulation approach and process for this should be presented so it is transparent what has been filtered and why, so that the values for the DMF are fully justified. The	The research output from this study was provided to the Customer Forum. Presentations were also made to the Forum members.

				prioritisation and selection of values for the DMF should be a transparent process.	
27/07/2017	Janine Shakleton	Customer Valuation	Scoping document	P3 In Summary - the values will be used to support the wider ODIs work stream - in what way? How will Yorkshire Water avoid a scenario where they use valuations from SP and RP and apply them to ODIs? Do you propose additional research on ODIs using WTP valuations as the basis on which to gain customer views on ODIs?	It was confirmed that research on ODI's will take place to ensure the ODI's selected are acceptable and supported by customers. The values will be used to point the value customer place on measures and the levels of elasticity in those values to identify likely rewards or penalties.
04/08/2017	Chris Griffin	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	I note this isn't a final document, and you have amendments planned. I just wanted to draw your attention to Q19 in demographics. A benefit is listed as 'Working family tax credits', was 'Working tax credits' meant instead? There is a family element to working tax credits, but this generally isn't referenced, and is part of the calculation that most people wouldn't be aware of.	Wording amended to reflect comment

07/08/2017	Melissa Lockwood	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	I like the positive language in Q10.	None required
07/08/2017	Melissa Lockwood	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	In Q14 where the choice for environmental improvement associated with cost is this illustrative?	It was confirmed that this would be illustrative in the choice cards presented to customers during the study.
07/08/2017	Melissa Lockwood	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	I just wondered if regulatory compliance can be linked to increasing bills e.g. complying with bathing water regulations and pollution incidents.	It was confirmed that this is captured in the current bill level, unless compliance will cost more to deliver, we will stipulate this to Ofwat in business plan submission e.g. drinking water quality is 100% to be compliance but its unlikely YW will ever achieve this no matter what customers are willing to pay
07/08/2017	Melissa Lockwood	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	I know the ODI is Cat 3 pollution incidents but would it be easier for a customer survey to talk about all pollution incidents, especially as Cat 3 is least serious.	It was explained that the measures must link back to the language and criteria used in our Decision-Making Framework

08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	S1. Include EA or other regulators	Wording amended to reflect comment
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	S2. Any plans to include customers who receive a service from another company in the main survey?	It was confirmed that the study would only include YW customers
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q1. Wording change suggestion	Wording amended to reflect comment
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q1. Could you ask for household size if metered? See later comment re metering, household size, income, and vulnerability.	Actioned as a result of the comment
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q5. Can you include examples of what this help might be – presume you are looking for households on WaterSure/social tariffs rather than on extended payment arrangements?	Verbal explanations were provided by the interviewers on request if customers asked for clarification. This was provided to minimise the amount of content customers were asked to review during the study.
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q6. Wording change suggestion	Actioned as a result of the comment
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q7. Wording change suggestion	Actioned as a result of the comment

08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q9. Should this be here or is a question missing? (Reference to Agreement scale)	Removed
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q10. If the aim is to understand motivations/attitudes above preferences for what people want to protect, then ideally these should all have the same lead-in wording. Why does this one mention Yorkshire in particular? Might it skew responses?	Wording amended to reflect comment
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q10.Can this be explained?	Actioned as a result of the comment
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q10. Can this be explained?	Actioned as a result of the comment
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Intro to study. Wording change suggestion	Wording amended to reflect comment
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Intro to Choice Experiment section. Wording change suggestion	Wording amended to reflect comment
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Example Choice Cards. Over what timescales are these service levels measures?	Actioned as a result of the comment - these are per year
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Example Choice Cards. Wording change suggestion	Wording amended to reflect comment
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Example Choice Cards. Can you add something to say – before inflation	Wording amended to reflect comment

08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Example Choice Cards. There are forecasts available though....	Wording amended to reflect comment
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q11. Wording change suggestion	Wording amended to reflect comment
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q12. To help people prioritise, should you include some contextual information about this? EG. Would they get compensation/be provided with alternative supplies of water?	The showcard was amended to address the challenge
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q12. Should this say what this would be? Because people will respond quite differently to a hosepipe ban compared to something more restrictive – so should define what this is. The 1/25 must have been arrived at for a specific type of water-use restriction?	Wording amended to reflect comment
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q12. Wording change suggestion	Wording amended to reflect comment
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q13. Wording change suggestion	Wording amended to reflect comment
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q13. The showcards for these are v important	No action required
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q15. Should be against 'No'?	Wording amended to reflect comment
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q16. Could have been a long time ago....?	Wording amended to reflect comment

08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q18. Not sure how past circumstances are relevant here?	It was explained that this was to better understand the transient nature of vulnerability and its impact on the value they place on services
08/08/2017	Liz Cotton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q20. If they are on a water meter, could you ask for household size and correlate this to income and views on affordability in the analysis? Derive an affordability curve from this? Because although £10k to £19,999 is not seen as being vulnerable, if this is a relatively large household on a meter they are likely to be vulnerable because they have a higher bill to income ratio.	Actioned as a result of the comment
08/08/2017	Janine Shackleton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q10. Why only one option for interest in YW land and countryside and yet you have 4 options for beaches and wildlife? Introductory wording should be the same for all options.	Wording amended to reflect comment
08/08/2017	Janine Shackleton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Intro to Choice Experiment section. I am interested in how YW know already that choosing these as a priority would increase the bill. I have yet to see evidence from YW of efficiency work they intend to carry out in other areas which may offset a bill increase. Without seeing this then	We have added a caveat to the questionnaire based on this comment to suggest that increased in bills will be

				customers are being presented with an assumption of bill increases	subject to efficiencies achieved by YW
08/08/2017	Janine Shackleton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Intro to Choice Experiment section. Is this statement true? Bills might reduce if YW make efficiencies in areas such as energy costs, could you add in “subject to finding ways of providing services more cheaply in the future, e.g. via new technologies” to address this.	Wording amended to reflect comment
08/08/2017	Janine Shackleton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q15. Surely they would be more vulnerable if English was <u>not</u> their first language?	Wording amended to reflect comment
08/08/2017	Janine Shackleton	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Q20. People in this band are also at risk of financial vulnerability. £16,105 is the household income threshold set by DWP for working tax credits. Although, £10,000 is around the figure for absolute poverty and relative poverty measure for a single household, both rise up to £20,000 for a family of four.	Actioned as a result of the comment
08/08/2017	Angela Collins	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	Overall, it’s very long but I see people are getting £5 for completing so that’s good	No action required
08/08/2017	Angela Collins	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	They are routing out anyone who doesn’t know who their water/waste water supplier is. Surely if they live in Yorkshire	It was explained that some customer who live on the YW boundary may receive water

				and they are household it has to be YW? I think they are important people to keep in	or waste services from elsewhere
08/08/2017	Angela Collins	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	At Q9 there is a scale after – I don't know why this is needed as the question above is a factual one	The scale was removed
08/08/2017	Angela Collins	Customer Valuation	WtP Pilot Questionnaire	I can't see how many responses they want or what the targets in each sample group are – it would be good to know this.	The sample profile was provided to the Customer Forum
12/12/2017	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Brief	In terms of the methodology, it says that the supplier will have access to YWs online community. Do you know if the supplier will be required to only use this as the source of sample or if they can source sample elsewhere/supplement the YW panel sample with customers recruited from the wider population? It would be good to have a mix of sample which is 'man on the street' and from YW's panel as the panel may be more informed than the average bill payer - it would be good to contrast these views so the research outputs are the combination of both slightly more informed views from YW panel and also grounded in the more uninformed views of the man on the street.	As above (row 65). It was explained that the online community would supplement the main survey in which a further sample on 'uninformed' customers would be recruited

12/12/2017	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Brief	<p>Communications and engagement about water/sewerage services are key. When it comes to reviewing supplier proposals, it would be interesting to see if there are any suppliers who can find ways of translating communications into a meaningful context for customers. When we break down performance commitments into aspects of service they can become a bit abstract - so do any of the suppliers have suggestions for how they can contextualise PCs into people's lived lives?</p>	No action required
12/12/2017	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Brief	<p>Finally, there is another aspect of this which isn't covered. Part of the rationale for ODIs is that companies are rewarded/penalised for the aspects of service delivery that customers most value. Given this, it seems appropriate to ask customers to what degree the achievement of each outcomes or combinations of outcomes would in principle affect their satisfaction with services?</p>	<p>It was confirmed that research on ODI's would take place later in the research programme to ensure the ODI's selected are acceptable and supported by customers. The values will be used to point the value customer place on measures and the levels of elasticity in those values to identify likely rewards or penalties.</p>

12/02/2018	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Research Material	The document is set out clearly, but the nature of this research will mean it is a heavy read for people who are not familiar with the detail of the industry. So, I've made some minor suggestions to simplify the wording in some places and hope this is helpful, although it is not a show stopper.	Wording amended to reflect comment
12/02/2018	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Research Material	Pg2 Environment - we will recycle all waste water. 'Waste water' could be ambiguous here - does it mean water which is wasted (as described above in water supply) or is this water which has been used by customers?	Wording amended to reflect comment
12/02/2018	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Research Material	Pg3 - instead of 'implement' suggest 'how we will do this over the next 40 years'	Wording amended to reflect comment
12/02/2018	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Research Material	Pg6 Customer service. Suggest: Ofwat (the regulator) expects water companies to provide an excellent service experience for property developers and household customers. There is a measure for each: This would avoid introducing incentive mechanisms (policy speak) at this early point.	Wording amended to reflect comment
12/02/2018	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Research Material	Pg8 Compliance risk index: 'requirements' - does this mean 'tests' or is it something different? 9 'Reduce the number of events affecting drinking water quality' - could there be an example of what an event might be?	Wording amended to reflect comment

12/02/2018	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Research Material	Pg9 Water supply interruptions text - where it says that sometimes it is scheduled (planned) - should this say this means that they would be warned for how long? Minor typo 'an interruptions' above 14	Wording amended to reflect comment
12/02/2018	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Research Material	Unplanned outage - is there a friendlier way of saying this? EG. Unplanned loss of supply capacity (not sure this is much better though!) Suggest "We closely monitor our water treatment works to check they have capacity to provide a continuous supply of high quality water."	Wording amended to reflect comment
12/02/2018	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Research Material	Pg10 Abstraction incentive mechanism - can this have some introductory text as some of the other things have?	Introductory text added
12/02/2018	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Research Material	Pg11 - 20 - measure to 'reduce' the number of mains pipe repairs completed per thousand kilometres. This looks odd - at face value it reads as though YW is planning to do doing fewer repairs - is that right?	Wording amended to reflect comment
12/02/2018	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Research Material	Pg13 Pollution incidents - suggest: Exceptionally heavy rainfall can sometimes overwhelm sewers and lead to sewage leaking out of pipes into rivers, streams or other watercourses.	Wording amended to reflect comment
12/02/2018	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Research Material	Pg14 River water quality How about: Water companies help to improve and keep rivers clean, and also as close to their natural state as possible. They do this by improving sewage	Wording amended to reflect comment

				treatment processes so that this clean treated water is suitable to put back into rivers, and also by improving the flow of water in rivers to help wildlife.	
12/02/2018	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Research Material	Pg15 Carbon reduction and management - how about Reducing our greenhouse gas emissions by using more renewable energy and using other carbon reducing schemes such as planting more trees on our land.	Wording amended to reflect comment
12/02/2018	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Research Material	Pg16 surface water - should the text say this is about managing rainwater drainage differently so that it doesn't drain into/enter the sewer system? It mentions the system but could be clearer.	Wording amended to reflect comment
12/02/2018	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Research Material	Discussion guide - mostly minor track changes Outperformance payments – this is when a company over delivers on a set target by providing a higher level of service. It costs more to deliver exceptional service [CL1] and this links to the customer bill – you pay more for a gold standard service. I just wanted to check with you whether the rationale for the overpayment given above - that it costs more to over-achieve so it is reflected in the customer bill - is accurate. Firstly, see comment CL1. In addition to this, the explanation given could suggest that a company could decide to spend more than was supported by	Wording amended to reflect comment

				<p>WtP research to achieve a higher level of service and trigger a bonus. Is that how it can work or should the explanation be different? If the explanation given is correct please could you delete my comment from the discussion guide.</p>	
12/02/2018	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Research Material	<p>It was really good to have the slides to refer to as it helped with understanding the discussion. One comment on the slides: Slide 10 - instead of outcome delivery could the slides/discussion guide refer to service targets or something else which is closer to how the man on the street might describe them? Only regulators/policy talk about outcomes.</p>	<p>Wording amended to reflect comment</p>
12/02/2018	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Research Material	<p>Do you know if YW are planning any quantitative testing of ODIs - if so what this might involve?</p>	<p>It was confirmed that research on ODI's would take place later in the research programme to ensure the ODI's selected are acceptable and supported by customers. The values will be used to point the value customer place on measures and the levels of</p>

					elasticity in those values to identify likely rewards or penalties.
12/02/2018	James Copeland	Outcomes	Research Material	Number of queries around the definitions used for PCs. (see feedback within the presentation material document)	Wording amended to reflect comment
12/02/2018	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Research Material	“From the YW documents I agree about PCs 48&49 being in the wrong section. I also think PCs 1, 46 & 47 could be grouped together. I’m not sure there is a clear distinction between PC1 and PCs46& 47 to mean one should go in a customer section and the other two in a Bills section.	Ordering and catogorisation of PCs considered prior to testing
12/02/2018	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Research Material	I was pleased to see that there is mention of asking customers what they think about the idea of incentives in section 6 of the discussion guide but feel this could be strengthened as I have some concerns that this may not come up if a customer doesn’t raise it themselves.	Wording amended to reflect comment

12/02/2018	Janine Shackleton	Outcomes	Research Material	We would also want the company to consider Ofwat's response to our letter on ODI's as follows: It is now possible to ask customers about the principle of ODIs after they have become informed about how it works in practice – they will have seen the service improvements involved the potential bill changes and bill profile impacts. So, their views on the principle will be grounded in its application. Ofwat has stated that the approach it has adopted for assessing ODIs give companies discretion not to follow its expectations where “[the company] can provide evidence of why this might not be in the interests of their customers” [1]. It is possible to interpret this statement as grounds for limiting or removing all financial ODIs where it is demonstrated that this is what customers want.	It was confirmed that research on ODI's would take place later in the research programme to ensure the ODI's selected are acceptable and supported by customers. The values will be used to point the value customer place on measures and the levels of elasticity in those values to identify likely rewards or penalties.
06/03/2018	Janine Shackleton	Cost Adjustment Claims	Brief	CCWater would like assurance that the needs of present and future generations are presented to and considered by customers.	This was considered in the design and development of the sample framework
06/03/2018	Janine Shackleton	Cost Adjustment Claims	Brief	CCWater would like to understand if, in the spirit of openness and transparency, the company will be sharing with customers evidence that alternative investment options have been assessed (and why they have been discounted).	It was discussed with the Customer Forum that alternatives had been discounted following the Ofwat guidance.

06/03/2018	Janine Shackleton	Cost Adjustment Claims	Brief	CCWater would like assurance that the cost implications for present and future generations are presented to and considered by customers.	This was included in the research
06/03/2018	Janine Shackleton	Cost Adjustment Claims	Brief	CCWater would like the assurance that this research will not just be conducted on line as this could exclude the views of customers who lack the capacity to use or do not have access to digital services.	The methodology applied was a mix of face to face and online.
06/03/2018	Angela Collins	Cost Adjustment Claims	Brief	I know it is good to be open in this section as you get more creative ideas but I think it would be helpful to state if you would like any qualitative engagement, any sub groups of customer type. It helps the agency bidding to meet your needs!	The research included both qualitative and quantitative methods.
06/03/2018	Angela Collins	Cost Adjustment Claims	Brief	I would also like to add that your panel are knowledgeable about the water industry and although representative of the demographics of your customer base I'm not sure they are representative of the knowledge of your customer base. I would be keen to see some on street interviews/ hall tests to ensure a proportion of the interviews are off line and with those who have no idea about YW apart from the bill they receive. If you do this it would be interesting to see some analysis to compare both bases as this would help you in the future to completely rebuff my claim!	It was explained that the online community would supplement the main survey in which a further sample on 'uninformed' customers would be recruited

06/03/2018	Angela Collins	Cost Adjustment Claims	Brief	With this budget I would expect some qualitative to further understand why your customers are stating their preferences and for a specific engagement approach to vulnerable and young customers.	The research included both qualitative and quantitative methods.
12/04/2018	Melissa Lockwood	Cost Adjustment Claims	Research Material	I thought the cost adjustment discussion today would be about this material so sorry for not saying this when I saw you today. I do understand more about the cost adjustment claims now but I still feel that these materials aren't equally balanced and could be leading responses. For example, the computer system script has lots of positive prompts but the Environmental/WINEP adjustment doesn't delve into understanding. I don't think this will balance preferences well. Also, the environmental issue is very complicated and I don't think this is drawn out.	This was discussed at the Customer Forum meeting on 14th April. It was agreed with the Forum to continue to test WINEP with customers, but to exclude the findings from any submission in May due to WINEP not being included in the CAC assessment.
25/04/2018	Chris Griffin	Acceptability Testing	Brief	Looks really thorough Paul. Look forward to seeing the data!	No action required
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Questionnaire	S2. What is the logic of these exclusions? Can understand shouldn't be anyone working for the company doing the questionnaire, but why the whole marketing / communications industry? especially if Yorkshire Water's own employees are not debarred?	This follows standard research guidelines for screening out respondents who could potential bias the results.

28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	2020-2025 plans section. Think the section here is rather confusing. The introduction reads as if you are reconsulting on the five-big long term strategy goals, not on the bits of it proposed to be delivered in the next AMP, though on a second read of the slides see it says What this means over the next 5 years (barely readable on my laptop reading panel!!)	Wording amended to reflect comment
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	In terms of the slides a number of bullets read as statements of intent with no quantifications, so people won't know how significant they are or aren't.	Quantifications linked to the presentation slides are provided on the performance commitment presentation slides
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Customer slide - fourth bullet - thought the switching choice was going to be all customers, not just vulnerable ones?	Wording amended to reflect comment
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Environment slide first bullet point - reductions since when?	Wording amended to reflect comment
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Transparency Slide. 5th and 6th bullet points are statements not proposed actions (ditto on detailed slide 16).	No quantifiable measures attached to these bullet points
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	No explicit commitment here about reporting your environmental performance / carbon emissions which would round the overall picture off!	Wording amended to reflect comment

28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	<p>The ASK ALL 2020-2025 improvement list at the bottom of page 16 2nd and third bullets re 40% reduction in pollution incidents and 70% reduction in internal sewer flooding match the figures on the environment slide which says that will have been done by 2020 (i.e. before the 5-year period. Is the latter date wrong, or is this a further 40 /70 % reduction, or are you doing it all pre-AMP and nothing will actually be done in the AMP? Confusing whatever.</p>	Wording amended to reflect comment
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	<p>Section 5: 1st para "Yorkshire Water must follow its statutory obligations and a change to these has recently been introduced by the Environment Agency ..."3rd Para. 2nd sentence "Yorkshire Water currently meets standards set out by the EA, however the new WINEP requirements poses an additional £754 million to the company over and above our current spend ... I think this is rather misleading. Ref the first sentence, as I understand it, the statutory framework hasn't changed, it's the periodic programme of measures identified by the EA to deliver it that has been updated, and which has identified substantial additional requirements to meet the statutory limits. Ref the second quoted sentence, if Yorkshire Water was meeting the standards presumably there would be no new WINEP programme? Think needs to say,</p>	Wording amended to reflect comment

				Yorkshire Water has or is in the process of meeting the EA's previous requirements, however ...	
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Third para last sentence - WINEP will mean an increase in your bill of approximately £20 by 2025": Wonder if less prejudicially should say "Your proposed bill includes an extra £20 for the increased WINEP programme. Otherwise your bill would have seen a reduction (before inflation is taken into account).	Wording amended to reflect comment
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	However, I think a bigger issue is that this section as currently posited is purely about the increased WINEP programme in terms of its bill impact. I think the Environment Group's concern was as much, if not more about testing customers attitude towards the alternative way the Company was suggesting the ultimate objectives of the legislation to improve the ecological quality of our rivers could be delivered, as outlined in the Catchment Sense document, whereby an overall better ecological result could be delivered for broadly the current level of expenditure (plus	To be discussed further at the environment sub-group

				probably also helping on other outcomes like flooding) in the longer term. Could we relook at this?	
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Pages 8 -14 & 16. Third Column header - I assume this is the predicted 2020 position - should we state that?	Explanations of the columns are provided in the overview prior to the survey commencing
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Last Column - Incentive Type. Not sure customers will readily understand the descriptors / what they mean. Probably needs a separate introductory card explaining what the incentive system is, what the particular descriptors mean, including who pays / receives the rewards and penalty payments! and how its adjudicated.	Wording amended to reflect comment
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Page 8 second and third measures, col 2 - not sure customers will know what the Priority Services Register is last measure. Wonder if rather than saying unknown in cols 3,4and 5, should say "to be measured in 2020" / "To be measured in 2025" / to be determined by (OFWAT or whoever) "	Wording amended to reflect comment

28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Page 9 measure 1 cols 1& 2. No doubt being pedantic here, but does compliance risk register actually measure quality (as opposed to the risk of non-compliance as the name suggests i.e. of failing / departing from the standard)?	No action taken
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Fourth measure columns 3-5. Why do we not at least know the projected 2020 position, and should we rather than say unknown to be measured in 2020" / "To be measured in 2025" / to be determined by (OFWAT or whoever) "	Wording amended to reflect comment
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Page 10 Last measure Customer supply pipe - do you need to define what that means (i.e. from the property boundary to where it enters the building??)	Wording amended to reflect comment
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Page 11 Measure 3 Our risk of a drought "affecting your supply"? Droughts may still occur!	Wording amended to reflect comment
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Page 12 measure 1 Can I just check units here - we're in the tens of thousands of hectares here, whereas for the rainwater being stopped running into sewers that I mentioned in the preceding e-mail you're only talking of 40 Hectares. Are both sets of figures correct (makes the latter look also not worth mentioning if it is!!!)	No action required
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Measure 2 col 2 last sentence. I assume this should say "This will be measured as the percentage of the total Yorkshire Water area catchments where we?"	Wording amended to reflect comment

28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Page 13 Measure 1 suspect customers might well ask why are you only looking at minor pollution incidents? Perhaps should add a sentence explaining the position with regard to major ones!!!	No action required
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Measure 4 cols 3 & 4 does your wording mean what I think it does that these are works that are on-going failures (as opposed to have a failure in the particular year)? Could perhaps explain more definitively in column 2.	Wording amended to reflect comment
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Page 16 Measure 4 cols 3-5 sim comment as before re stating "unknown"	Wording amended to reflect comment
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Page 17 The scales of the bars in the bar chart do not appear consistent (disproportionate increase from 19/20 to 20/21). Should you also say here on what basis inflation is measured (CPI / RPI) and that the actual value is determined by Ofwat / not the company? Finally, I think the slide layout could do with some improvement = suggest you put the with inflation 2025 box under the with inflation bar chart and move the without inflation box somewhere where it doesn't appear linked to the bar chart.	Wording amended to reflect comment
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Page 18 -bullet points 2 & 3 - please refer to my earlier e-mail query on these reference to the first bullet point on slide 5.	Wording amended to reflect comment

28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Page 19 - please see my previous e-mail comments on section 5 of the questionnaire - similar comments clearly apply to / have implications for this page.	Wording amended to reflect comment
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Section 1 final paragraph. Should you also say that Ofwat can force alterations? also relevant to later on where you're saying still in process of planning before bills finalised.	Wording amended to reflect comment
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Section 3 - should the list at the end include flooding.	Flooding included in a previous performance commitment
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Section 5 sixth para / sections 8 on. Is it your intention to have any breakdown of costs available or only to give the global totals in terms of any questions that arise about specific aspects of the business plan and perceived value for money / appropriateness of paying for those specifics>	No action required
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Section 8 page 5 second para re inflation and bills going up - and also because the regulator allows inflation increases!!! need to explain terms thereof too as I mentioned in preceding e-mail.	Wording amended to reflect comment
28/06/2018	Dave Merret	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	Appendix Minor typo in line 3! Ref. line 5 and related earlier mentions - I assume YW's role is purely in terms of its sewerage works outfalls impact on bathing water quality??? or is it voluntarily taking a wider role?	Wording amended to reflect comment

28/06/2018	Janine Shackleton	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	S2 I thought customer feedback had said this wording wasn't clear? openness and transparency in what? perhaps "in how we conduct our business" should be inserted?	Wording being amended for final business plan submission
28/06/2018	Janine Shackleton	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	S2 Shouldn't this have a commitment to keep bills affordable?	Wording on affordability included in the detail of the plan
28/06/2018	Janine Shackleton	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	S3 Add 'including' to the bullet point	Wording amended to reflect comment
28/06/2018	Janine Shackleton	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	S8 not ambitious enough. CCWater annual tracking survey 2017-2018 shows 45% of YW customers are aware of priority services. By 2025 you should aim to increase awareness to above 50%	Feedback provided to HH Retail team /Discussion held with Forum and further analysis to be undertaken to define target
28/06/2018	Janine Shackleton	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	S10 is this right? only 15 properties in YW region have low pressure ??	No action required
28/06/2018	Janine Shackleton	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	S11 is measuring learning hours the right thing to do? if you just extend the course time you can increase the hours? is the goal for the educational sessions to lead to an understanding of how to reduce water consumption and what not to flush so that customers will put this into practice? Perhaps a measure of students understanding would be a better measure?	Fed back for consideration

28/06/2018	Janine Shackleton	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	S11 This doesn't make sense. It seems to be saying that you have no sensitive sites and therefore you will always achieve the 0% target and as such you will always achieve a reward.	This is correct, we don't take from sensitive sites
28/06/2018	Janine Shackleton	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	S12 are some of these commitments mandatory? or are they all purely based on customers feedback?	No action required
28/06/2018	Janine Shackleton	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	S12 what is meant by improve? what will customers see as an improvement?	Yes, the biodiversity of the land improved will change
28/06/2018	Janine Shackleton	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	S13 does this include combined sewer overflow incidents as well?	Yes, the figure includes CSO incidents
28/06/2018	Janine Shackleton	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	S13 is this ambitious enough? Some companies are aiming for 0% of properties at risk of sewer flooding.	Fed back for consideration
28/06/2018	Janine Shackleton	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	S13 is this mandatory? compliance implies it is something you must adhere to and therefore suggests it is not a commitment based on customer feedback.	No action required
28/06/2018	Janine Shackleton	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	S13 how many treatment works have you got? what is the % that are failing if 4 fail?	Wording amended to reflect comment
28/06/2018	Janine Shackleton	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	S14 I'm surprised YW are not being more ambitious with this given the devastating impacts we have seen of flooding in the area. Given the choice of how to spend investment money i would have thought customers would have chosen flooding prevention over leakage reduction. Is there clear	Flooding included in another measure

				evidence that customers were offered a chance to voice their opinion?	
28/06/2018	Janine Shackleton	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	S14 if the measure is to exceed, how many are actually meeting the requirements?	No action required
28/06/2018	Janine Shackleton	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	S14 Is this not double counting the water you have committed to recycling as part of the water supply commitments?	No, this refers to holding back or slowing surface water running in to sewers
28/06/2018	Janine Shackleton	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	S15 is there no table for commitments for this section?	No quantifiable measures attached to these bullet points
28/06/2018	Janine Shackleton	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	S16 I cannot determine a link between these words and the fact this section is about bills.	Wording amended to reflect comment
28/06/2018	Janine Shackleton	Acceptability Testing	Research Material	S18 Reads like you are going to drink less water. perhaps replace drinking water with tap water?	Wording amended to reflect comment