

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
1	Strategy	Challenge Panel 1	Who will be the challenge panel for non-household customers upon their transfer to Water2Business in April 2017?	UWE	BW	Bristol Water confirmed that the BWCP would be responsible for considering the wholesale plan and retail household plan. There would still be a need for BW to understand non-household customers' views for the wholesale services.	17/11/2015	Acknowledged. No change required.
2	Water Resources	Challenge Panel 1	The end of year target for Raw Water Quality in 2015/16 is "Deteriorating". Why is this?	UWE	BW	Bristol Water's intention is to improve from deteriorating to improving to a stable performance on this measure by the end of the 5 years of AMP6. The work is with landowners to improve point sources and will take time to show an improvement.	17/11/2015	Acknowledged. No change required.
3	Tariffs	Sub Group Nov 2015	The percentage of the customer base that are pensioners.	NSC	BW	The percentage of people over 65 in the South West is 16%	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
4	Tariffs	Sub Group Nov 2015	Do social workers mention the availability of water discounts when they do their assessments?	NSC	BW	Bristol Water do not work specifically with social workers but do fund a variety of partners that promote our social tariffs such as StepChange, the National Debtline, Citizens Advice and Talking Money.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
5	Customer Engagement	Sub Group Nov 2015	Online panels may be less representative of older customers' views.	NSC	BW	Panel representation has been analysed and the results are uploaded on the FTS. Older customers are fairly represented.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
6	Customer Engagement	Sub Group Nov 2015	The need to ensure views are captured on customers' preferences and on incentives on the project plan	Deputy Chair	BW	BW will use the ongoing customer data to help inform the PR19 process, this is captured in the Customer Work stream document.	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
7	Tariffs	Sub Group Nov 2015	To which costs is the retail margin applied?	Deputy Chair	BW	The retail margins for household and non-household retail apply to the combined wholesale and retail costs.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
8	Tariffs	Sub Group Nov 2015	Customers may be expecting a lower bill following the CMA redetermination. How does BW intend to manage this expectation given that bills will in fact be rising?	Report Writer	BW	BW said it worked hard with Bristol Wessex Billing Services Ltd in February each year to explain why bills are increasing.	25/11/2015	Acknowledged. No change required.
9	Information Assurance	Sub Group Nov 2015	A number of challenges were made by members including the extension of the risks, strengths and weaknesses exercise to other information (eg Regulatory Accounts), scoring the 'Impact on Customers' should reflect the impact of poor information, not performance, the risk rating for 'Training Matrix Compliance' and 'Staff Satisfaction' should not be low (as these were key measures for not impacting on customers), the risks associated with third party information and the need to consult a wider range of stakeholders to gather any concerns over information provided in the past as well as the future. BW would also need to clearly explain to the full BWCP the Ofgem information risk assessment criteria, the 'Impact on Customers' scoring regime and the Impact Probability Matrix.	All	BW	BW to consider these challenges in its forthcoming draft Assurance Statements and Plan and to present the Plan at the next meeting of the full Panel and invite further comments.	01/03/2016	Acknowledged. Changes made.
10	Strategy	Challenge Panel 2	Bristol Water to discuss with Wessex Water option for CCG cross over	Chair	BW	This was discussed with ??? and ??? (Wessex) on the 18 Aug. We agreed that separate CCG's were required for our companies but we should agree at least annually attend each others CCG given the overlap of our two businesses. We also agreed that we should look at joint opportunities for customer research.	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
11	Tariffs	Challenge Panel 2	Bristol City Council to share available local government information on pensioners	CCW	BCC	Closed - no longer required	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
12	Tariffs	Challenge Panel 2	What percentage of the customer base is of pensionable age?	CCW	BW	16% of people in the South West are over 65s. Applying the 16% rate to the BW supply area number of over 65s calculates a figure of 32,145 customers eligible for the pension credit social tariff.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
13	Strategy	Challenge Panel 2	BW were asked about the recruitment criteria for online panels as this approach tends to disadvantage views of older people	CCW	BW	Panel representation has been analysed and the results are uploaded on the FTS. Older customers are fairly represented.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
14	Tariffs	Challenge Panel 2	With regard to the cross subsidy (now 87p), it would be useful to see how BW compared to others in the industry.	Deputy Chair	BW	Please see table on page 3 from the 'CCWater Board Meeting in Public - 12.05.16' which highlights the cross subsidy schemes across the industry (located in the FTS)	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
15	Tariffs	Challenge Panel 2	The Chair asked if customers knew how to complain	Chair	BW	Bristol Water explained that this is on the bill	01/03/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
16	Tariffs	Challenge Panel 2	How are customers being informed about the new pension credit tariff?	CCW	BW	BW said this information is on the bill but that they were also doing a mail drop of leaflets with all their partners (eg Age UK).	01/03/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
17	Tariffs	Challenge Panel 2	What is the number of customers already metered and is there is an opt out arrangement?	Chair	BW	BW replied that customers had 2 years to revert back to RV charges for those choosing to opt for a meter but that this wouldn't apply to change of occupier metering.	01/03/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
18	Tariffs	Challenge Panel 2	Has BW underspent its allowance on metering so far in AMP6?	Deputy Chair	BW	BW said it had not been fully funded for the metering programme but as this performance measure had a financial incentive associated with it, the company would receive a penalty for not meeting the annual target in 2015/16.	01/03/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
19	Strategy	Challenge Panel 2	Bristol Water to factor input needed from members on the SDS into the Challenge Panel's timeline.	Deputy Chair	BW	At this point, there is not a regulatory requirement to produce a strategic direction statement but we have decided to do an abridged version to set the context for our next five-year regulatory business plan. I am currently in the process of developing scenarios (states of the world) that we want to test our business plan against and this will form the basis of the SDS, along with input from the customer work package (e.g. customer priorities), the regulation work package (outcomes and performance measures) and the production, environment & quality work package (WRMP steer). We would like to test our scenarios after Christmas with a stakeholder group and would welcome input from the CCG.	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
20	Strategy	Challenge Panel 2	Consumer Council for Water to confirm what comparative information it will provide CCGs as stated in its Water2020 consultation response	CCW	CCW	CCW had provided a paper about the WaterUK industry dashboard. This will provide comparative performance data from July 2016	09/06/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
21	Information Assurance	Challenge Panel 2	Ofwat's concerns related to the quality of wholesale cost data in the PR14 business plan and asked Bristol Water to provide proposals for improving confidence in this area as part of the final assurance plan.	Ofwat	BW	Included in the agenda for the 21/09/16. Bristol Water provided assurance framework which was discussed.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
22	Information Assurance	Challenge Panel 2	Members to provide any further comments on draft assurance plan by 16/3/16.	Chair	Members	Complete	16/03/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
23	Information Assurance	Challenge Panel 2	Report Writer to assist with the Panel's scrutiny of Bristol Water's performance and Atkin's assurance findings.	Chair	Report Writer	Complete	31/03/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
24	Information Assurance	Challenge Panel 2	The Panel is not providing a rubber stamp for the governance committee of Bristol Water's Board. The issue of the expectation on p4 of the Draft Assurance Plan that the Challenge Panel would provide an opinion on the approach. The Challenge Panel is not competent to do this.	Chair	BW	BW to amend the wording for its Final Assurance Plan (to be published end March 2016).	31/03/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
25	Engagement Framework	Challenge Panel 2	BW were asked for its timescale for customer research	Deputy Chair	BW	Bristol Water has shared the work package brief for Customer Research and Engagement which clarifies the time line for research for PR19 - the document is located on the FTS.	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
26	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 2	Are relevant Ward Councillors and Town and Parish Councils being kept informed of progress and developments on this Scheme?	CCW	BW	BW confirmed that it was extensively communicating with everyone affected.	01/03/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
27	Tariffs	Challenge Panel 2	Ofwat was yet to publish its guidance for the review but it may suggest that all companies have the same set of default tariffs. BW was considering covering this in detail at the June meeting but the timing may lends itself to a sub group meeting	Deputy Chair	BW	No longer required	09/06/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
28	Strategy	Challenge Panel 2	Consumer Council for Water to share research results on household competition when available	CCW	CCW	CCW had provided a paper on its research into customer views on retail household competition to the 9 June 2016 meeting	09/06/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
29	Strategy	Challenge Panel 2	University of West of England to share examples of USA domestic water competition with Bristol Water.	UWE	UWE	No longer required. Overtaken by the issue of Ofwat's draft proposals.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
30	Strategy	Challenge Panel 2	Bristol Water to ensure timely provision of meeting papers and minutes	Chair	BW	Written into BWCP Terms of Reference, which were approved.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
31	Strategy	Challenge Panel 2	To facilitate transparency the Chair to provide documented updates of all meetings attended	Chair	Chair	Written into BWCP Terms of Reference, which were approved.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
32	Strategy	Challenge Panel Away Day	The members agree that a note should go to ???? thanking him for his work as Chair of the Local Engagement Forum	Chair	Chair	Complete	01/06/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
33	Strategy	Challenge Panel Away Day	Bristol Water to confirm type of organisations that would be eligible for costs to attend meetings	Chair	BW	Any organisation where the member is not there as part of their expected role can ask to claim back costs.	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. Changes made.
34	Strategy	Challenge Panel Away Day	Further recruitment to panel to cover business, farming and charities	Chair	BW/Chair	New members recruited include a representative from Western Power Distribution involved in their customer-focused group, a farmer based near Chew Lake, a social entrepreneur involved in regional social enterprise development among others	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
35	Strategy	Challenge Panel Away Day	Bristol Water to facilitate contact between Chair and INED	Chair	BW	Complete	01/08/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
36	Strategy	Challenge Panel Away Day	Bristol Water to ensure Chair is invited to at least one Board meeting per year	Chair	BW	The Chair is attending the October 2016 BW Board meeting	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
37	Strategy	Challenge Panel Away Day	Bristol Water to provide conference call facilities	Chair	BW	We have a conference call number available if required	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
38	Strategy	Challenge Panel Away Day	Bristol Water to provide monthly email updates	Chair	BW	Written into BWCP Terms of Reference, which were approved.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
39	Strategy	Challenge Panel Away Day	Agendas to include 15 minute in camera sessions at start and end	Chair	BW	Complete	09/06/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
40	Strategy	Challenge Panel Away Day	Bristol Water to consider arranging meetings at different sites	Chair	BW	June meeting held at Woodford Lodge. November meeting due to take place at Purton	09/06/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
41	Strategy	Challenge Panel Away Day	Bristol Water to incorporate underlying trend into presentations on performance	Chair	BW	Included trends in the annual customer satisfaction survey presentation. Trends available for most of our performance data such as KPI's and SIM results which can be presented to the BWCP upon request.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. Changes made.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
42	Strategy	Challenge Panel Away Day	Bristol to incorporate evaluation criteria into its presentations	Chair	BW	Bristol Water will include a final slide in each presentation in its presentations to the BWCP, the members would expect BW to report against the following four criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How it is customer led • Impact on customers • How it relates to Best Practice and Innovation within the industry • Ethical Issues, eg differing 'willingness to pay' methods, intergenerational concerns, etc. Informal scoring of BW's presentations will be carried out as well as of the BWCP's own performance at the meeting.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. Changes made.
43	Strategy	Challenge Panel 3	Meeting actions with responses to be documented in the Challenge Log	Chair	Deputy Chair	Updated Challenge Log discussed at the September meeting. To be updated monthly.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. Changes made.
44	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 3	Bristol Water to calculate % of pensioners in its whole supply area	Chair	BW	The percentage of people over 65 in the South West is 16%	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
45	Strategy	Challenge Panel 3	Bristol Water to confirm the proportion of flats that have opted for a meter over the last 3 years AMENDS TO WORDING: What is Bristol Water's position on its metering performance commitment and what are Bristol Water doing to catch up?	Chair	BW	In progress - We are reviewing what is the best thing to do regarding a catch up. This includes a range of options from catch up in AMP6 to spreading this over the longer term. We will update the CCG with our long term metering strategy in March. BW does not have the data for flat optant customers. BW is now aiming to catch up the target through both expanding the Change of Occ to all properties and to target more meter option customers through targeted campaigns starting in August 2017.	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
46	Strategy	Challenge Panel 3	Bristol Water to map out workload to March 2017 for panel to include input to SDS	Deputy Chair	BW	See Challenge 19	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
47	Water Resources	Challenge Panel 3	The Deputy Chair asked what the company was doing to improve response to supply interruptions	Deputy Chair	BW	Bristol Water confirmed that it had increased the number of staff called out per incident and was also looking at ways to improve its rezoning capabilities. Investment such as the Southern Resilience Scheme helped to address this.	09/06/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
48	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 3	The Report Writer asked the impact of the benign weather on the reported performance	RW	BW	Bristol Water confirmed that this was reflected in the stable performance for asset reliability where bursts were 23% lower than expected.	09/06/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
49	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 3	The EA felt that the 1 in 15 year target for hosepipe ban frequency looked high	EA	BW	The company agreed it was more risky than they would like but that the PR14 customer research had not supported a higher level of service in this area.	09/06/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
50	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 3	Bristol Water to confirm average time for optant meter installation in 2015/16	Chair	BW	From 01/04/15 to 31/03/16, the average number of working days for meters to be fitted (that have had meters fitted) was 39 days.	30/08/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
51	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 3	The Deputy Chair asked how customers would be informed about the new change of occupier metering policy	Deputy Chair	BW	Bristol Water confirmed that it was on the annual bill, on Wessex searches, on charges literature, in the customer magazine Watertalk and on the 'If you're moving home' FAQ on the website.	09/06/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
52	Strategy	Challenge Panel 3	The Report Writer asked if the annual report would tell customers how we were targeting improvements in performance for 2016/17	RW	BW	The Chairman's welcome and the CEO statement describe some of the short term business priorities going forward, the report does not specifically address how we will be targeting performance improvements.	06/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
53	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 3	Bristol Water to include trend data when reporting performance	Chair	BW	Repeat of Challenge 41. Included trends in the annual customer satisfaction survey presentation. Trends available for most of our performance data such as KPI's and SIM results which can be presented to the BWCP upon request.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. Changes made.
54	Strategy	Challenge Panel 3	Bristol Water to facilitate an Environment sub group to review the raw water quality and biodiversity index performance measures	Chair	BW	Environmental sub-group due to be held on November 2nd	24/08/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
55	Strategy	Challenge Panel 3	Bristol Water to facilitate a Vulnerable customer sub group to review the % of customers in water poverty performance measure	Chair	BW	The reduction in bills has led to an overachievement on the target for the AMP. The updated affordability calculation model from CACI shows that using our defined threshold of 2% disposable income, there are 1,712 customers in water poverty, 0.37% of the customer base. This is significantly lower than the target of 2.0% we set in our business plan for 2015/16. The two key reasons for this are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our business plan assumed a c1% reduction in bills, but the actual reduction was 16% • Disposable incomes have increased since the original model was created in 2012 (+7.35% in the unmeasured base, +3.78% in the measured base). 	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
56	Information Assurance	Challenge Panel 3	Bristol Water to facilitate an Assurance sub group to review the 2016/17 assurance plan, how this reflects Atkin's management letter recommendations and to understand the internal assurance processes at Bristol Water	Chair	BW	Bristol Water to provide Atkin's assurance report - located in the FTS	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
57	Information Assurance	Challenge Panel 3	The Deputy Chair asked how many business plans Bristol Water would submit in September 2018.	Deputy Chair	BW	Bristol Water said there would be three. There would not be a non-household retail plan this time as the market opened in April 2017	09/06/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
58	Engagement Framework	Challenge Panel 3	The Chair asked about whether the views of customers that had specifically been affected by incidents had been sought on the two options	Chair	BW	Bristol Water confirmed that text messaging or twitter could be possibilities in future to test this	09/06/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
59	Engagement Framework	Challenge Panel 3	University of Bath made the point about understanding the demographics of respondents using these techniques	UB	BW	Bristol Water acknowledged that this would be supplemented with other approaches that are representative of the company's customer base.	09/06/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
60	Engagement Framework	Challenge Panel 3	Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) asked how customers signed up for the online panel	CAB	BW	Bristol Water said that it has used ebilling addresses, and had advertised it on both the website and in Watertalk.	09/06/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
61	Environment	Challenge Panel 3	The Deputy Chair asked why the environment priority previously tested hadn't been asked	Deputy Chair	BW	Bristol Water said that this had been an unintentional oversight. The 15 priorities tested mirrored those tested in 2012 so that the company could track customer views	09/06/2016	Acknowledged. Changes made.
62	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 3	Bristol Water to consider new messaging on its online survey graphic	Chair	BW	Feedback has been taken on board and incorporated as much as possible. ??? sending ??? the new design 12.1.17	12/01/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
63	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 3	Bristol Water to consider ways to improve promotion of its vulnerable customer tariffs	Chair	BW	Community engagement events including our partnership with Blue Monday. Online form for pension credit to be considered after Wessex Water trial.	24/08/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
64	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 3	Bristol Water to make sure that customer views on these areas are tested in the company's engagement strategy	Chair	BW	Agreed will be a core part of the phase 1 of BW PR19 customer research programme - The report is located in the FTS	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
65	Strategy	Challenge Panel 3	BWCP members to consider whether to comment on Ofwat's draft report to Government on retail household competition	Deputy Chair	BWCP	No comments to be provided on Ofwat draft proposals	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
66	Customer Engagement	Email	Regarding Phase 1, how will demographic validity be assured?	Chair	BW	To be improved in the approach proposed by the new consultants, although this will build on the approach taken in PR14	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
67	Engagement Framework	Email	Regarding Phase 1, there is a risk that the use of existing research precludes the use of experiments, limits identifying customer-led innovations, excludes best practice in water and other sectors, eliminates identification of what 'future' we are heading towards, limits learning from PR14 research and other activities currently carried out by other water or utility companies. How will these issues be mitigated?	Chair	BW	We are keenly aware that we need to ensure that we cover best practice in our approach to engagement. We have already implemented some new approaches - online sample surveys, Annual customer satisfaction survey, monthly customer satisfaction survey, feedback cards, stakeholder survey and the online panel - but we agree it would be helpful to identify this as a key objective and we will amend the tender documentation to make this much more explicit. *awaiting doc by NERA	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. Changes made.
68	Engagement Framework	Email	Regarding Phase 1, how will the strategic support enable, or identify where, dialogue with the customer on complex issues (e.g. inter-generational equity, resilience, reductions in water usage, etc) where informed thought leads to better decision-making and how will the views of different stakeholders be weighed against each other?	Chair	BW	We would expect this to be part of the proposal to be included in the later phases of support, but we agree it would be helpful to make this a transparent requirement at this stage.	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. Changes made.
69	Engagement Framework	Email	Regarding Phase 1, how will social media, the potential of apps and other relatively new techniques that have gained in popularity recently be used to engage customers and how will this engagement be evaluated?	Chair	BW	We have already identified some new potential techniques (we can send feedback surveys as part of the SMS package which we can send to customers following an interruption to supply, we can also use surveys on twitter/fb/web) but again we agree we will need some support in ensuring that this can be incorporated in our overall approach and provide structured evaluation.	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. Changes made.
70	Engagement Framework	Email	Regarding Phase 1, how will behavioural considerations be taken into account based on existing research	Chair	BW	We are not sure that it will be possible to retrospectively apply behavioural analysis to existing research, but will check. We agree this is clearly something we need to build into future research and again think it would be helpful to amend the tender document to identify this explicitly.	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. Changes made.
71	Engagement Framework	Email	Regarding specific research that will be commissioned from third party companies, how soon will you be able to map out where additional research input is required and when this might occur?	Chair	BW	This is likely to be part of the initial phase of the strategic support and I would expect this to be completed well in advance of December 2016. We will ensure that we consult the CCG for ideas and requirements before each of the phases of work are initiated.	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
72	Engagement Framework	Email	Regarding specific research that will be commissioned from third party companies, how will the CCG inform the scope of third party research?	Chair	BW	We would include a review process for the CCG to comment on all future phases of work. As we discussed we are keen to ensure we incorporate the CCG's views in the design of third party research. I understand that we had a subcommittee to the CCG for PR14 that was focused around customer engagement. We could see this working again but our preference is to try to have the discussion with the full CCG and it is for us and our advisors to make sure we present in a way that is understandable and transparent. We will of course keep this under review and if you already have a strong sense that a subcommittee would be beneficial we would be happy to discuss further.	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
73	Engagement Framework	Email	Regarding specific research that will be commissioned from third party companies, how will the customer help design the research?	Chair	BW	If necessary we will commission specific customer research to inform the design of the future stages.	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
74	Engagement Framework	Email	Regarding specific research that will be commissioned from third party companies, how will the CCG be involved in arriving at the outcomes from the research?	Chair	BW	As we discussed we will build in a specific feedback stage to the CCG to review, comment and appraise the outcomes of the research.	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
75	Engagement Framework	Email	Regarding specific research that will be commissioned from third party companies, how will the research company explain the research findings to the CCG?	Chair	BW	This will inevitably be a combination of BW and the research company, but we would expect the CCG to have full access to the outcomes and for the research company to be able to present the outcomes in a way that are understandable to the CCG.	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
76	Engagement Framework	Email	Regarding specific research that will be commissioned from third party companies, how will customer views regarding concepts such as expansion of the joint billing to include other utilities, the use of apps, smart meters, etc. be incorporated into the research?	Chair	BW	We would expect this to be explicitly covered in the future research stage but wanted to remain open about what should be covered.	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
77	Engagement Framework	Email	Regarding specific research that will be commissioned from third party companies, how does customer engagement research become an iterative process?	Chair	BW	It remains our overall company objective to demonstrate this as part of the PR19 business plan submission. This is going to be a continued journey for us but we agree it would be best to detail this as an explicit objective in the tender document.	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
78	Strategy	Challenge Panel 4	The Deputy Chair will update the Log on a monthly basis and will circulate to members the list of any outstanding challenges.	Deputy Chair	Deputy Chair	Issued at end of September 2016 and will be for the next BWCP meeting in December 2016	22/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
79	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 4	BW will look at the timing of SIM performance reporting to the Panel to avoid problems in future.	Chair	BW	This has been done and the BWCP meetings will be planned to reflect this.	17/10/2016	Acknowledged. Changes made.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
80	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 4	The Chair challenged BW to explain how improvements in SIM had been achieved.	Chair	BW	BW said it had been focusing particularly on live complaints and had been refining the customer journey. It has been using text messaging in order to be more proactive. It also holds daily 'huddles' each morning to focus on complaints and other current customer-related issues	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
81	Innovation	Challenge Panel 4	The Report Writer challenged BW over the extent of its external benchmarking to customer service systems and processes it is undertaking in order to identify innovations that would further benefit its customer service performance	Report Writer	BW	BW is regularly looking outside the sector in order to benchmark its customer service. In particular through the Institute of Customer Service membership. In addition to this resource has been bought in from outside the sector and we maximise the opportunities for networking, including a visit to WPD.	22/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
82	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 4	The Deputy Chair asked if the SIM reward is payable at the end of the five years.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW confirmed this and that it has to maintain the performance over the five years, not just in one year, to earn any reward.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
83	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 4	The Chair challenged BW on the extent of its segmented customer information, eg by postcode, information on garden ownership, numbers of bathrooms, numbers on social tariffs, etc	Chair	BW	The need for a better understanding of the segmentation of customer type has been referenced in the Customer Engagement Framework. It is awaiting sign off by BW and the CCG but if goes ahead will be done. The CCG will be involved in what types of segmentation are used. The CCG will be involved in what types of segmentation are used. The segmentation variables have been discussed with the Customer sub group in the April meeting. ???? emailed ???? on 11.4 to confirm she was happy with the variables for segmentation.	12/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
84	Strategy	Challenge Panel 4	The Report Writer asked what sort of organisation the strategic advisor would be.	Report Writer	BW	BW replied that it was likely to be a company that has expertise in customer engagement rather than economics or regulation.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
85	Engagement Framework	Challenge Panel 4	WPD requested that the Panel have early sight of the stakeholder engagement plan.	WPD	BW	This is included in the Customer Framework	12/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
86	Water Resources	Challenge Panel 4	EA challenged the map, not by disputing the supply risk in BW's area, but highlighting that there are variations in resource planning methodologies across companies and that it is not possible to compare companies directly	EA	BW	BW accepted this	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
87	Information Assurance	Challenge Panel 4	The Report Writer asked if the DP and WRP will have gone through external technical assurance, perhaps by EA, before going to customers for consultation	Report Writer	EA	The EA said its role is to provide guidance to Defra on content and the planning process, not to approve the Plans. EA will contribute as part of the consultation process. It will inform BW if they've strayed from the accepted methodology but notes that the methodology is broad.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
88	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 4	The Chair challenged BW over its confidence in the regulatory requirements for the DP and WRP and how it intends to engage with customers	Chair	BW	BW replied it had high confidence in the former but that it would be looking for the Panel's help with engagement.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
89	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 4	The Chair said it will be important to get feedback from customers on their willingness to save water when drought is threatened, what assurances the company can give them and how to test this. There is a need to start to pull information together soon	Chair	BW	BW accepted this and it is planned as part of our drought plan public engagement in January/February 2017 via a targeted questionnaire. The drought plan consultation, this particular question has been asked on the online panel so the feedback is being captured and fed into the process.	21/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
90	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 4	UWE has access to information on customer engagement on drought from other cities around the world (including customer memory and experience of drought and perception of drought likelihood) and offered to pull this together for the Panel and BW.	UWE	UWE and Deputy Chair	Two specific questions compiled and sent to UWE. Now overtaken by the public consultation on the draft Drought Plan	22/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
91	Water Resources	Challenge Panel 4	The Chair hopes that the Panel will be able to raise the profile of the consultation on water resource planning and will look for opportunities to do so	Chair	Chair	Expectation on Challenge Panel to be involved in relevant consultations as per ToR	22/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
92	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 4	The Chair challenged BW over the need to maintain and retain the relationship with the end user of water. Is there anything that could be learned from the energy sector? WPD added that the relationship needs to be with the end user rather than the bill payer. Customers may struggle to understand the water chain under the new market and are likely to contact BW even after they've been transferred.	Chair	BW	With any issue relating to water services or operations, the end user will continue to contact Bristol Water. If the query is to do with billing, switching, or payments then we will advise them to contact their retailer. The Ready to Retail videos explain this process and are located in the FTS.	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
93	Tariffs	Challenge Panel 4	The Deputy Chair referred to the current and well established Guaranteed Standards of Service (GSS) system and to its effective automatic customer compensation payment arrangements. Complaint levels may rise if GSS doesn't continue and there may be time lags as billing related complaints received by BW will have to be forwarded to the retailers for action	Deputy Chair	BW	BW will still have a responsibility to pay GSS but this changes to being paid to the retailer rather than the consumer. We are confident that the processes we have in place will met GSS requirements and therefore complaints for Bristol Water will not rise due to retail separation. If consumers complain about GSS this complaint would be with the retailer not the wholesaler.	17/10/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
94	Tariffs	Challenge Panel 4	The Deputy Chair requested that BW should alert the Panel to any adverse financial impact of new charges on customers	Deputy Chair	BW	If we have any tariff increases over 5% we have to carry out an impact assessment of the customers affected and agree a strategy for handling the impacts of charges increases on customers. If required, this will be agreed with CCWater ahead of publication of our charges scheme in January, and we will publish our handling strategy at the same time.	28/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
95	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 4	The Deputy Chair would also welcome the executive summary of the Frontier Economics and PwC reports be made available to assure himself that there is no adverse affect on customers.	Deputy Chair	BW	The Frontier report is uploaded in the FTS. The PwC report won't be produced until January (as they don't do the audits until then) so we can provide that if required at that point.	14/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
96	Tariffs	Challenge Panel 4	With regard to the proposed charges for 17/18, the Deputy Chair noted the biggest increases are driven by inflation and revenue recovery. How is the company going to explain this to customers next March and still maintain trust?	Deputy Chair	BW	BW agreed it's not an easy message but that it's not in charge of the price setting methodology.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
97	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 4	The Deputy Chair referred to the meter penetration target being missed in 2015/16 and asked if this would improve as a result of the proposed bill increase next year.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW replied that the majority of meter changes are not driven by optants but on change of occupier. BW hasn't decided on its meter policy for PR19 yet but will have formed a view on this by January next year. Metering policy presented to BWCP.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
98	Tariffs	Challenge Panel 4	BW noted that the proposed bill increase next year results in bills similar to those in place in 2005 (excluding inflation). The Chair suggested BW promote this as a positive message to customers.	Chair	BW	BW replied it would rather not draw attention to the level of bills in this way.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
99	Tariffs	Challenge Panel 4	WPD asked if customer location affects the charges they pay. BW replied that all customers pay the same regardless of where they live	WPD	BW	BW could choose to charge according to location but does not wish to (along with nearly all companies) as it considers it is not warranted and potentially very controversial. It would have to consult customers on this.	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
100	Tariffs	Challenge Panel 4	NS asked if BW faced challenges communicating with ethnic minority customers	NSC	BW	BW replied that it does have the facility to communicate in several languages, particularly on bills. It does note some cultural differences surrounding payment of bills but accommodates this where it can	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
101	Information Assurance	Challenge Panel 4	The Report Writer asked when the company's Assurance Plan will be updated and whether information risk assessments and stakeholder consultation be undertaken again	Report Writer	BW	BW confirmed all these activities will be carried out in time to re-publish the Assurance Plan in March 2017. BW do not expect Ofwat to reconsider the company's 'Prescribed' assurance status until 2018. Assurance plan re-issued	21/09/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
102	Strategy	Challenge Panel 4	The Chair subsequently asked the Report Writer to agree dates for future sub group meetings and main meetings with BW and to let members know	Chair	Report Writer and BW	Completed during November 2016	22/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
103	Customer Engagement	Email	Regarding the list of questions set out, there appears to be synergy between questions 5 and 8 on risks and challenges respectively and you may benefit from combining the two	Chair	BW	This was considered but both questions were asked. Completed in tender	21/01/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
104	Strategy	Email	Regarding question 3, it is unclear how the strategic partner intends to engage with the Challenge Panel and how creative this process may be, particularly in terms of the use of Chinese walls.	Chair	BW	We addressed this during the presentation questions. Completed in tender	21/01/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
105	Customer Engagement	Email	Regarding question 9, innovation needs to be applied to the customer engagement process as well as to the entire customer journey and experience, building in customer behaviours and experimentation and using a range of surveying techniques and methods.	Chair	BW	We looked for examples on this in the responses and presentations. Completed in tender	21/01/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
106	Engagement Framework	Email	I am concerned that customer priorities may have been established in prior research from several years ago by Bristol Water instead of from a 'clean sheet' where additional categories of information may be required	Chair	BW	Bristol Water is keen to use existing, current and future customer priority research. Phase 1 will address this. Covered in the framework	21/01/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
107	Engagement Framework	Email	I am concerned that there is no mention of the adoption / consideration of insight gained from customers regarding how or whether the liberalisation of marketplaces (such as banking, energy, telephony and broadcast media), from insight gained in other sectors or organisations that excel in customer satisfaction/service and how this might affect customer choice, expectations, standards, behaviours and preferences	Chair	BW	This is a worthwhile consideration and a point we will continue to develop into the framework for customer engagement. Covered in framework via ICS survey	21/01/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
108	Engagement Framework	Email	I am concerned that there is no explicit statement regarding putting the views of customers at the heart of Bristol Water's business planning,	Chair	BW	From observing the presentations we choose a partner who demonstrates this as a priority. Completed in tender	21/01/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
109	Engagement Framework	Email	I am concerned that the customer also receives value for money	Chair	BW	Value for money was considered as part of the tender	21/01/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
110	Engagement Framework	Email	I am concerned that Bristol Water may be able to pre-empt a proportion of 'unwanted' contacts from its customers through excellent customer service based on robust customer engagement	Chair	BW	Strategy in place to reduce unwanted contact and on-going engagement does support that	21/01/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
111	Engagement Framework	Email	I am concerned that there may be a lack of ambition regarding learning from best practice, benchmarking and other means of comparison from exemplars in liberalised sectors worldwide	Chair	BW	ICS benchmarking now agreed for Q4 and training programme being designed. ICS benchmarking has taken place, resulted received end of April. BW scored higher than any other utility company has in the UKCSI. It also put BW above the average performance across all sectors. BW scored 83.6, UKCSI average is 77.8 and Utilities 74.4. The findings will be used as part of the long term customer service strategy via a working group and monitored through the Customer Service Working Group. In addition to this, the framework also highlights that the Benefits Transfer review will use national data so will help with comparative analysis.	21/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
112	Customer Engagement	Email	How will Bristol Water determine what enables excellent customer service to be sustainable within the organisation?	Chair	BW	Part of Responsive to Customer strategy and ICS benchmarking and ambitions for service mark help	21/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
113	Customer Engagement	Email	How are adequate resources (e.g. time, money, knowledge, etc) allocated to improving internal and external customer service?	Chair	BW	Governance in place to review this and focus given throughout the business	21/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
114	Customer Engagement	Email	How are the indicators that are monitored on a corporate basis determined? How might this be measured and quantified?	Chair	BW	Through the governance process for the customer service directorate	21/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
115	Customer Engagement	Email	How does Bristol Water articulate how its customers should benefit by receiving excellent customer service?	Chair	BW	ODIs are key indicators, aim is to meet customer expectations whilst keeping bills affordable	21/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
116	Customer Engagement	Email	How does Bristol Water implement best practice from water, regulated industries, other companies?	Chair	BW	ICS benchmarking and networking events	21/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
117	Customer Engagement	Email	How is excellent customer service recognised and rewarded within Bristol Water? How do such incentives drive the right type of performance within the business?	Chair	BW	Compliments via line manager and shared business wide, team of the month and in performance reviews.	21/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
118	BW Performance	Email	How does your focus on excellent customer service help you to define what it is that Bristol Water needs to do to be ranked 'best in class' as per your SIM target?	Chair	BW	For improvements to maintain customer expectations.	21/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
119	BW Performance	Agenda Review Nov 2016	BW were asked to develop and publish a suite of comparative metrics which can inform the BWCP and customers of the company's performance against its industry peers	Chair	BW	BW agreed to investigate and develop such an information suite however a timeframe was not agreed. This was presented at the BWCP no 7 meeting.	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. Changes made.
120	Strategy	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Deputy Chair asked if the information 'Owner' and 'Reviewer' was the same person	Deputy Chair	BW	BW replied they would be different people to ensure the robustness of the assurance regime	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
121	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Report Writer asked where ultimate accountability for information reliability and accuracy lies	Report Writer	BW	BW responded that accountability lies at the respective Director level but that information Owners were responsible for producing information of appropriate reliability and accuracy and have to confirm in writing that they have done so. Formal approval forms are in use and have been so for a number of years	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
122	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Chair asked about data completeness and accuracy	Chair	Atkins	Atkins replied that data may not ever be complete and fully accurate depending on the source and type of information and the inherent risk of human error. This is to be expected and is reasonable	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
123	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	CCW would like to see an example of BW's reporting methodology and assurance activity in practice	CCW	BW	BW agreed that this would be possible and suggested this be undertaken in summer 2017 and would arrange. We will incorporate this within our presentations of assurance around 17/18 reporting. Covered in an assurance update meeting 13 June meeting.	15/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
124	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Chair asked Atkins if it had any areas of concern following its recent mid-year audit.	Chair	Atkins	Atkins is satisfied there is a programme of improvement in place, which is supported by the company's management	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
125	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Deputy Chair asked if it intends to take Panel through the Assurance Plan again next Jan/Feb.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW said that it would like feedback on updated methodology before it publishes its Plan next March. Panel provided feedback and Plan published	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
126	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Chair asked why BW had chosen to use a variation of the information risk methodology favoured by Ofgem for the electricity industry and whether the company compared its methodology with other companies both in sector or outside	Chair	BW	BW replied that Ofwat had offered companies the Ofgem methodology as a possible (but not mandatory) approach. Atkins added that it considered BW's methodology to be reasonable and appropriate.	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
127	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Deputy Chair observed that the resulting risk assessments didn't appear to provide much distinction between attributes	Deputy Chair	BW	BW acknowledged this and added that its mitigations do not differ significantly between the information categorised in the various 'amber' risk categories. However it considers the risk assessments and mitigations to be appropriate nonetheless.	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
128	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Chair stressed the importance to the BWCP of the impact of misreporting on customers and the need for the Panel to understand this impact and its materiality	Chair	BW	BW replied that customer impact has been assessed in terms of effect on levels of service and on bills. However it's not easy to measure quantitatively	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
129	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Chair agreed that the company's current approach is fairly qualitative and suggested that BW might consider identifying and managing customer impact across a range of indicators.	Chair	BW	BW agreed to consider this. Research to date shows a variety of different methods and attributes involved	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
130	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Report Writer questioned the increased risks around per capita consumption and the increased probability of poor customer complaint reporting	Report Writer	BW	BW replied that the former was due to the degree of estimating required to generate per capita consumption data. It was unable to explain the increased probability of poor complaint recording and would look again at this.	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
131	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Chair asked whether BW has mitigations and controls to counter these higher risks	Chair	BW	BW replied that it did or was working towards achieving these by the end of the current reporting year. Mitigations and controls now in place	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
132	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Report Writer observed that Ofwat considered BW's last Assurance Plan to be written in technical terms and not accessible to customers.	Report Writer	BW	BW will consider how best to use the BWCP to review its next Plan from the perspective of customers. BWCP involved in commenting on Plan.	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
133	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Deputy Chair asked BW if it has an objective to move out of Ofwat's prescribed category in a year's time	Deputy Chair	BW	BW confirmed this.	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
134	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Deputy Chair asked Atkins whether it considers BW to be on track to implement its information assurance plan	Deputy Chair	Atkins	Atkins confirmed it had seen no evidence to suggest otherwise.	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
135	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	Atkins noted that the company doesn't currently have a methodology for forecasting year-end performance	Atkins	BW	BW acknowledged this but is working on it. End of year forecasting now in place.	30/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
136	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Chair referred Atkins' mid year audit finding as expressed in a RAG format. There were many 'greens' in terms of data quality and some methodologies, with 'ambers' elsewhere. No 'reds' had been recorded. She said such results was encouraging but didn't provide any information on findings that were on the cusp of green/amber or amber/red	Chair	Atkins	Atkins replied that the ambers were closer to green rather than red and that they have no undue concerns but are keen that BW maintains the momentum of improvement	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
137	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Deputy Chair wondered why the reporting methodologies for Ease of Contact and Value for Money information had gone from green to amber since the last assessment	Deputy Chair	BW	BW replied that the description of these measures in the Business Plan were inaccurate and that performance is now measured on a different basis. The Business Plan targets remain however. The associated reporting methodologies need to be revised to accommodate these aspects, hence the amber risk status until this has been done (by year end). Now completed.	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
138	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Deputy Chair observed that this demonstrates that the assurance regime is working and recommended that BW uses this example in its Assurance Plan update	Deputy Chair	BW	BW will consider this offer. Overtaken by other work and now not required.	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
139	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Chair asked the company what it meant by 'longer term' in its sides	Chair	BW	BW replied 25 years	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
140	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Deputy Chair challenged the company that there is a danger in only focusing its forthcoming customer engagement on the short term five year business plan horizon, and ignoring the longer term	Deputy Chair	BW	BW accepted this challenge and will consider how to accommodate it. The customer engagement framework will allow BW to ask customers about longer term preferences. The Customer Engagement Framework shows plans to consider longer term customer views, the schools programme is aimed at the future generation thoughts and the customer priority groups asked customer to consider their properties both for now and the long term.	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. Changes made.
141	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Report Writer said that some CCGs have been engaged by their companies to help with longer term planning. The Chair said the BWCP would be very happy to engage with BW in this way	Report Writer	BW	BW will consider this offer. BWCP involved in commenting on Plan which is now more customer friendly.	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
142	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Deputy Chair noted that BW's references to the Risk Based Review in its slides are in the context of Ofwat's PR14 methodology. Resilience has come a long way since	Deputy Chair	BW	BW said it will update its plans when Ofwat's PR19 methodology becomes available. Final methodology now available. This challenge was cleared by the data presented at the ODI meeting on 26 February 2018	26/02/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
143	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Deputy Chair asked BW who the main points of contact for the Panel will be during the PR19 process	Deputy Chair	BW	BW (???) replied that his directorate would be the main point of contact. Other BW directorates will be present at Panel meetings as necessary. ??? has been recruited as BW's PR19 Project Manager. BW has more resources in place now than at equivalent time at PR14. There is also greater governance in place than before	30/11/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
144	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Deputy Chair to provide BW with the list of seven Performance Commitments on which Atkins had noted audit shortcomings. The Panel will need to know how well BW is addressing these issues so it can report accordingly next year. There is also a need for the Panel to understand the materiality of them.	Deputy Chair	Deputy Chair	List of 7 Performance Commitments provided by email	06/12/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
145	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	The Deputy Chair said that the Panel was seeking a formal response from BW to be included in the 2017 report.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW response indicated that 3 concerns have been cleared but 4 remain as ongoing. Detailed responses placed on the fts. Challenge cleared by discussion at Assurance sub group on 21 July 2017 and resulting meeting notes. See also challenge #516	29/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
146	Information Assurance	Assurance SG Nov 2016	BW also agreed to provide the Panel with a progress update on its reporting methodology improvements for 2016/17 at next week's meeting	BW	BW	we gave an update, the presentation/minutes should confirm	12/12/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
147	Strategy	Challenge Panel 5	The Deputy Chair asked that everyone put Panel members' email addresses on their contacts list to avoid emails going into spam folders. The Deputy Chair will put an email list on the file transfer system (FTS).	Deputy Chair	Members	Panel members email address list placed onto the BW file transfer system and circulated to all current members	12/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
148	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 5	NSC challenged whether the hosepipe ban 15-year frequency is a strong enough target.	NSC	BW	BW replied that many steps are taken before a ban would be introduced including deploying additional water sources and encouraging customers to use less water	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
149	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 5	UWE (??) considers that the communication of water shortage risk to customers is not good and asked the company what it could do better in this respect.	UWE(??)	BW	BW accepted this challenge but stated that current targets are set and cannot be changed and the company will be held to account against them. It will have the opportunity to review targets for PR19.	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
150	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 5	NE considers the hosepipe ban target to be divorced from environmental protection and that BW should review the Drought Plan in this context.	NE	BW	BW accepted this challenge and will include it in the DP consultation which will involve the Panel. The drought plan consultation included targeted information for customers on environmental aspects of drought and the consultation material was shared with the BWCP	25/09/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
151	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 5	UWE (??) asked how many samples are taken to arrive at what appears to be very precise result	UWE(??)	BW	BW replied that many thousand samples are taken in line with DWI requirements. The causes of the 40 failures include nickel, lead and iron which often result from deficiencies in customers' plumbing	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
152	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 5	UWE (??) asked if there was scope for a free 'first plumbing fix' for customers.	UWE(??)	BW	BW said that this was a possibility but it had to weigh up the costs and benefits of what is an industry wide problem, not just BW.	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
153	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 5	The Chair asked if organisations such as Water UK are looking at this and raising its profile.	Chair	BW	BW accepted that it doesn't have the visibility it needs for action but there is only handful of failures each year. There is no compulsion on customers to change taps.	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
154	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 5	UWE (???) wondered if customers are aware of the issue and whether BW can manage this.	UWE(???)	BW	BW replied that it has an approved plumber scheme but wider industry joint action is needed on the issue.	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
155	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 5	The Chair asked what the operational triggers for increased action are.	Chair	BW	BW replied that it uses nightline flows to monitor the situation and responds accordingly.	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
156	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 5	BW are currently missing their target and are forecast to miss the end of year target	Chair	BW	BW will be looking again at its metering strategy before PR19 as part of next year's budgeting activity and will come back to BWCP with proposals. This was presented at the BWCP no 7 meeting.	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. Changes made.
157	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 5	?? asked what the benefits of having a meter are and why as a BW customer he hasn't heard of them.	????	BW	BW replied small households usually gain most from reduced bills. Its metering scheme is published in its annual report and in other literature and at public events.	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
158	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 5	?? suggested BW look at TV adverts, bus adverts, petrol pumps adverts.	????	BW	BW agreed that more could be done and will reflect on the suggestions. There is also a need for a better industry position on the issue. This was presented at the BWCP no 7 meeting.	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. Changes made.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
159	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 5	NSC asked how the cost of additional meter reading is handled.	NSC	BW	BW replied that the additional costs are spread across all customers.	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
160	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 5	CCW stated that the challenge for BW is to look at its publicity.	CCW	BW	BW will review this as part of its budgeting process and will come back to Panel in the summer of 2017 with any new proposals. This was presented at the BWCP no 7 meeting.	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. Changes made.
161	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 5	The EA asked if there was a financial incentive associated with this measure	EA	BW	BW replied there is a potential reward against this measure at the end of the AMP period	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
162	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 5	EA asked if the company has a view yet on it overall rewards and penalties position. Other companies provide CCGs with an indication of whether it will end up in the black or the red.	EA	BW	BW replied that its general view at the moment is that it will end the period in the red but it is too early to be precise	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
163	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 5	NE said it remains uncomfortable with an incentive around raw water quality and that the measure and any incentive needs to be smarter at the next price review.	NE	BW	BW agreed that it should be different at PR19. A new measure is being developed for PR19 through consultancy investigations.	25/09/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
164	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 5	DHF enquired by what measures raw water quality is judged, what the future threats there are and the costs of dealing with them.	DHF	BW	BW said the measures are similar to tap water quality, eg lead, iron, metaldyhide, etc.	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
165	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 5	NE suggested a more precise driver at PR19 would be algal blooms (reducing nutrient levels).	NE	BW	BW said that it will be testing willingness to pay for improving raw water quality at PR19. Customer willingness to pay has included aspects of this measure and further testing will be carried out during the consultation phase of WRMP19.	25/09/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
166	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 5	UWE (???) asked about the company's strategic aims for this measure, how they compare nationally and whether BW was doing any benchmarking.	UWE(???)	BW	BW agreed this was a good question but that it is difficult to compare across the industry. The regulatory framework was limited at the time last business plan was developed. The current Ofwat consultation on PR19 outcomes may address this	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
167	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 5	This indicator's target is not being met and is forecast to miss slightly at year-end	Chair	BW	BW considers the target set was exceptionally high	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
168	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 5	BW's performance has improved over 2015/16 however the target is not being met.	Chair	BW	There has been a methodology change since PR14 as the company's classification of negative billing contacts was not in line with the new SIM measure. BW is currently looking to see what can be achieved against the new more stringent definition. Changes now implemented.	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
169	Information Assurance	Challenge Panel 5	The Deputy Chair informed the Panel of the company's amended information risk assessment methodology, which now places additional emphasis on the customer impact of poor information being reported. This change has had the effect of increasing information risk on many measures. This caused some concern to the members of the Panel.	Deputy Chair	Atkins	The mid-year audit of the company's methodologies and resulting performance data provided by Atkins had not identified any material issues. Atkins also reported that it had not seen anything to suggest the company would not implement the improvements in assurance planned for 2016/17	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
170	Information Assurance	Challenge Panel 5	BW has had additional feedback from Ofwat which suggested it is currently on the margin of 'prescribed' and 'targeted'. A particular concern expressed by Ofwat is that BW's published information is not always accessible in language to customers. BW said it would welcome the BWCP's help in making its future communications better in this respect and in helping it further strengthen its assurance processes	BW	BWCP	Whist the Panel considers the company is moving in the right direction, it wishes to see it do more, particularly in areas where information risk is 'amber'. The panel would welcome assisting BW in this way. BWCP provided assistance as requested.	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
171	Information Assurance	Challenge Panel 5	UWE (???) added that BW's activities impact on customers in areas where there are no performance measures, eg health, dental health, psychological health, perception.	UWE(???)	BW	BW said it would welcome a separate discussion with UWE (???) on this. This has been overtaken by events so is not required before we submit our Ofwat report.	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. No action before Ofwat report
172	Engagement Framework	Challenge Panel 5	BW thanked the BWCP members for their contributions. It will consider these in preparing its draft customer engagement framework for the Panel's Engagement Sub-Group to review on 9 January 2017.	BW	BW	BW will finalise its strategy in time for the Panel's review at its next meeting on 25 January 2017. Strategy finalised and presented to Panel on 25 January	07/12/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
173	Engagement Framework	Challenge Panel 5	The Deputy Chair asked if details of the joint research being undertaken with Wessex Water by Accent would be shared with the BWCP at the input stage as well as at the results stage. The Chair added that members of the Panel who have a specialist interest in customer engagement should have the opportunity to be involved in the learning after the proposed pilot study has taken place and also observe and take part in some surveys.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW will consider how best to meet the Panel's needs and will discuss further with the Sub-Group on 9 January. The panel will be invited to see the survey before it goes live. The panel were able review and make comments on the questionnaire before it went live.	23/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
174	Research Results	Challenge Panel 5	The Deputy Chair asked how the stated preferences used in the first stage and the revealed preferences from the second stage would come together. .	Deputy Chair	BW	BW replied that it would present and discuss this with the BWCP Engagement Sub-Group on 9 January. Seen in the framework	23/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
175	Engagement Framework	Challenge Panel 5	UWE (???) asked if BW had yet considered to whom the WTP questions will go and how the responses will be assessed.	UWE(???)	BW	BW said that work was ongoing on this. Can be seen in the Accent paper on FTS	23/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
176	Research Results	Challenge Panel 5	CCW stated that the impact on other stakeholders as well as customers should be covered.	CCW	BW	BW said the wider research framework will accommodate this. Seen in the framework	23/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
177	Research Results	Challenge Panel 5	?? said that ability to pay as well as willingness to pay should be assessed.	????	BW	BW replied that the company's previous research on affordability and cross subsidy will be included in wider research framework and will be presented to the Sub Group on 9 January. Seen in the framework	23/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
178	Research Results	Challenge Panel 5	BW would like feedback from BWCP members on the proposed survey questions as soon as possible. It was agreed that BW would set up an early morning telephone conference call with members on either 14 or 15 December and would circulate the proposed questions in advance. Key points arising from the call would be documented by BW and circulated to all BWCP members.	BW	BWCP	Conference call not held as questionnaire not available in time; to be re-scheduled. Feedback provided by email.	06/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
179	Tariffs	Email	BW have used a value of £16 instead of the BW estimate of £24.44, thus we request clarification of the effect on customers	Deputy Chair	BW	Ofwat no longer require strict allocation of the tariff differential and BW are satisfied their differential meets the changed rules. See the full details in the fts	23/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
180	Tariffs	Email	Ofwat reported a BW revenue misallocation, thus we request clarification of the effect on customers	Deputy Chair	BW	This was a misallocation between the non-household wholesale and retail elements. There was no impact on customers' bills; see fts for details	23/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
181	Tariffs	Email	Ofwat reported additional costs in the preparation of the Retail market, thus we request clarification of the effect on customers	Deputy Chair	BW	BW are republishing the corrected figures. See the details in the fts	23/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
182	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	The Chair asked how these surveys relate to external issues such as public health and climate change and for things that customers don't necessarily know that they want.	Chair	BW	BW replied that such issues will be picked up using qualitative research. All research now complete.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
183	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	Western Power Distribution (WPD) asked how BW can demonstrate that the attributes it uses for research purposes are the things that customers value.	WPD	BW	BW replied that it uses the results from its qualitative research to inform this. Research attributes were selected by customer priorities.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
184	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	The Chair highlighted the risk of introducing 'nudge' or 'bias' into the questions posed to customers	Chair	BW	BW agreed with the need to avoid this risk. All research complied with recognised standards.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
185	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	NSC stressed the need to educate customers about BW's water service and to ensure the engagement framework is developed in terms of transparency and understandably to the customer.	NSC	BW	BW agreed these points are important and said they are embedded in the framework.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
186	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	The Deputy Chair said that the Panel should see and have the opportunity to comment on the outcome of the review of existing information as this has informed the proposed framework.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW agreed that the Panel should have the opportunity to do this and will to supply the detail of the review. Customer engagement framework and research shared with BWCP at all stages.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
187	Affordability	CESG January 2017	The Chair asked BW how well they understood the needs of customers who are currently just above the social tariff threshold. Affordability and vulnerability are different things.	Chair	BW	BW agreed that this is an area the engagement framework should cover. Framework updated.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
188	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	Company perception and performance will also be included in the engagement framework, for example how BW compares with other water companies. The Report Writer said that that comparisons should also be made outside the water sector	Report Writer	BW	BW agreed. The results from ICS survey will allow us to benchmark against others in the utility sector such as gas and electric companies. These results will be available in May. ICS results shared when available.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
189	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	WPD suggested there may be merit in testing the current customer priority list before doing any further detailed work	WPD	BW	Testing priorities has been carried out in the customer focus groups, the online panel, market engagement day and staff roadshow.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
190	Environment	CESG January 2017	UWE noted that environmental dimension appears to be missing from the PR19 priority list. The Chair added that the Panel will need to understand why the environment doesn't appear to figure now.	UWE	BW	DbD replied that environment isn't in the top five priority list but acknowledged that it may need more attention. An update on this topic will be provided at the CCG sub-group on the 4/04/2017. Update provided in July.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
191	Environment	CESG January 2017	The customer engagement process and the economic business planning process will come together at some point. BW needs to be clear what customers think about the environment.	Chair	BW	BW and DbD agreed and the engagement framework will provide a number of different ways to gather customer's views on the environment. Update provided in July.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
192	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	WPD asked BW what they want to achieve from the engagement process.	WPD	BW	The company replied that it wants to develop a business plan that's right for customers and the business. It wishes to implement an engagement framework on an on-going and longer term basis such that it won't have undertake such a big exercise at PR24.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
193	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	The proposed BW customer panel currently has around 2000 participants. ?? asked about the demographic of the panel. DPD said it will be assessing this in due course. The Chair said the BWCP would like to see the outcome of this when the time comes.	Chair	BW	BW agreed. Online panel demographics shared with BWCP.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
194	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	BW propose that a 'Shadow Customer Challenge Group' is established, made up of a selected group from the customer panel. The Chair suggested the name be changed to avoid confusion with the BWCP	Chair	BW	As it states in the Framework, the customer panel will be named 'Customer Forum Group'	26/04/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
195	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	The Deputy Chair would wish to see the demographic of the proposed Group and the quality of data coming from it.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW agrees to sharing the demographics of the Customer Forum Group, which will mirror the segmentation of our customer base. Demographics shared at each stage.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
196	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	?? said that it would be important for the Panel to know the detail of customer segmentation	????	BW	This will be shared for feedback from the CCG on the 4/4/2017. Segregation was discussed at the 4 April sub group and a conclusion reached with the Panel.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
197	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	NSC asked whether charities and ethnic minorities will be consulted as part of the process.	NSC	BW	BW said it would consider this and suggested that religious groups, scout associations and village halls could possibly be included as well. Such groups included where appropriate after BW consideration.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
198	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	The Chair suggested that Local Authorities may also be a source of information, for example the provision of school meals for children, the location and occupancy of council housing stock, etc.	Chair	BW	DbD agreed this could be a good potential data source and will consider this. BW considered this but there was a problem with sharing such personal data.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
199	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	The Deputy Chair wondered if BW's debt information may also be useful.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW replied that its debt information is currently asset based, not customer based. DPD said it would be analysing BW's customer complaint data to see whether it would assist with engagement in the longer term. This is a longer term action and not required for our report. To be placed in the 'no action before Ofwat report' section.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No action before Ofwat report
200	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	The Deputy Chair suggested all the 'better information' work should be accurately documented and wondered whether any peer review or checks will be built in to the process	Deputy Chair	BW	BW agreed about documentation and said that it will have internal governance processes in place including quarterly internal reviews and challenge sessions. Panel have been informed about what has been put into place.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
201	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	DPD outlined proposals for annual stakeholder surveys and other events, on-going stakeholder engagement and quarterly developer and retailer days	WPD	BW	BW stated that the intention is to be more systematic and disciplined with stakeholder surveys. All of the proposals outlined are included in the framework	26/04/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
202	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	The Deputy Chair asked whether future customers will be included in the engagement process.	Deputy Chair	BW	DbD replied that an annual schools engagement process is being proposed with possible extension to further education establishments such as UWE. School programme is being developed. Youth board work has started which also meets this challenge.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
203	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	The Deputy Chair also asked whether other groups will be included such as rural customers or members of the Polish or Somali communities. The Chair added transient populations such as students or travellers might also be considered. ?? added that BW may be able to draw upon research from other sectors and associations.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW welcomed these suggestions and said it aims to include as many groups as possible. Use of appropriate national data may be possible in some cases.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
204	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	CCW (????) asked how BW defines the term 'stakeholder'. DbD said it uses a broad definition but some work is needed on stakeholder mapping. The Chair asked that this work be shared with the Panel when complete	CCW(MBell)	BW	BW agreed to this. This is no longer required before the Ofwat report.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No action before Ofwat report
205	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	Both DbD and BW are keen to include staff engagement within the proposed framework and are proposing bi-annual staff road shows and an online staff panel. UWE said that it's 'innovation days' are very useful in obtaining ideas from students and that BW might consider holding such events with its staff	UWE	BW	BW agreed to consider this. Staff views are now included in the process	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
206	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	The Chair highlighted the risk of just asking questions about operational issues and possibly missing issues concerning the role of water in the wider environment. How the initial qualitative research is framed will potentially determine the outcome	Chair	BW	BW agreed. All research reviewed by BWCP.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
207	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	UWE said it had looked at companies' use of Twitter and hashtags and that this was potentially an interesting research tool and data source	UWE	BW	BW said it is also working with Baringa to see where systems could be improved and where social media could be used more.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
208	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	BW informed the panel that the joint stated preference research with Wessex is underway but the survey hasn't yet been signed off internally and has yet to start	Chair	BW	BW stated that the Panel will be informed when work commences. Work now complete and results presented to BWCP.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
209	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	A website-based online scenario game is proposed which will be similar to stated preference research but will allow customers to physically make trade-offs and should attract far more participants. Such games were trialled by Anglian and Severn Trent at PR14 but lacked a quantitative dimension	Chair	BW	BW intends to add such a dimension. On line 'slider' game now used and results presented to BWCP.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
210	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	The Deputy Chair requested a link to any publicly available information on these PR14 trials	Deputy Chair	BW	BW will arrange if possible. Overtaken by completion of BW's slider game.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
211	Research Results	CESG January 2017	The Chair considered this to be a very interesting approach but asked how many people will be surveyed and how BW will make the segmentation appropriate.	Chair	BW	BW will keep the Panel informed on these issues. Segmentation declared for all research.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
212	Research Results	CESG January 2017	The Deputy Chair asked how BW intends to use the information from the research into water use behaviour by UWE students	Deputy Chair	BW	BW will inform the Panel of its use of the UWE data at the appropriate time. See new Innovation poster from BW.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
213	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	The Panel needs to have confidence the framework is soundly based and so wishes to review the work done to identify priorities for research and the appropriateness of the associated segmentation of customers. The Chair said that the main information requests from today's meeting include data on customer segmentation and the outcome of the initial evidence review	Chair	BW	BW agreed to provide both for the Panel's review. Now provided in framework.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
214	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	The Panel asked to have the opportunity to observe the research being undertaken if possible	Chair	BW	BW agreed to provide this facility if possible. Opportunities were given to attend the focus groups on customer priorities, we intend to continue with this approach.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
215	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	The Panel (through this sub-group) should receive regular updates from the company on its engagement process and results. The timing of these meetings will be approximately quarterly but will be determined by the engagement timetable (which wasn't presented in detail today). It was agreed that the scope and objectives of each sub-group meeting should be defined in advance to maximise effectiveness	Chair	BW	BW agreed to devise an appropriate programme of sub-group meetings (with agendas and objectives) in line with its engagement timetable and present this for review and approval at the next Panel meeting on 25th January. Now in operation.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
216	Strategy	CESG January 2017	The next meeting of this engagement sub-group was scheduled for 9 March but BW will now assess the appropriateness of this date. The Chair reminded the company that vulnerability was due to be discussed at his meeting	Chair	BW	The CCG sub-group on the 4/4/17 will cover vulnerability. Vulnerability research now complete and presented to BWCP.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
217	Engagement Framework	CESG January 2017	BW would also welcome some initial comment on the information presented today as it will be taking the proposed framework to its Board shortly for approval. BW will circulate the documentation from today's meeting and request comment accordingly	Chair	BWCP	BWCP to provide comments and feedback; see later Challenges for the details	26/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
218	Tariffs	Tariff SG January 2017	The Chair asked why increases to some unmeasured charges were less than those for measured supplies.	Chair	BW	BW replied that the difference in the increases were marginal (around 0.1%) and result from the charges calculation methodology. BW has been able to skew the smaller charge increases to unmeasured properties with lower rateable values.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
219	Tariffs	Tariff SG January 2017	The Deputy Chair noted BW's intention to increase its funding to debt advice partners, to ask charities to apply for extra funding to support projects and/or attempt to work more with charities.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW agreed to prepare a note on the impact of this for the BWCP meeting on 25 January. We have not increased our funding this year to our debt advice agencies but we have provided additional funding for 'hard to reach' projects. The outcome of these projects is yet to be reported but once we have this we will update the CCG.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
220	Tariffs	Tariff SG January 2017	WPD asked if BW will be consulting customers on its purposed funding to debt advice partners.	WPD	BW	BW said it would be. As the new tariffs commenced in April 2017 and their have been no complaints this challenge is considered to be closed	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
221	Tariffs	Tariff SG January 2017	The Chair asked if someone from the BWCP could be invited to the Social Tariff Workshop.	Chair	BW	BW replied that CCWater had been invited. CCWater said that one of its representatives will be attending	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
222	Tariffs	Tariff SG January 2017	UWE noted that the proposed bill increases for 17/18 were more than double RPI and wondered how BW will be explaining this to customers.	UWE	BW	BW agreed that this need to be explained clearly and said that it will be referring to the essential investment it has to carry out to maintain and improve service. Charges changes explained to customers via newsletter in March.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
223	Tariffs	Tariff SG January 2017	The Chair asked when BW intends to complete its review of its long term metering strategy.	Chair	BW	BW replied that it intend to go to its Board with its revised strategy in March this year. This was presented at the BWCP no 7 meeting.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
224	Tariffs	Tariff SG January 2017	The Deputy Chair enquired if BW had seen an increase in complaints as a result of its backlog of installing meters in AMP6.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW replied that it had not seen an increase.	09/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
225	Engagement Framework	Email	WPD would like to see more face-to face engagement by BW with its customers during the acceptability testing of the Outputs of the Business Plan	WPD	BW	BW are in early phases of planning what the customer engagement will look like for acceptability testing so has flexibility in the approach. We will take this suggestion on board to look how we can include more face-to-face testing. Face to Face testing will be used for this as we will have the online game which will come out to events where this will occur.	11/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
226	Engagement Framework	Email	How will BW inform its customers of the actions taken as a result of its customer engagement programme.	WPD	BW	This will be through several channels - the website customer engagement page, the business plan itself and Watertalk.	11/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
227	Engagement Framework	Email	What evidence does BW intend to provide to ensure that the options that are identified for WTP testing are the correct ones	WPD	BW	Research based upon customer priorities as found by research.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
228	Engagement Framework	Email	How does BW intend to ensure that the WTP survey is conducted in a way that gives the customers meaningful choices and explains cost and risk in a clear way	WPD	BW	Cognitive testing of the survey was carried out prior to the pilot stage to test clarity of the questionnaire. The cognitive interviews provided an opportunity to identify any difficulties customers may have in understanding the survey and what it is asking of them. Participants were able to make the choices with the information provided. No major problems with the survey were identified, the full report is located on the FTS.	26/04/2016	Acknowledged. No change required.
229	Engagement Framework	Email	How will BW ensure its customer engagement 1) is conducted in an open manner, 2) includes diverse customer interests.	WPD	BW	The segmentation data ensures all customer types are represented and all research will be checked against the segmentation criteria. The framework has explained how open engagement will occur, in particular through the online game.	11/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
230	Engagement Framework	Email	How will BW demonstrate that the customer engagement process becomes an integral part of its decision making that can be tracked over time.	WPD	BW	The evaluation framework launch April 17 shows the evidence path that is being used to show how the research and engagement is being fed into the decision making in the business plan. Each piece of research and engagement has a business owner.	11/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
231	Engagement Framework	Email	How does BW intend to demonstrate very clearly how their customer engagement informs and changes their Business Plan over time	WPD	BW	The evaluation framework launch April 17 shows the evidence path that is being used to show how the research and engagement is being fed into the decision making in the business plan. Each piece of research and engagement has a business owner.	11/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
232	Engagement Framework	Email	How will BW demonstrate the value obtained through customer engagement and its impact across the organisation (e.g. operational, staff engagement & motivation, asset health, environmental and biodiversity actions, etc	WPD	BW	The evaluation framework applies to ongoing customer engagement as well and is part of the monthly customer service governance meetings.	11/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
233	Engagement Framework	Email	How does BW intend to show that it has avoided a 'one size fits all' approach in its WTP research	WPD	BW	The evaluation framework applies to ongoing customer engagement as well and is part of the monthly customer service governance meetings.	11/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
234	Triangulation	Email	Where are the points for triangulation of data in the customer engagement strategy.	WPD	BW	All research which has a valuation associated will be triangulated.	11/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
235	Research Results	Email	How does BW intend to demonstrate that it is not overly reliant on the WTP part of its customer engagement	WPD	BW	The framework explains this and the use of triangulation also answers this.	11/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
236	Research Results	Email	With regard to the classification of service attributes by strategic importance and valuation sensitivity, how will BWCP be able to challenge the evidence base of the classifications, valuation assumptions and the trade-offs that may be required by BW	WPD	BW	Triangulation of research results is first step; followed by challenging all decisions.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
237	Engagement Framework	Email	How does BW ensure it has identified the right attributes for its WTP research	WPD	BW	Research based upon customer priorities.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
238	Engagement Framework	Email	What strategies does BW have to increase the voice of developers Developer Day seminars and the plan of action following the workshop on 8 March?	WPD	BW	This was raised by ????. It is slightly outside our terms of reference so we have agreed that it is not required before the Ofwat report.	04/06/2018	Acknowledged. No action before Ofwat report
239	Water Resources	Email	With regard to the deteriorating quality of raw water, how is BW engaging the relevant parties regarding catchment area land management and how are their needs evaluated and fed into PR19 planning	DHF	BW	The Tripartite meeting contain updates on BW catchment management which clearly shows an improvement in raw water quality which will lead to higher quality targets in PR19	18/04/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
240	Engagement Framework	Challenge Panel 6	The Chair observed that BW's priorities for engagement and the service attributes on which it intends to engage with customers (as presented in Appendix A of its Framework) were primarily its own list and didn't fully reference Ofwat's industry concerns such as resilience	Chair	BW	DbD replied that resilience has been included but that resilience is considered to be a group of service attributes rather than a single one. BW added that its evidence review shows that customers' views on resilience are scattered and need to be brought together and built upon. BW also added that it has considered Ofwat's focus for PR19 but agreed it could be better mapped and presented in its Framework document. framework updated.	25/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
241	Engagement Framework	Challenge Panel 6	The Chair said that customers' maturity in terms of their understanding of the service received also varies and the company should be considering the things customers know and those they don't know	Chair	BW	This comment is noted	11/05/2017	Acknowledged. No action before Ofwat report
242	Environment	Challenge Panel 6	NE said that customers' environmental concerns should be opportunities and that questions concerning the environment should framed to be more positive.	NE	BW	BW noted this. Focus group documents revised.	25/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
243	Engagement Framework	Challenge Panel 6	EA asked how BW will be engaging with customers on resilience.	EA	BW	DbD replied that resilience has both operational and business dimensions. There will be stated preference (valuation) research followed by deliberative research to put additional context onto the valuations. All such research now completed.	25/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
244	Resilience	Challenge Panel 6	EA said that there needs to be a common understanding on 'Resilience' as there is a risk of inconsistency in definition and perception.	EA	BW	BW agreed. It will be developing its valuation metrics for resilience shortly.	25/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
245	Engagement Framework	Challenge Panel 6	The Deputy Chair, questioned the priorities included in the engagement framework	Deputy Chair	BW	BW clarified that the current list of priorities included in the engagement framework are not the priorities for the Business Plan. The engagement process and outcomes will inform the Plan. Priorities will evolve over time	25/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
246	Environment	Challenge Panel 6	NE asked why the environment doesn't appear in the list of priorities for engagement.	NE	BW	DBD replied that environmental issues will be covered as part of resilience. At present the environment is not a priority for our customers.	25/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
247	Engagement Framework	Challenge Panel 6	The Chair said that cross cutting themes such as environment, climate change, biodiversity and affordability should be clearly identified in the deliberative research. BCC added that, whilst it considered the proposed framework to be comprehensive, such cross cutting themes need to be woven in.	Chair	BW	DbD agreed this is a useful suggestion and BW will consider how best to do this.	25/01/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
248	Engagement Framework	Challenge Panel 6	NSC asked if BW was in touch with other companies on for PR19.	NSC	BW	BW replied that not much sharing of information happens in the commercial environment. There is no common industry framework	25/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
249	Engagement Framework	Challenge Panel 6	EA said that it is important how the outcomes are derived as well that what they are, particularly in respect of wider societal benefits such as recreation, wildlife, etc. The Chair added that engagement is a two way process with customer education an important aspect. The quality of engagement will depend on education, context and responsiveness of both by company and customers. The proposed interactive game is an exciting aspect and should provide an opportunity to include wider societal benefits into the engagement	EA	BW	BW replied that its framework incorporates a staged approach and includes programme contingency, review and sense checking of outcomes and the flexibility to evolve as necessary	25/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
250	Strategy	Challenge Panel 6	There was discussion after the meeting between the Chair and BW over the timing of the sub-group meetings in relation to BW internal reviews and the benefits of engaging with the Panel before the BW review.	Chair	BW	BW will consider this. Sub group meeting timing now agreed.	25/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
251	Strategy	Challenge Panel 6	EA referred to BW's slide on Regulator Priorities pointing out these were Ofwat's priorities only, not EA, NE, DWI or CCW. BCC added that local council priorities should also be considered.	EA	BW	BW noted this and accepted EA's offer to help with the identification of environmental priorities	26/04/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
252	Engagement Framework	Challenge Panel 6	BW would welcome any comments from the Panel on its upcoming activities including customer segmentation, stated preference approach and the use of focus groups	BW	BWCP Members	Panel comments sent direct to BW by 31 January 2017, see challenges below for details	31/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
253	Drought Plan	Challenge Panel 6	The Chair requested a list of consultees for the Drought Plan.	Chair	BW	BW supplied a list of consultees	31/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
254	Drought Plan	Challenge Panel 6	BW was questioned on its approach to the consultation exercise.	Chair	BW	BW replied that it will be using various forms of communication such as adverts on buses, social media and through its billing process	25/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
255	Drought Plan	Challenge Panel 6	BCC asked about the expected level of customer response. The customer response to the last Plan was very limited.	BCC	BW	An online panel is out from 31st March and a survey online with a £200 prize draw. Aiming for a minimum of 30 responses.	25/01/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
256	Drought Plan	Challenge Panel 6	The Chair suggested that BW could extend reach through engaging with gardening clubs, health clubs, leisure centres, etc. There maybe scope for using the customer centre to help by using holding messages to promote the consultation. NSC added that allotment holders could also be consulted. CCW considers it important to tailor communication to individual consultees. UWE said that customers only respond when and if it's relevant to them. BW could put out a simple message to all customers saying that BW would really like to hear from them because the Drought Plan matters to them and to customers and here's how they can respond.	Chair	BW	BW considered this but could not reach all of these with the resource they had.	25/01/2017	Acknowledged. No action before Ofwat report
257	Drought Plan	Challenge Panel 6	EA mentioned the proliferation of car washes, wondered what their impact on water supply was and whether BW was engaging with this industry.	EA	BW	BW noted this but said that car washes were a non-essential user of water and would be covered by temporary use bans if imposed	25/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
258	Drought Plan	Challenge Panel 6	NE noted that BW's reservoir control curves and the resulting impact on the environment are not well defined.	NE	BW	BW agreed that the evidence base for the curves isn't good. There is scope to improve them but this is unlikely to be completed in time for the forthcoming WRMP update. It may include a commitment in the WRMP to review its control curves. WRMP19 will reference the need to update the existing control curve and it has been confirmed that review of these curves cannot be completed in time for WRMP19.	25/09/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
259	Drought Plan	Challenge Panel 6	BW invited feedback from the Panel on the non-technical summary of its Drought Plan	BW	BWCP Members	Panel comments sent direct to BW; see challenges below for details	07/02/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
260	Environment	Challenge Panel 6	The Deputy Chair noted that DWI do not attend the group but meet separately with BW.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW will let the Panel know how it will be engaging with DWI as part of the PR19 process and how it will keep the Panel informed of the outcomes. ???? from the DWI attended the BWCP meeting on the 25 April.	25/09/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
261	Research Results	Email	Figure 2; The bottom boxes state that the change in bill is above inflation; so why does the 'Option B (Current)' increase by £1.5 every year when there is no change in service level?	Deputy Chair	BW	The £1.5 increase every year is to maintain service levels. With no investment at all the service would deteriorate and so the service level would change.	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
262	Research Results	Email	Figure 2; Why have 3 levels? Does this mean that the 'Package Choice' will be repeated for each combination of Option and level, ie 12 times?	Deputy Chair	BW	Yes – this is to ensure complete coverage of options without over complicating the survey. The key advantage of this proposed method is that questions would be much simpler for respondents to answer. The approach does not need too many SP exercises which also simplifies the burden on participants.	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
263	Research Results	Email	Figure 2; Why have Options A and D got the same percentage change range from Option B (Current) when Option A is 1 stage deterioration but Option D is a 2 stage improvement? It gives the impression that it is better the go for reducing service level.	Deputy Chair	BW	Your comment has been passed on to Accent.	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
264	Research Results	Email	Figure 3; Each Package has an improvement in both rivers and bathing; what if respondent only wanted improvements in rivers? This is on the basis that improvements in rivers benefit bathing eventually	Deputy Chair	BW	Package C has an improvement in rivers and not in bathing	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
265	Research Results	Email	Exercise 1; The paragraph says that the exercise consists of 5 attributes and names them, but only names 4. Confusing	Deputy Chair	BW	Agreed, your comment has been passed on to Accent. Research report shows changes made.	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
266	Research Results	Email	Exercise 2; The paragraph says that the exercise consists of 5 attributes and names them, but only names 4. Confusing	Deputy Chair	BW	Agreed, your comment has been passed on to Accent. Research report shows that changes made.	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
267	Research Results	Email	Figure 5; I have difficulty with '1 in xxx' in understanding what is good. Further explanation would be useful.	Deputy Chair	BW	Agreed, we have already raised this with Accent but they are unable to change the measure.	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
268	Research Results	Email	Figure 5; Does BW choose the packages to ensure complete coverage?	Deputy Chair	BW	We are confident that complete coverage has been reached	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
269	Research Results	Email	SP Exercise; Can the missing sections be provided?	Deputy Chair	BW	The missing sections are not yet available and form a separate piece of research that we have not started. Research now complete.	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
270	Research Results	Email	I had difficulty deciding how the questionnaire was to be responded to; it starts off talking about a 'call', then says the respondent will be shown information and then talks about the hover button. So I am not sure if it is a phone call, face to face or via internet.	Deputy Chair	BW	The questionnaire will be issued mainly as an online survey with customer emails provided by Bristol Water, the sample will be 900 online responses. 100 in home face-to-face interviews will be completed to include seldom heard customer groups such as hard to reach, the digitally excluded and customers on a very low income and customers over 70. More information on this segmentation will be provided to cover this query. Where the number of interviews falls short of the representative target, the data will be weighted to match the makeup of the BW customer base.	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
271	Research Results	Email	In Q12, Q13 and Q14 I presume the session is ended if the quota is full but what happens if the respondent prefers not to say?	Deputy Chair	BW	They will be excluded from the quota controls and their interview would be included in the total but not count towards the quota controls. In reality as we're doing this work online and we're not paying incentives we are unlikely to close this quota. Rather we will weight the final data set to the ONS regional statistics.	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
272	Research Results	Email	In Q19 is 'clean water' same as 'drinkable'? If so then my reply would depend on the notice of the 24hour period, because with notice I can stock up and the effect would be minimal.	Deputy Chair	BW	The clean water we supply is the same as drinkable. This question is asked in the context of Q18 which asks what the customer typically uses water for on a daily basis. Q19 explores what the impact would be of not having water for these uses. It is an open question so we expect customers to give honest and varied responses.	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
273	Research Results	Email	Have any arrangements been made for BWCP members to witness if it is a face to face or to try out if it is via the internet	Deputy Chair	BW	We do not feel that witnessing face to face interviews would be appropriate, largely due to the customer base that we will be focusing on for these. We will however be able to send out the online exercise for members of the panel to trial when this becomes available	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
274	Research Results	Email	The questionnaire does not seem to provide information on the selection / quota of respondents from particular postcodes or occupation. How is this quota being devised, what assumptions are being made, which ones were ignored or downgraded in any way?	Chair	BW	We're looking to set quotas on the household survey by age, social grade and gender as per the census data for the South West Government region. We will include a household 'booster' of 100 in-home interviews. The purpose of this work is to capture the views of those who are likely to be under represented (or excluded) from the online survey. Accents' suggestion is the following categories (which are likely to overlap and therefore not be mutually exclusive): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Digitally excluded – those who do not have access to the internet at home or work via laptop or mobile Very low income – those in social grade E (ie: state pension only or long term unemployed) Elderly – those over the age of 70. English is a second language (i.e. Somali) 	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
275	Research Results	Email	How does this relate to and inform the customer segmentation work that will follow?	Chair	BW	We are just at the starting phases of the segmentation work and are reviewing all the customer data we already have and what demographics have been used previously. The WTP research will form a piece of the puzzle for the segmentation work to understand different customer groups. If after the segmentation work, we find groups that haven't been represented; we will address these gaps with further research.	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
276	Research Results	Email	How important or not is the number of occupants in a dwelling and why do the more in-depth household questions arise from Q54 onwards?	Chair	BW	Agreed, your comment has been noted and sent to Accent. Explanation given.	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
277	Research Results	Email	How will the information gathered from the quotas inform how patterns of water usage (ie bill), how different communities may use water differently, etc	Chair	BW	Initially we will explore differences around general demographics (age, social grade). Additionally the analysis will explore variations in response based on respondent's experience of any service failure and whether they use beaches/ivers.	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
278	Research Results	Email	Q15 provides an opportunity to measure how many people might wish to have a water meter or have more information about the topic. Can additional choices be given to the customer?	Chair	BW	This is a stated preference survey with the purpose to determine evaluations; separate research will be conducted to take a deeper dive into metering.	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
279	Research Results	Email	Q18. Regarding water use, 'cleaning' is a rather broad category when compared to 'cleaning teeth' or 'taking a bath or shower'. Given that the most widely spoken non-English language in Bristol schools is Somali and, along with the 3rd, 4th and 5th, all come from countries where the Moslem faith is practiced, why not have a category for 'ritual cleansing'. Likewise given that medical or therapeutic water usage is required by a population of our customers, why is this category omitted. Why is a better understanding of these uses deemed less relevant than others?	Chair	BW	Agreed, a category for ritual cleansing, medical water use and therapeutic water use has been added.	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
280	Research Results	Email	Q21 – For some of us, being able to use a green space for walking, reading, kicking a ball, walking a pet, picnicking, etc in and around beaches or rivers is a valid reason to be concerned about these facilities. One does not have to immerse oneself into the water to value the environment. On what basis are these activities excluded?	Chair	BW	Agreed, the text has been revised to reflect this 'Activities by beaches and/or river banks (e.g. walking, reading, picnicking etc)'.	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
281	Research Results	Email	Q22 – I am not sure what quality of the environment is trying to say. Do you mean natural resources, such as the prevalence and number of plants and animals in our area, the range and number of natural habitats, green spaces, water and air pollution, etc? Here you must give the customer enough information to make the question relevant to them or they will not be engaged in the discussion/survey.	Chair	BW	Agreed, the text has been revised to reflect this 'On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is 'very uninformed' and 5 is 'very informed', how informed do you feel about the quality of the environment (e.g. the range and number of animals, plants, natural habitats and green spaces; air and water pollution, etc.)?'	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
282	Research Results	Email	Q24 is far too glib for me. I am interested in people like me. Is £461 the average for a retired couple, a family of 4, a family with small several toddlers, a household of 6 or more, a household with a swimming pool, a household with a septic tank, an avid gardener what waters the lawn and borders, owner of a menagerie of pet animals, etc? As there is no average customer, there is no average bill. Can you please tell me which of your customer types has an average bill of £461, otherwise the figure is totally meaningless?	Chair	BW	The average bill is only being used when the customer cannot provide an estimate of their bill. We anticipate that most customers will roughly know what they pay for their water and sewerage and so very few people will get told the average. For those that are provided with the average bill, we believe that the average for all customers is sufficient for the purpose of this stated preference survey.	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
283	Research Results	Email	'Non Ideal Taste and Smell of Your Tap Water'. The units quoted are different. Why is this? 503 calls for 515,000 properties vs 21 in 10,000. Is there a reason for this difference? If you wish to use two different scales, perhaps also including a %age figure will enable the customer to make a judgement based on comparable information. This point is also relevant to figures used in the sections 'Occasional Low Water Pressure' and 'Road and Traffic Disruptions'.	Chair	BW	Agreed, standardising the scales is a point that we had raised previously, amendments have now been made	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
284	Research Results	Email	Q27 – I note there is nothing regarding billing services that people might wish to see changed/improved.	Chair	BW	Agreed, an option has been added for billing services.	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
285	Research Results	Email	Q28 – an interesting choice of reasons selected and omitted. What about people's understanding being heightened due to recent natural events (flooding, drought, messages about the prevalence of wildlife), an awareness that nothing comes for free, an understanding that we need higher standards of service, an appreciation that water resources are generally undervalued. I think your choice of explanations or reasons are very limited and skewed. This consideration applies to Q29 and Q30	Chair	BW	Agreed, your comment has been noted and sent to Accent. Research now complete and report accepted by BWCP.	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
286	Research Results	Email	Page 12 of 16 starts with service levels and investments by WW and BW then goes to WW spends in one area or reductions. This is totally unclear to me. Why WW and BW in one area and only WW in others. Can BW not spend more in one area or reduce bills? Very confusing	Chair	BW	Agreed, this has been amended	09/02/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
287	Drought Plan	Email	Your Water Supply: Re maximum volumes available – can you set out briefly the principles used by the EA to determine how much water can be extracted. Likewise, can you provide an estimate based on several scenarios of how much water might be used on a 'typical day'.	Chair	BW	Included our annual average daily demand for 2015/16 (latest outturn data)	30/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
288	Drought Plan	Email	Where our water comes from: Discover Water has a great graphic showing that water companies are not the only users of water. Can we use something like this to demonstrate the need for balance in abstraction?	Chair	BW	Action for non-technical summary of WRMP: this information will be included in a non-technical summary for consultation. Content with the response and subsequent actions	25/09/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
289	Drought Plan	Email	Where our water comes from: Is it appropriate also to highlight your role in stewarding the environment as well as providing drinking water to all your customers?	Chair	BW	Action for non-technical summary of WRMP: this information will be included in a non-technical summary for consultation. Content with the response and subsequent actions	25/09/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
290	Drought Plan	Email	What is a drought: ???? informed the Challenge Panel that it is hard for people to think of Britain as having droughts, as there is so much rain here and we speak frequently about the weather. It is important to reflect back to customers this perception to demonstrate that BW understands their views	Chair	BW	This comment is noted	30/01/2017	Acknowledged. No action before Ofwat report
291	Drought Plan	Email	What is a drought: An additional heading on How likely are droughts to occur in future. Although you refer briefly to the possibility of droughts occurring in the future, the climatic instability brought on by climate change can make future predictions difficult. However, it is likely that Britain will have drier winters and wetter summers and perhaps catastrophic weather events such as heavy snowfalls or floods.	Chair	BW	The drought plan focuses on the actions we would take if a drought occurred today, It is reviewed every 5 years, It is not a strategic planning document, therefore it is not appropriate to consider the risk of drought in the future in the context of the drought plan. This is more appropriate for the water resource management plan, and is included in that via the climate change assessment. Similarly, house building and population increase etc are all addressed under the WRMP process.	30/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
292	Drought Plan	Email	What is a drought: Please confirm that the predictive models used are based on current water consumption and, if possible, a year.	Chair	BW	Reference changed to 'water resource modelling tools' as this better reflects the assessment carried out, which focused on resource availability. They demonstrated that current demands would be able to be met, but tested the systems to the maximum output levels as reported in the WRMP	30/01/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
293	Drought Plan	Email	Demand actions: Is there an opportunity to refer to the Discover Water site on leakage levels from burst pipes? BW's 2015-16 performance is 113 compared to the water industry at 130	Chair	BW	I don't think it is appropriate to go into comparing figures and detailed numbers in this document, The reporting figures are also likely to be out dated come late May when the 2016/17 outturn figures are released.	30/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
294	Drought Plan	Email	Using water wisely: Can you re-word in the garden, don't water. can be deleted to provide a more positive statement.	Chair	BW	We have included the message: "In the garden – mow on a higher setting to keep moisture in, that way you won't have to mow so often if at all."	30/01/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
295	Drought Plan	Email	Temporary Use Bans: Might it be worth mentioning in this paragraph (rather than the one following) that BW will be working with businesses, farmers and trade organisations to encourage them to use water wisely. (ie rather than in Drought Order – Non-Essential use bans)	Chair	BW	We would be doing this as part of our ongoing water efficiency campaign, before the implementation of TUBS. Have added a comment under the 'using water wisely' section to reflect this	30/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
296	Drought Plan	Email	Drought Order – Non-Essential use ban: What might a public inquiry consider?	Chair	BW	It could consider whatever the Government wants it to consider, depending on the circumstances of the drought and the drought order being applied for and/or the number of objections that have been raised to the proposals. This is a little too wide ranging to go into detail here I think.	30/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
297	Drought Plan	Email	Emergency drought orders: The last sentence reads awkwardly, particularly the last phrase 'we would not have needed to implement this drought action'	Chair	BW	Sentence re-worded.	30/01/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
298	Drought Plan	Email	Supply actions: A short introductory paragraph stating two additional options for consideration, might work here. Why is one worded 'we will discuss' while the other is 'we will consider'?	Chair	BW	Re-worded the 'discuss' paragraph to be clearer as it was referring to discussions with the water companies.	30/01/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
299	Drought Plan	Email	Customers and the environment: It might also be worthwhile to refer to the types of drought and that the wider environment may also be affected by the drought.	Chair	BW	Additional sentence added at the top of the section to address this.	30/01/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
300	Drought Plan	Email	Customers and the environment: When did customers say the level of service was about right? What impact will planned housing and industrial developments and climate change uncertainties have on the service level?	Chair	BW	Reference made to the customer engagement process for the WRMP14	30/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
301	Drought Plan	Email	Customers and the environment: How might a drought affect people that use their own raw water supplies? Should this be addressed somewhere in the document?	Chair	BW	Private water supplies are regulated by the council, the water company is not responsible for managing these supplies. We may be asked to support the council during a severe drought to help provide water supplies to such properties if their private supplies start to fail. This would likely be via the provision of bottled water or similar.	30/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
302	Drought Plan	Email	Customers and the environment: Is there a need to indicate what water reduction methods are being used by businesses?	Chair	BW	Retail separation makes this a very grey area, as we will become the wholesaler of water (not the retailer) We have already stated that we will work with businesses and trade organisations to encourage them to use water wisely. Given the variety of businesses this is likely to effect, to be more prescriptive would be outside the scope of this non-technical summary. It would need to be considered on a case-by-case basis as part of the overall water efficiency campaign.	30/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
303	Drought Plan	Email	Drought Plan public consultation: We should thank the reader (as well as saying we value their feedback) for their interest and highlight the importance of their feedback, whether supportive, positive, critical or negative as it will enable us to compile a better drought plan that meets personal, community, societal and environmental interests (as these are what some of the key indicators that motivate people to take decisions and actions).	Chair	BW	Amended	30/01/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
304	Drought Plan	Email	Page 2; The different types of drought is good; could it include which of the 3 types takes priority and the effect on the other 2 of the water supply drought	Deputy Chair	BW	The three types of drought are based on the Environment Agency definition. They are not prioritised at all but managed together for the best use of water resources for people and environment. No changes made to the document.	30/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
305	Drought Plan	Email	Page 3; in the 'Actions' box there is a comment about reducing bulk supplies to third parties; how is this achieved if you have a contract to supply?	Deputy Chair	BW	It would depend on the circumstances of the drought and how each individual company would be effected. In our drought plan section 4.3.1 we state that "Management of the transfer to Wessex Water and the opportunity for reducing this supply would be reflective of the specific drought conditions and the need to implement the most efficient use of water resources across the region as a whole."	30/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
306	Drought Plan	Email	Page 4; in 'Demand actions' could you clarify who does the action? Specifically if you are expecting the customer to do something	Deputy Chair	BW	Final wording for the document published as: "You can make a significant contribution to reducing demand during a drought by making some relatively small changes to your water use habits".	30/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
307	Drought Plan	Email	Page 7; in 'Protecting the environment' you state that an SEA has been carried out; it would be good to include some of the results of the assessment particularly if you have changed anything to show that you are listening to stakeholders.	Deputy Chair	BW	Final working for the document published as: "The SEA has helped inform the selection and phasing of the demand and supply actions we have included within our drought plan. This information will also be used in prioritising drought actions during a drought."	30/01/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
308	Information Assurance	Email	About this Document; Is the Statement of Risks, Strengths and Weaknesses only intended for engagement with stakeholders? How might customers be presented with this information and the ability to interrogate it?	BWCP	BW	The language has been changed to reflect your suggestions	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
309	Information Assurance	Email	About this Document; How will Bristol Water inform customers of their performance in a way that increases trust and confidence? How are confidence and trust measured?	BWCP	BW	We have added within this section (at the bottom of page 4 on the published version) a further explanation of how we will increase trust and confidence among our customers.	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
310	Information Assurance	Email	About this Document; In several places, you use the phrase 'we are required to' which, whilst perfectly correct, gives the impression that you are doing so under duress. Much better to say something along the lines that 'we wish to...and would like your input' or something similar.	BWCP	BW	The language has been changed to reflect your suggestions.	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
311	Information Assurance	Email	Our approach to assurance; Ploughing through the Annual Report takes stamina, intention and commitment. 'Watertalk' is disposable by its very nature. A series of, say, 'Customer Fact Sheets' or other easy to read materials could be made available on the Bristol Water website and linked to Discover Water or other relevant websites. While it is not the only customer-friendly method of communication, such a series of fact sheets could pick out issues relevant to customers in a convenient, easily updated manner, which would be found in a timely manner. The Challenge Panel would expect such fact sheets to be available through a number of communications channels and social media sites	BWCP	BW	We have included a 'one page summary' of the document (attached), which will be used to help advertise the Draft Plan on our social media sites (including LinkedIn and Twitter).	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
312	Information Assurance	Email	Assurance progress during 2016/17; What does 'NHH Market', 'WTW' mean?	BWCP	BW	The language has been changed to reflect your suggestions	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
313	Information Assurance	Email	Assurance progress during 2016/17; Bristol Water presents Ofwat's recent assessment of the company's assurance practices and highlights minor concerns in four areas, including last year's assurance plan. Bristol Water doesn't explain what these concerns are, how it will address them and what progress has been made since last year. This is a major omission in our view and leaves the reader wondering. We know that Ofwat had concerns over the accessibility to customers of the Assurance Plan. We suggest Bristol Water includes a new section to explain this and how it has or intends to respond.	BWCP	BW	A new paragraph has been added section (of page 9 on the published version) to provide further detail.	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
314	Information Assurance	Email	Taking into account Stakeholder and Customer feedback; In general, there is an opportunity to learn how to consult better with customers by improving the engagement process in future consultations, such as the Drought Plan consultation. There is an opportunity to measure how different approaches to customer engagement results in greater participation in the consultation process. Bristol Water should set a target number of responses and work towards achieving this number. By being able to demonstrate increasing customer engagement, Bristol Water increases its legitimacy as a service provider, puts itself in a position to tailor its service to the needs of specific audiences and feedback to its audiences what has changed both operationally and in business planning as a result of the consultation.	BWCP	BW	We recognise that we had no other responses to the Statement of Risks consultation other than from the BWCP. We have included a 'one page summary' of the document (attached), which will be used to help advertise the Draft Plan on our social media sites (including LinkedIn and Twitter). We have not set a target for the number of responses we want to achieve as part of this consultation.	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
315	Information Assurance	Email	Reporting on performance and information covered by this Assurance Plan; Figure 2: Is there an opportunity to identify how / where Bristol water might triangulate information to corroborate assurance processes? For example, how might information gathered from customer complaints or contacts a) substantiate or b) demonstrate areas for improvement or c) highlight needs for investment, etc link to outcomes such as customer minutes lost to unplanned interruptions, negative water quality contacts, leakage, etc? Such triangulation will help demonstrate whether and how Bristol Water is 'dealing appropriately with any risks and weaknesses identified in our Statement of Risks, Strengths and Weaknesses.'	BWCP	BW	This section no longer exists in the published version.	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
316	Information Assurance	Email	Reporting on performance and information covered by this Assurance Plan; There is a need to demonstrate that the systems of processes of Bristol Water provide the best service for customers, at the right price, 24 hours a day. At this point, the customer can be assured	BWCP	BW	This section no longer exists in the published version.	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
317	Information Assurance	Email	Reporting on performance and information covered by this Assurance Plan; We have a difficulty with white type on a light blue background; it gives the impression that Bristol Water are hiding something	BWCP	BW	This section no longer exists in the published version.	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
318	Information Assurance	Email	How we propose to move from 'prescribed' to 'targeted'; Customers expect good quality information, but we also expect to be able to compare the performance of Bristol Water against others in the sector where comparable information [UK-wide and internationally] exists	BWCP	BW	This is now section 12 in the published version and the language has been changed to reflect your suggestions	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
319	Information Assurance	Email	How we propose to move from 'prescribed' to 'targeted'; What has the company learned from being 'prescribed' and how will this make it a better company from the customers' perspective? How can customers tell that the positive changes have been embedded in the company?	BWCP	BW	This is now section 12 in the published version and the language has been changed to reflect your suggestions	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
320	Information Assurance	Email	How we propose to move from 'prescribed' to 'targeted'; Processes and data do not necessarily prove that the company is acting in the best short-, medium- or long-term interests of customers. How does the customer benefit from this move? Otherwise, customers could think it is better for Ofwat to be watching over Bristol Water intensively! This section contains a lot of waffle that needs sharpening up.	BWCP	BW	This is now section 12 in the published version and the language has been changed to reflect your suggestions	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
321	Information Assurance	Email	Annex 1 – Details of Risk Assessment; Figure 3 [called figure 23 in the text!] should appear on the same page as the majority of the text otherwise the continuity is lost.	BWCP	BW	The page layout has been changed to reflect your suggestions	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
322	Information Assurance	Email	Annex 2 – Additional Assurance; The table in Annex 2 needs changing to remove all the split words which make it difficult to read; even to the extent of putting the whole of Annex 2 in Landscape format.	BWCP	BW	The page layout has been changed to reflect your suggestions	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
323	Information Assurance	Email	Annex 3 – Atkins approach to Assurance; Not certain Annex 3 is required, could be a link	BWCP	BW	Ofwat suggested we include an abbreviated version and so we have kept this section within the document. The information is significantly shorter compared to last year's version	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
324	Information Assurance	Email	Overall – Presentational; The document is not particularly accessible as customers may not understand the technical nature of the comments. What remedies can you use to make the item more easily understood? We appreciate that it is a specialised document which will only appeal to a limited number of stakeholders but we would like to see it written in plain English with the terms clearly explained	BWCP	BW	A Glossary section has been added and extended since the draft was sent to the BWCP, we have included a 'one page summary' of the document (attached) and there are more figures/ graphics included in the published version	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
325	Information Assurance	Email	Overall – Presentational; The document is still too long with some repetition	BWCP	BW	The published version has been shortened to 24 pages	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
326	Information Assurance	Email	Overall – Presentational; We found the risk register on page 22 difficult to follow	BWCP	BW	The explanatory text in the opening paragraph and within the column entitled 'additional assurance identified for 2017/18' has been updated	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
327	Information Assurance	Email	Overall – Presentational; The Severn Trent document is easy to read, has a clear structure with simple introductory paragraphs followed by sub-headings set out in the intro para, with good charts/graphs. It is a format we would support	BWCP	BW	An executive summary has been included in the published version (on page 3).	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
328	Information Assurance	Email	Overall – Contextual; Given that there were no responses to the information, risks, strengths and weaknesses statement when it was posted on the website for consultation then it might be worth Bristol Water having a rethink on how they engage in respect of this document else we would expect a similar result. What channels will you use to communicate with customers, how might your approach differ among different segments of customers, how will you communicate changes that arise as a result of the consultation?	BWCP	BW	We recognise that we had no other responses to the Statement of Risks consultation other than from the BWCP. We have included a 'one page summary' of the document (attached), which will be used to help advertise the Draft Plan on our social media sites (including LinkedIn and Twitter)	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
329	Information Assurance	Email	Overall – Contextual; The document is not ambitious in terms of demonstrating continuous improvement.	BWCP	BW	The additional assurance (Annex 2) attempts to clarify where we have progressed since 2016 and what plans we have put in place moving forward, for example we have identified new audits are required for GSS data and Unplanned Customer Minutes Lost	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
330	Information Assurance	Email	Overall – Contextual; We cannot see any evidence that there has been any stakeholder input (apart from BWCP) into the development of the document and this makes it difficult to get responses when you do consult as the risk is that it is a tick box exercise. How will you use different types of motivation (ie responding is what customers like me do, is for the greater good, improves how the company takes my views on board, etc)	BWCP	BW	We will be proactively contacting stakeholders to alert them to the consultation for the Draft Assurance Plan.	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
331	Information Assurance	Email	Overall – Contextual; The document refers to a need for targeted and tailored engagement during the consultation period which is commendable but does not explain what this means. The Challenge Panel would wish to see the engagement segmentation, approach, key messages, target number of responses, etc at a future meeting or sub-group meeting	BWCP	BW	We will be proactively contacting stakeholders to alert them to the consultation for the Draft Assurance Plan	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
332	Information Assurance	Email	Overall – Contextual; We would like to see a better explanation of why there is clear gap between Bristol Water and other water companies with more examples of where Bristol Water is adopting best practice	BWCP	BW	Added figure 3 to section 4 (page 9)	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
333	Information Assurance	Email	Overall – Contextual; We would like more emphasis on the role of the Company rather than their auditors – the document gives the impression that Atkins are the main driver in this process and we would like to know what Bristol Water are doing to manage their own compliance	BWCP	BW	Added figure 2 to section 3 (page 6)	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
334	Information Assurance	Email	Overall – Graphic; All the documents set out the assurance approach highlighting typical activities and examples of where responsibility lies, and to a greater or lesser degree provided charts to explain this. We would like to see more use of charts in this way	BWCP	BW	Section 3 has been updated to reflect your suggestions	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
335	Information Assurance	Email	Overall – Graphic; A review by your graphic designers could be beneficial as the colours used lack legibility for some types of reader	BWCP	BW	For consistency, we have stuck to the colours that will reflect those used as part of our PR19 business plan.	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
336	Environment	Email	Impact of Service changes: The description includes 'environmental measures attached to them'; however, not all bullet points have an 'environmental measure'. What is good about the descriptions is that they include information on the numbers of complaint for each category and a brief, easy to understand description	BWCP	BW	The wording has been changed to: "This is about various types of water and sewerage service failures and a few environmental measures."	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
337	Research Results	Email	Impact of Service changes: Information in the 'Discoloured Water' info button – is this correct – 'Your Water would look like the water below'	BWCP	BW	Apologies, this was taken out from the questionnaire but seems to have been missed after the formatting changes were made.	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
338	Research Results	Email	Impact of Service changes: Non ideal taste and smell of your water – begs the question of how/why minerals or gasses may be dissolved in the water. Also the use of the word 'harmless' might be helpful	BWCP	BW	We fear that this may be too technical for the average customer to take in. It does say "harmless" in this sentence: "On rare occasions, your water may be discoloured because of harmless deposits that accumulate over time in water mains, but the water is safe to drink."	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
339	Research Results	Email	Impact of Service changes: Because the number of incidences is measured in different ways, might the use of %ages provide a common thread alongside the actual numerator and denominator of each.	BWCP	BW	On some of these attributes it's not possible to have a percentage. For some (traffic disruption for example) it's not clear what the base would be – all those who drive across the supply area? It's certainly not the number of HH and NHH customers). That leads to inconsistent comparison. Defining TUBS and essential use bans in percentage terms isn't an easily understandable measure for customers and we've used what is considered to be the most appropriate measure. As you will see in the cognitive feedback report, all participants found the show cards and descriptions clear and easy to understand. We will have a conversation with Accent about the measurements for the main stage but suggest leaving it for the pilot.	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
340	Research Results	Email	Impact of Service changes: Poor river water flow levels making it less suitable for activities such as fishing points the reader in a direction and could skew results. What is true is that there may be some environmental damage. Perhaps this can be considered further, particularly as it is reflected in questions at 37% complete	BWCP	BW	These are the attribute descriptions used in the Wessex dual supply work so need to remain consistent.	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
341	Research Results	Email	Impact of Service changes: 45% willing to pay a higher bill for 'other customers' properties'. Having been asked about our priorities in the previous section, perhaps this question is more about paying for improvements to the areas of my priorities (and those of others). Do you need two questions here instead? Do we need a better introduction to this question? Strange wording on this question which will lead to different answers. Again, another potential skew.	BWCP	BW	This question was suggested in the UKWIR (2011) guidelines, and is comparable across different surveys. We could change if there is a better form, but it's not obvious to us what that would be.	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
342	Research Results	Email	Impact of Service changes: At 46%, the questions are all property related, hence the choices are limited. For example, some people may be motivated by other options – need to improve the environment, leave the world in a better state for my children, it's normal to do it this way, I expect high standards for myself and others, together we can improve conditions, etc.	BWCP	BW	An "Other – please type in" option has been added for those who may be motivated by other options.	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
343	Research Results	Email	Impact of Service Failures: All of a sudden, I'm confronted with the term 'attributes'. Yet it has not been defined or described in any way. These buttons flash up as the page is loaded, then disappear. Hmmmmm. Is my computer able to see the inner workings of the survey collection system???? Am I psychic?	BWCP	BW	This was a coding bug and has now been fixed.	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
344	Research Results	Email	Impact of Service Failures: In asking what has the most 'impact on me', you mean at this very moment in time. If the question is asked differently to make the respondent think in the longer to medium term, a different answer applies. How do we test intergenerational issues, particularly when the descriptions about environmental impact of service changes does not provide any information about longer-term consequences or impacts? Hence, the environmental choice is likely to lose out (ie have the least impact on the respondent), except for a small proportion of people that actively use water resources as opposed to those that picnic / read by the water or those with concerns about environmental degradation, climate change, etc. In general, the choices are framed over the short term. When I think about the world that my children or grandchildren will inherit, then my answers may be different for some scenarios. Are you allowed a subsidiary question on each scenario – ie, this is my view, this is what I'd like for my grandchildren?	BWCP	BW	These are tricky issues. In choosing this format we have been trying to simplify the choices considerably over the PR14 approach. In doing so, we have had to find a way for customers to be able to trade off some quite disparate things against one another – this is what Wessex and Bristol have to do after all. The embedded assumption in the approach is that the company will aggregate over time and people, with the customer trade-off just being focused on themselves in the here-and-now. So, to the extent that environmental improvements, for example, will affect future generations as well as current ones, these benefits are valued via the company summing the here-and-now values over time, appropriately discounted. It becomes more difficult for customers otherwise if we're asking them to evaluate the longer-term consequences of the various issues themselves. Overall, we don't expect there to be any bias against environmental measures via this approach. In fact, in pre-testing with another company we found that WTP for the environmental measures exceeded the values obtained under the previous PR14 approach.	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
345	Research Results	Email	Final pages: Bristol Water panel and the Wessex Water panel – I am unable to reach these pages. What information do you propose to include?	BWCP	BW	There appears to be an error within the hyperlink as the URLs are correct. This has been fixed.	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
346	Research Results	Email	On the first page the closing date is given as 24th February	BWCP	BW	That's just there as an example, this will be amended before the launch	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
347	Research Results	Email	63%, from choice 6 to 7, another screen flashed on to the screen for a sec	BWCP	BW	This was a coding bug and has been fixed this now.	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
348	Research Results	Email	75%, is it really the bills from 2019 to 2024 or 2020 to 2025?	BWCP	BW	The bill change will be from 2019-2024 because 19/20 is the base year and 24/25 is the final year. Customers see the bills change at the start of each year, so there will be 5 annual increases from the base 19/20 bill to the final 24/25 bill. On the other hand, the improvements being paid for will be made in the years 2020-25.	01/03/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
349	Information Assurance	Email	Page 3, the list of 9 key information topics; as all 9 are regulatory requirements please consider adding the supply of data to the 'Discover Water' website to the list, as this has become a major source for water customers	Deputy Chair	BW	This has been added	26/04/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
350	Information Assurance	Email	Is it possible to add why the three additional pieces of Assurance have been undertaken as the current wording gives the impression that something was found to be in error with these three topics	Deputy Chair	BW	We have added an explanation that these are areas of reputational risk from mis-reporting	26/04/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
351	Information Assurance	Email	Page 7, the bullet points; there are two bullets but the wording seems to indicate that there should be three	Deputy Chair	BW	amended	26/04/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
352	Information Assurance	Email	Page 8, the second set of bullet points, the first line says there are five new processes but the set of blank circle bullet points only list four	Deputy Chair	BW	amended	26/04/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
353	Information Assurance	Email	Page 24, Annex 4, this list of nine key information topics appears three times in the document. In the first two the third item is '2018/19 Wholesale.....Scheme' but the last version on page 24 has the third item as '2017/18 Wholesale.....Scheme'; is this correct?	Deputy Chair	BW	amended	26/04/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
354	Engagement Framework	Email	How will BW's measurement of improved customer differentiation / segmentation in this sector drive innovations in customer service?	Chair	BW	Cleared by Ofwat compulsory performance commitment of D-Mex being required	24/04/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
355	Engagement Framework	Email	BW expressed an interest in having a developer on the Challenge Panel. Given the diversity within the sector, how do the commercial interests of developers align with the ethos and operation of the Challenge Panel in representing the views of customers?	Chair	BW	Developer appointed to BWCP.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
356	Engagement Framework	Email	How does BW plan to handle a proliferation of groups, panels and committees representing customer perspectives?	Chair	BW	This has now been implemented	24/04/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
357	Vulnerability	Email	What triangulation will be applied to weight the types of vulnerability expressed in the consultation group when compared with other types of vulnerability and the remedies required?	Chair	BW	Triangulation methodology accepted by BWCP.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
358	Vulnerability	Email	What triangulation will be applied to vulnerable customers' priorities when compared with other customer priorities in the valuation process?	Chair	BW	Triangulation methodology accepted by BWCP.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
359	Vulnerability	Email	How and when will BW determine what education and information-giving are required to change customer behaviour?	Chair	BW	Content with the response and subsequent actions	17/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
360	Vulnerability	Email	How will BW move its consultees from research participants to water advocates / campaigners and/or co-creators of the future?	Chair	BW	This has now been implemented	24/04/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
361	Strategy	Email	Who within BW owns the corporate responsibility agenda?	Chair	BW	The Bristol Water Board owns corporate responsibility which is fundamental to a public service organisation, the CEO and the executive deliver on their behalf. There isn't a corporate responsibility team within BW and therefore things that are traditionally considered as CR, are delivered across a number of teams (e.g. environment, community, recreation, supporting vulnerable customers etc). It is a key part of our Strategy (????) and stakeholder relationships and communication (????). Support of investors is fundamental to keeping customer bills affordable in the long run. See annual report and trust in water statement for our story. The decision on the trade off's in our plan (risk, affordability, dividends, sharing mechanisms etc.) is one which the board is making as part of its role in assuring our business plan submission. We aim to be very transparent on the decisions which we have made and this will form one of the sections within our BP. Our approach to corporate & financial resilience and building trust can be found in Bristol Water...Clearly	17/07/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
362	Strategy	Email	How is the line drawn between corporate shareholder investment vs customer bill increases?	Chair	BW	The Bristol Water Board owns corporate responsibility which is fundamental to a public service organisation, the CEO and the executive deliver on their behalf. There isn't a corporate responsibility team within BW and therefore things that are traditionally considered as CR, are delivered across a number of teams (e.g. environment, community, recreation, supporting vulnerable customers etc). It is a key part of our Strategy (????) and stakeholder relationships and communication (????). Support of investors is fundamental to keeping customer bills affordable in the long run. See annual report and trust in water statement for our story. The decision on the trade off's in our plan (risk, affordability, dividends, sharing mechanisms etc.) is one which the board is making as part of its role in assuring our business plan submission. We aim to be very transparent on the decisions which we have made and this will form one of the sections within our BP. Our approach to corporate & financial resilience and building trust can be found in Bristol Water...Clearly	17/07/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
363	Strategy	Email	What does BW hope to gain through its corporate responsibility agenda?	Chair	BW	The Bristol Water Board owns corporate responsibility which is fundamental to a public service organisation, the CEO and the executive deliver on their behalf. There isn't a corporate responsibility team within BW and therefore things that are traditionally considered as CR, are delivered across a number of teams (e.g. environment, community, recreation, supporting vulnerable customers etc). It is a key part of our Strategy (????) and stakeholder relationships and communication (????). Support of investors is fundamental to keeping customer bills affordable in the long run. See annual report and trust in water statement for our story. The decision on the trade off's in our plan (risk, affordability, dividends, sharing mechanisms etc.) is one which the board is making as part of its role in assuring our business plan submission. We aim to be very transparent on the decisions which we have made and this will form one of the sections within our BP. Our approach to corporate & financial resilience and building trust can be found in Bristol Water...Clearly	17/07/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
364	Tariffs	Email	In section 6 on page 41 the report states that it would '...be helpful to engage with CCG members... ..on Bristol's approach to asset health and which PCs and ODIs relate to it'. Have you taken up this suggestion as it would be good to set aside some time to carry it out.	Deputy Chair	BW	Yes this is planned as the qualitative research on resilience is planned to cover asset health and the outputs will be used by ??? and his team for the PC/ODI work. This will be expected to be evidenced in the quarterly review in September. Cleared by the updates we have received in the 2 Sub Groups concerning PC and ODIs.	04/04/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
365	Engagement Framework	Email	The Conclusions [section 11] contains some interesting ideas, particularly on pages 55 & 56. If BW are intending taking any of them forward it would be good if you could take us through the process, possibly at next week's sub group meeting?	Deputy Chair	BW	These ideas have been taken into account as this document support the framework so yes we have incorporated his suggestions into the framework	04/04/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
366	Customer Engagement	Email	340. I am not content that, because of Wessex dual supply work, we cannot challenge THEM to do something about the skew regarding the range of uses the public may engage in around rivers, lakes, reservoirs, beaches and other bodies of water.	Chair	BW	BW response; Regarding 340, due to the question being asked already by Wessex and to provide continuity we have not been able to change this question – we will provide more context. Research now complete and report accepted.	03/04/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
367	Customer Engagement	Email	341. I am still not content with the response from BW. Of course UKWIR guidelines may suggest the question, but does it also determine where and how the question is answered? I don't know enough to know whether the Challenge Panel's challenge is being appropriately addressed or not.	Chair	BW	BW reply; We have discussed them internally and agree that a second round of planned research will allow us to pick up the themes in 341-344. I am not 100% sure what this relates to but it may be the second round of WRMP research – the results will be provided to the sub-group on 20th April and the report will be uploaded to the FTS when finalised. I have now read the WRMP research report and it clears the queries in this challenge. No changes	24/04/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
368	Customer Engagement	Email	342 - Same issue regarding a skew. 'Other' does not enable people to think laterally as they will have been guided by the property based questions.	Chair	BW	BW reply; We have discussed them internally and agree that a second round of planned research will allow us to pick up the themes in 341-344. Content with the response and subsequent actions	03/04/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
369	Customer Engagement	Email	344 - I am not content that intergenerational issues are being excluded at this point. Where do they arise, if not here?	Chair	BW	BW reply; We have discussed them internally and agree that a second round of planned research will allow us to pick up the themes in 341-344. Content with the response and subsequent actions	03/04/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
370	Triangulation	Email	How will BW explain any significant differences between the answers that you may get from one type of survey v another	WPD	BW	We will address differences between the two approaches as part of the triangulation task as we will consider the PR14 WTP in this as well	12/04/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
371	Triangulation	Email	Will Ofwat see Max-Diff as an innovation rather than a deviation – is there any opinion or steer from Ofwat on this sort of refinement to methodology?	UWE(CS)	BW	To answer your question about Ofwat's acceptance of Max-Diff, they have not been specific around the approach to WTP but challenged us to ensure the results are triangulated. We will be using both the PR14 WTP and the PR19 WTP as part of our triangulation process so this is how we will address this point.	13/04/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
372	Customer Engagement	Email	Page 53 of the report states that the PR19 style was significantly shorter than the PR14 style. However, Table 7 on page 35 has the PR14 average completion time as 19 minutes but the PR19 style average ranges from 22 to 36 minutes for the various types of respondents. Could this be explained	Deputy Chair	BW	We will ask Accent to clarify your point. Times within acceptable limits and report now accepted.	13/04/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
373	Triangulation	Email	The section on how to interpret the Max-Diff results into monetary values is a bit complex; to give the Panel confidence in the eventual results can a Peer Review be carried out by other personnel?	Deputy Chair	BW	We have not yet concluded our internal discussions with Accent on how the results will be interpreted into monetary values. We will discuss this with you at the next Internal Challenge and Review. We can plan now to have a peer review of this process done. Triangulation methodology covers this point.	13/04/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
374	Drought Plan	Challenge Panel 5	Challenge #149 is in 2parts, this challenge is for the PR19 part: the Panel will have the opportunity to review water shortage targets in PR19	UWE(??)	BW	WRMP draft to be shared with BWCP when completed and will contain information indicated. The WRMP is out for consultation so this challenge can be cleared.	18/04/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
375	Customer Engagement	CESG 4 April 2017	The Chair is interested to see how BW intends to identify and measure the messages from the qualitative research that work best and is keen to see how this develops.	Chair	BW	The finance research was an example of this using a boiler to simplify the message. Learnings are captured through the evaluation.	10/01/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
376	Customer Engagement	CESG 4 April 2017	The Chair asked what weight will be given to specific issues in future research and the need to be clear how attributes are weighted and the priority given to them.	Chair	BW	Triangulation methodology covers this point.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
377	Customer Engagement	CESG 4 April 2017	The Chair asked how BW intends to involve customers in the business plan other than surveying them. Customers are saying they want to participate in discussions and how is BW going to enable this?	Chair	BW	The framework sets out multiple methods for involving customers in the business planning process. Other than surveys, there are opportunities for customers to participate in discussion via focus groups, deliberative events, a customer forum group, developer & retailer days, depth interviews as well as engagement with the online game at our summer events.	15/06/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
378	Resilience	CESG 4 April 2017	The Chair questioned the difference between 'Reliability' and 'Reliable Supply for the Future' in the list of priorities presented by BW. Is the latter more related to water resources?	Chair	BW	Customer priorities now accepted.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
379	Customer Engagement	CESG 4 April 2017	The Sub-Group said they would like to review the results from the cross-sector valuation review and their use and wishes to receive assurance on the robustness of the review.	Sub group	BW	Triangulation methodology covers this point.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
380	Resilience	CESG 4 April 2017	The Sub-Group wishes to understand the approach to the Cost of Resilience research, its findings and their use.	Sub group	BW	Triangulation methodology covers this point.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
381	Customer Engagement	CESG 4 April 2017	The Sub-Group wishes to attend the scenario workshops	Sub group	BW	Agreed, BW welcomes panel participation and the invitation was extended to all panel members. One member attended the first event.	15/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
382	Vulnerability	CESG 4 April 2017	There is an ongoing challenge on BW to discuss vulnerability with the BWCP or this Sub-Group.	Deputy Chair	BW	Vulnerability research now complete.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
383	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 7	The Deputy Chair asked whether environmental or other priorities (that may not arise automatically) were specifically tested in the qualitative research.	Deputy Chair	BW	DbD said that such priorities were inconsistent across the results so far and that it's BW's intention to probe environmental issues further and a methodology is being prepared.	17/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
384	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 7	UWE(???) asked if BW had sense checked the priorities of customers identified so far as it is important to know your customers and their expectations from the outset.	UWE(???)	BW	DbD agreed that it's essential to get this right. In the focus groups, customers were asked what do they expect from a water company. The details of the qualitative research and the results are included in a report from the exercise circulated to the CRSG	17/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
385	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 7	The Chair noted that the Phase 1 research by Accent was commissioned before the Panel had the opportunity to look at it. She has concerns that the research into the recreational value of BW's assets and its water didn't take into account visit, painting, being outside, relaxing, birdwatching, etc. The questions used were framed as around active use (sailing, fishing) rather than wider benefits and how BW intend to include these in its research.	Chair	BW	Content with the response and subsequent actions	17/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
386	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 7	The EA and NE would like to see the overall engagement strategy and framework presented in a simple table or diagram to show all the components of the customer engagement framework and their purpose and linkage and associated attributes. This would be a very useful reference for the Panel.	EA/NE	BW	BW agreed and will prepare it and include it in the presentation pack from now on and will keep it up to date. Completed.	17/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
387	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 7	The Chair asked how BW had devised its evaluation checklist.	Chair	BW	DbD said it had referred to Ofwat's requirements, used an evaluation specialist and tested it with BW's senior water resources management.	17/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
388	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 7	The Chair asked if BW had looked outside the water sector.	Chair	BW	DbD said its evaluations specialist has experience of other sectors.	17/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
389	Triangulation	Challenge Panel 7	WPD asked if the company's customer engagement framework will capture the results, and record what was used and what was rejected as a result of the research.	WPD	BW	DPD said this was helpful suggestion and will consider it. Framework updated.	17/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
390	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 7	The Chair asked is there a point when wider education of customers starts, eg on metering and whether the company has wider strategic education activity planned. The Chair would like to see a strategic communications strategy. The customer has to know enough about assets, environment, climate change and public health and what these mean to be able to contribute to the planning process. EA added the importance of bringing customers up to a level so they can make informed decisions. The WRMP contains lots of options. EA wondered what journey BW is taking its customers on (to make informed decisions)?	Chair	BW	BW agreed were good challenges and it needs to think about use of existing communication channels, eg social media, print, focussed interviews. BW suggested it would review the purpose and use of Watertalk to perhaps include more educational articles. all research now complete, maybe considered for ongoing engagement.	17/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
391	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 7	The Deputy Chair asked about complaint numbers relating to BW's metering strategy, whether complaints might increase as a result and whether BW would be tailoring its response accordingly.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW replied that a lot of proactive work with customers had been done and that so far complaints had not increased significantly. Complaints would be analysed as time goes on in order to assess whether any changes to the metering strategy were needed.	17/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
392	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 7	The Chair asked how BW will be measuring the results and experiences of the metering project and how it makes a good customer engagement campaign. BW needs to capture the associated customer contacts	Chair	BW	BW agreed to think about this. Presentations to BWCP now complete.	17/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
393	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 7	EA said that the way BW had informed the Panel about its metering strategy was effective. EA suggested the same approach would be very useful if used for the WRMP as well.	EA	BW	BW agreed to do this at the next meeting in July. This was done.	17/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
394	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 7	The Chair asked for clarification of the arrows BW had used to illustrate its change and rate of change in performance over the last three years.	Chair	BW	BW attempted to explain but agreed the presentation could be clearer. Final methodology now available. This challenge was cleared by the data presented at the ODI meeting on 26 February 2018	26/02/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
395	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 7	The Report Writer noted that BW is using this comparative information in its internal management reporting and asked if it had any intention to share it with its customers as a way of informing them of its position in the industry.	Report Writer	BW	BW replied that it has yet to consider this. BW included comparative information in their published mid year performance report so this can be closed.	15/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
396	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 7	The Report Writer asked if there were currently any industry comparative metrics for resilience and environment.	Report Writer	BW	BW replied that there were not but that it is Ofwat's intention to devise common indicators on Resilience but this is not likely to happen in the short term.	17/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
397	Asset Health PCs	Customer Engagement Phone in	The Deputy Chair asked if cryptosporidium can be included as an attribute.	Deputy Chair	BW	NERA replied it could be using guidance from DWI.	17/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
398	Customer Engagement	Customer Engagement Phone in	NE asked what environmental attributes are being considered, eg biodiversity, natural capital, etc. NE would welcome clarity on this.	NE	BW	NERA replied that it is in discussions with BW. BW will let the BWCP know in due course. On agenda for November meeting.	17/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
399	Water Resources	Customer Engagement Phone in	NE enquired if the analysis assesses when to implement drought control measures.	NE	BW	NERA replied it did not. This is a narrow piece of research and BW would have to define quite precisely the measures to be valued. DbD will discuss this with Patric Bulmer to see if there are more specific actions that can be considered and will report back. NE has agreed to realise this as a query on the drought plan when that is published.	17/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
400	Environment	Customer Engagement Phone in	NE wants to see generally how the environment is being taken into account in the analysis.	NE	BW	BW agreed that this needs to be made clear. Separate environment engagement document produced.	17/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
401	Triangulation	Customer Engagement Phone in	WPD enquired what BW will do if the attributes don't have a market value.	WPD	BW	NERA agreed that it will not be possible to place a market value on everything. The approach only gives a lower bound on the valuation. It will try to triangulate valuations from different evidence.	17/05/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
402	Customer Engagement	Email	Where does this questionnaire fit alongside other pieces of customer research?	EA	BW	Please see the framework - it is one piece of research on WRMP options	03/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
403	Customer Engagement	Email	What is the purpose of this research?	EA	BW	The purpose of the research is to understand customers Willingness to Pay for options included in the WRMP. The purpose of each piece of research is set out in the framework.	03/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
404	Customer Engagement	Email	What will this research be used for?	EA	BW	As stated in the framework	03/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
405	Customer Engagement	Email	Why does the design document not explain that a repeat of BW's worst drought on record [ie between 1:75 and 1:100], would give BW significant resource problems. Surely this will help the customer understand the Water Resources situation you are in compared with other companies?	EA	BW	This is beyond the scope of this survey but has been picked up in the deliberative study. Jeremy confirmed it is cleared	03/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
406	Customer Engagement	Email	Why are you not explaining to customers that the new resilience guidelines are talking about even tighter resilience of coping with a 1:200 year drought?	EA	BW	This is beyond the scope of this survey but has been picked up in the deliberative study. Jeremy confirmed it is cleared	03/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
407	Customer Engagement	Email	Surely you should be asking questions of your customers about what level of resilience they are willing to pay for – not just the solutions without knowing the problem the solutions are trying to address?	EA	BW	This is beyond the scope of this survey but has been picked up in the deliberative study. Jeremy confirmed it is cleared	03/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
408	Customer Engagement	Email	Based on these fundamental questions you need to take us all on a better 'journey'. You need to take us with you and need context setting and process reminders.	EA	BW	included in all current BWCP presentations.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
409	Customer Engagement	Email	The wording of Table 1: Measures and Descriptions is a bit biased towards the negative impacts of leakage control; particularly 'would lead to higher bills and also local traffic disruption when digging up roads to fix the pipes.' More of the positive benefits should be highlighted such as reduced demand so less pumping, treatment etc.	EA	BW	Wording amended to: "reducing leakage further would lower the volumes of water Bristol Water would need to take from the environment and also reduce the energy usage from treating and pumping this water. However, it would leak to higher bills and also local traffic disruption when digging up the roads to fix pipes." We have not included large scale developments as that is an alternative option that we are potentially allowing customers to choose, rather than an implication of them not choosing leakage.	15/06/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
410	Customer Engagement	Email	The wording for the metering measure should also highlight that metering could be seen as a fairer way to pay.	EA	BW	This has been amended	15/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
411	Customer Engagement	Email	Q3; why are persons with a septic tank are not included? I do not see any other question that requires the foul waste to be handled by Wessex; what am I missing?	Deputy Chair	BW	This has been removed	15/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
412	Customer Engagement	Email	Page 10; the leakage rate is referred to in percentage terms but on page 7 it is in terms of litres; why change in the middle of the questionnaire as this will only cause confusion.	Deputy Chair	BW	This has been amended	15/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
413	Customer Engagement	Email	Q42 seems to be a duplicate of Q11 with a bit more detail; is it required?	Deputy Chair	BW	Q11 asks about the main income earner in the household to inform the SEG category. Q42 is different and asks about employment status		Acknowledged. No change required.
414	Customer Engagement	Email	Please explain Temporary Use Bans to interviewees, both in their content [ie effect on the customer, ie water use restrictions, etc] and likely frequency so that they are able to respond to the following questions	Deputy Chair	BW	Yes – this is explained to them in the questionnaire.	15/06/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
415	Customer Engagement	Email	BW should consider splitting 'the impact on the frequency of a TUB' into 2; one on the effect of the TUB on the customers' use of water and the second on the frequency of occurrence of the TUB. Both have effects that could change a response.	Deputy Chair	BW	The present study is focussed on customers' preferences over water resources management plan options. However, we do ask them about whether, and how, they would be affected by a TUB.	15/06/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
416	Customer Engagement	Email	The explanation of how BW gets from the 4 factors to the measures being tested needs to be explained more fully, so that we can be sure all aspects are covered.	Deputy Chair	BW	It is probably clearest to look at the questionnaire itself to see how it is explained.	15/06/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
417	Customer Engagement	Email	The level of service is both the effect of the water use restriction and its frequency. Please amend.	Deputy Chair	BW	Amended to show that the focus is on the frequency of a TUB.	15/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
418	Water Resources	Email	Increased storage, universal commercial metering, reducing transfer to neighbours and use of area meters [to quickly identify leaks] need to be considered for inclusion.	Deputy Chair	BW	Increased storage and meters are topics for discussion at the deliberative events as we feel these warrant a more detailed discussion & education. We have not included universal commercial metering as an option for this HH questionnaire as 99% of commercial properties are already metered. Reducing transfers from neighbouring companies is not an option as the EA are encouraging greater water transfers.	15/06/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
419	Water Resources	Email	I understood that BW were considering about 100 ideas for their demand-supply balance so I am concerned that BW have reduced this to 6 with very little customer involvement, please justify.	Deputy Chair	BW	Bristol Water has gone through a stringent options assessment process for selecting options for WRMP19. The list of 100 included unfeasible options such as transferring ice from the polar ice caps which was easy to rule out and the options assessment included environmental criteria from the SEA, HRA and WFD. The final options for assessment have been grouped into the categories presented in the questionnaire and include around 30 options. For instance, 'leakage' includes enhanced leak detection efforts in distribution pipes, increasing find and fix leakage control activity on trunk mains and distribution mains and replacement of customers supply pipes to name a few. The purpose of the survey is to understand customers willingness to pay for options for balancing supply and demand. Results of this will be used to further screen the options for WRMP19.	15/06/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
420	Customer Engagement	Email	The use of the words 'small' and 'high' tend to bias the respondents view and should be avoided	Deputy Chair	BW	Added text above. The footnote also explains.	15/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
421	Customer Engagement	Email	The descriptions in Table 1 should include some other positive benefits like higher reservoir levels, reduced pumping and chemical costs, etc where applicable.	Deputy Chair	BW	Example card has been replaced above. The actual choice cards are yet to be programmed, but these will include 3 changes not 4, as described.	15/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
422	Customer Engagement	Email	In several descriptions in Table 1 where BW are trying to be as helpful as possible to the respondent, the wording has a bias towards one result; could this be re-phrased	Deputy Chair	BW	As this is an online survey with client's supplied sample with no information on demographics we can't set quotas. However, as with Stage 1 the survey results will be weighted using ONS census data for age, social grade and gender.	15/06/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
423	Customer Engagement	Email	In section 6; Metering, please make clear that BW are talking about household customers only	Deputy Chair	BW	As in the stage one survey, the stage 2 WtP survey will be completed online by 500 HH customers and 300 telephone interview for NHH customers. Accuracy of the results will be tested in the pilot of 200 PR14 and 200 PR19 online surveys.	15/06/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
424	Customer Engagement	Email	In Table 2, please make clear that 'Local disruption' only affects road transport	Deputy Chair	BW	Research report accepted.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
425	Customer Engagement	Email	In Table 2 I read '£££' as being £3/per year increase; could you clarify in the table	Deputy Chair	BW	Research report accepted.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
426	Customer Engagement	Email	In Table 4 please make clear that the percentage change in bills is per year or over the whole 5 years.	Deputy Chair	BW	Research report accepted.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
427	Customer Engagement	Email	The text states that the number of measures that differ between the 2 options is limited to three; but the example in Figure 4 has four measures that differ.	Deputy Chair	BW	Research report has update.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
428	Customer Engagement	Email	Please include some detail of how you are to ensure that the respondents demographics matches the demographics of the BW customer base; and thus what maximum adjustments would be acceptable.	Deputy Chair	BW	Research report has update.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
429	Customer Engagement	Email	Please include the size of the survey numbers and thus the likely accuracy of the results.	Deputy Chair	BW	Research report has update.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
430	Customer Engagement	Email	In general, how will the education of participants reflect that water is a finite, scarce resource, with only 2% of the world's water being fresh water mostly locked in polar ice caps?	Chair	BW	Research report has update.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
431	Customer Engagement	Email	How will the participants be informed on the relationships that demand has on each of the following : population growth, changes in the volume & frequency of rainfall, the range of environmental impact?	Chair	BW	Research report accepted.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
432	Customer Engagement	Email	How will the impact on bills relate to other household costs - the same %age, increasing or decreasing?	Chair	BW	Research report accepted.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
433	Customer Engagement	Email	BW uses only a limited number of reasons why its customers should adopt water meters and leaves out some key reasons why people will reduce or be more aware of their water consumption. Additional reasons are, for example, quality of life for my children, water security, repairing current environmental degradation, people like me conserve water, it's good citizenship, etc. How can such messages can be incorporated into the information provided to customers?	Chair	BW	Research report has update.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
434	Customer Engagement	Email	Why does the matrix exclude a column for intergenerational impacts as the TUB covers 25 years?	Chair	BW	Research report accepted.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
435	Customer Engagement	Email	Should leaks also be presented as %age of leaks per treated water?	Chair	BW	Research report accepted.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
436	Customer Engagement	Email	Can examples be provided to exemplify : environmental impacts, new water resources, level of demand for water that could be 'shared', etc.	Chair	BW	Research report has update.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
437	Customer Engagement	Email	With the exception of leakage, what comparisons between companies, countries, etc can be used to show a performance context?	Chair	BW	Research report accepted.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
438	Customer Engagement	Email	How many water companies are using Accent as a provider, what comparisons can be made between companies and their approaches	Chair	BW	We believe 5 other water companies are using Accent has a provider. We are in discussions with Accent to see if we can make comparisons with them. ??? confirmed it is cleared	15/06/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
439	Environment	Customer Engagement Phone in	EA's comments on the research material had been sent to BW previously by email and BW had responded. EA's main concerns centred on how the environment had been referenced in the research material.	EA	BW	BW's response was to increase and improve such references, particularly by trying to grade the impact on the environment on the various top trumps cards and by increasing environmental references in the facilitators' notes in order to bring out that a benefit to the environment is also a benefit to customers.	07/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
440	Environment	Customer Engagement Phone in	The Chair that BW should inform participants that water is a natural, precious, vulnerable and finite resource. Only 2% of the world's resource is fresh water and that most is locked in the polar ice caps. Customers expect to have water but don't necessarily put a value on it.	Chair	BW	DbD agreed to include this information in the research material. Jeremy confirmed that this was done	07/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
441	Resilience	Customer Engagement Phone in	The Chair said that resilience and sustainability are linked but that customers don't necessarily understand the difference between them.	Chair	BW	DbD agreed that this could be clarified. Resilience research completed.	07/06/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
442	Environment	Customer Engagement Phone in	With regard to the scenarios the Deputy Chair noted that the effect of mains bursts on the environment was fairly clear (eg chlorine, sediment) but the effect of a collapse of the canal wasn't. The Chair added that the environmental damage caused by sediment and changes to the habitat on the canal margin might be considered.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW agreed and facilitators made aware.	07/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
443	Customer Engagement	Customer Engagement Phone in	Overall the Chair considered that the research material was unclear on asking how customers feel about particular issues relating to water and what would motivate them to change their behaviour in order that BW can understand how to communicate back and educate them on specific issues. The emotional dimension and the thread linking feelings and behaviours appear to be missing.	Chair	BW	BW/DbD replied that there are discussion questions for each scenario but that these can be extended to capture emotional/behavioural dimensions. This would be added to the notes for the research facilitators. ??? confirmed that this was done	07/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
444	Customer Engagement	Customer Engagement Phone in	The Chair remarked that water trading in a national drought situation may not be possible as other companies won't have water to trade.	Chair	BW	DbD agreed and said that the facilitators will attempt to draw these points out of discussions during the Top Trumps process.	07/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
445	Water Resources	Customer Engagement Phone in	Regarding water efficiency, participants should be prompted to consider how water could be used better, eg the types of plants to grow in the garden, how we wash clothes, water use whilst showering, use of grey water. There are always choices and there is also the question of responsibility (eg BW and/or the customer)? Participants should be encouraged to change the way they think about water.	Chair	BW	DbD agreed and said that the facilitators will attempt to draw these points out of discussions during the Top Trumps process.	07/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
446	Customer Engagement	Customer Engagement Phone in	For Slide 28 the Deputy Chair asked how much more demand is needed to push BW into a drought situation.	Deputy Chair	BW	DbD will consult BW in order to give participants more information about this. Information added to research.	07/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
447	Customer Engagement	Customer Engagement Phone in	The Deputy Chair noted that BW's bill is £8 lower than the industry average. The risk of hosepipes bans is higher than Wessex, but BW's average bill is lower. Is there a link and what could Bristol do with the extra £8 per year?	Deputy Chair	BW	This is difficult to calculate within our timeframe for delivery. The valuation survey at the beginning and end of the session gives customers a good idea of what service level improvements can be achieved with £25.	15/06/2017	Acknowledged. No action before Ofwat report
448	Customer Engagement	Customer Engagement Phone in	The Chair noted that, for customer education, schools are only one point of contact. Education can be far wider eg to include churches, community groups.	Chair	BW	specialist groups are included where appropriate.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
449	Resilience	Customer Engagement Phone in	Slide 9 (How to be Resilient) - what more could BW do within its operations to save water? It may only be a small percentage of water put into supply but it would demonstrate that BW is committed to water efficiency.	Deputy Chair	BW	Research report accepted.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
450	Drought Plan	Customer Engagement Phone in	Slide 13 (Serious Drought) mentions that BW would plan for emergency situations in the event of a drought. One would have expected that BW already has plans in place.	Deputy Chair	BW	DpD agreed the text is incorrect, creates the wrong impression and needs to be changed. Changes made	09/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
451	Customer Engagement	Customer Engagement Phone in	Slide 22 (Water Main Burst) - the water main burst scenario is comparable with the canal breach. With the latter BW says it would investigate the reasons for the failure to prevent it happening again. There is nothing similar for the water main scenario.	Deputy Chair	BW	DpD agreed and will consult BW to expand the water main slide accordingly. ??? confirmed that this was	07/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
452	Customer Engagement	Customer Engagement Phone in	NE noted that the resilience research material was very focused on BW's ability to supply water. There was little mention on the resilience of the environment and BW's impact on this.	NE	BW	BW noted this but said that a water cycle poster would be used as part of the educational material used at the sessions. Changes were made.	09/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
453	Resilience	Customer Engagement Phone in	NE considered that further explanation of the difference between Resilience and Sustainability was required, for example that resilience is also about environmental protection and that sustainability is concerned with long term demand for water and its impact on the environment.	NE	BW	DbD agreed to make this more explicit. ??? confirmed that this was done	07/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
454	Water Resources	Customer Engagement Phone in	The Deputy Chair mentioned that neighbouring companies are key to water trading for BW. In a regional drought situation they may not be able to trade water because they won't have water themselves. JJH noted that other companies may be able to offer help in the form of water tankers, bowsers, bottled water, etc.	Deputy Chair	BW	DbD agreed to let their facilitators know this. ???? confirmed that this was done	07/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
455	Environment	Customer Engagement Phone in	NE raised the generic issue of needing to ensure how water supply can impact the environment is understood, eg taking water from the environment, dried habitats, less oxygen, algal blooms. An additional slide would be helpful.	NE	BW	DpD agreed to consider this, possibly adding information to Slide 5 and by including an environment poster (with quiz questions). ???? confirmed that this was done	07/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
456	Environment	Customer Engagement Phone in	NE are concerned about the term 'environment' being used too generically. For example the environment 'scores' on the top trumps cards and the relative differences between cards is not clear. They are too broad and not convincing. DbD said there will be representatives from BW at the research sessions and the facilitators will be briefed.	NE	BW	DbD said there will be representatives from BW at the research sessions and the facilitators will be briefed.	07/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
457	Customer Engagement	Customer Engagement Phone in	NE said that everyone will need to be clear over how scores have been derived and he is not sure the facilitators can do this effectively.	NE	BW	DbD suggested that the environmental scoring could expressed as pros and cons rather than negative or positive. ?? agreed to discuss the scoring with EA (??) and get back to BW with suggestions for the cards by Thursday. Changes were made.	09/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
458	Environment	Customer Engagement Phone in	NE noted that BW's reference to its catchment work reference is useful. As a general point he stressed the importance of management of land to create a more natural hydrology and increase resilience and the opportunity has BW got to do this.	NE	BW	DbD will see if this can be introduced on an existing top trumps card. DbD took the following steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Created a specific information poster to highlight BW's catchment management work with farmers Created a specific "Environment" Top Trumps card following requests from participants Changed the environmental scores on the Top Trumps cards Provided facilitators with notes on environmental impacts for each Top Trump card (notes provided by ????) 	21/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
459	Environment	Customer Engagement Phone in	NE noted that trade off between effects on supply (eg bans, restrictions) and environmental damage was not present on the Top Trumps cards.	NE	BW	DbD said they could add some information on this to facilitators' notes and that information could be introduced in the discussion questions (eg Slide 15). Provided facilitators with notes on environmental impacts for each Top Trump card (notes provided by ????). Also changed the environmental scores on the Top Trumps cards	21/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
460	Triangulation	Email	How will customer expectations, knowledge or lack of it on resilience issues be triangulated across the customer engagement framework? A simple map or other diagram would be most helpful.	Chair	BW	Content with the response and subsequent actions	17/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
461	Customer Engagement	Email	We were presented with three scenarios; what other scenarios were considered by the Bristol Water team, why were these scenarios rejected, how will the issues in the rejected scenarios be addressed in the overall customer research framework?	Chair	BW	The scenarios we wanted to capture were: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What happens when we are constrained by environmental issues. What happens when we are constrained by the systems used to collect water. What happens when we are constrained by our ability to distribute and supply water. We also wanted to capture scenarios which could occur over long term, medium term and also sharp shocks. Other scenarios considered were the 1933/34 drought, the Portway main collapse in the mid 1990's, water pollution problems at water sources & treatment works failures. We rejected these scenarios on the basis that we think the three key underlying issues throughout the supply chain that we could face are best covered by the examples we have chosen. We wanted to pick relevant scenarios where customers could have a familiarity or recollection of what happened. If we used other examples from the 1930's or scenarios that are less likely, customers could struggle to comprehend the risk posed to them in the face of resilience. The purpose was to illustrate the principles of resilience and we don't feel like the rejected scenarios would add anything to this.	15/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
462	Customer Engagement	Email	Much of the success of the deliberative exercise is related to the quality of the facilitation and the notes provided to facilitators; how are facilitators recruited and what knowledge and skills do they possess, how is the facilitator's briefing note compiled, how are the facilitators briefed prior to the session and debriefed afterwards, what guidance is available to facilitators on compiling feedback from their table?	Chair	BW	All our facilitators are experienced consultants who have facilitated events before or received internal facilitation training that covers how to guide a discussion without influencing. The first draft of the process plan is created in the early stages of designing the event and is regularly refined and updated as the structure of the event develops into its final form. It is based on process plans from previous successful events so it incorporates lessons learnt over many years. We reviewed the process plan with the relevant Bristol Water staff, and the Challenge Panel, with updates after each round of feedback to ensure it reflected your views. We provide facilitators with a high level briefing the week before the event and a more detailed briefing the day before. On the day, the facilitators and BW representatives get together before participants arrive and reconvene in each break to review the timeline. Once the participants have left, a full debrief takes place to discuss what went well and what could be improved. Each facilitator has a proforma sheet on their table to write down their notes, ensuring they address each discussion question. Each session is recorded on a Dictaphone so facilitators can listen back to the session when typing up their notes. We hold an analysis meeting with all facilitators to compare our notes and identify common themes and divergences, this often prompts facilitators to go back to the recording to confirm our interpretation.	15/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
463	Customer Engagement	Email	How is quality control applied across the 12 tables of participants?	Chair	BW	Facilitators reconvene regularly throughout events to discuss how their table discussions are going and ensure a consistent approach to facilitation. The final report goes through a rigorous quality assurance process by the DbyD Project Director before it is shared with the client.	15/06/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
464	Vulnerability	Email	Identify areas where vulnerable customers can contribute to the design of Bristol Water's future planning.	Chair	BW	Included in vulnerability research report.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
465	Vulnerability	Email	Vulnerability triangulation points across the breadth of Bristol Water's research need to be provided.	Chair	BW	Content with the response and subsequent actions	17/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
466	Vulnerability	Email	In addition to saving money, there may be a wider range of motivations that determine people's behaviours and actions. These should be explored.	Chair	BW	Included in vulnerability research report.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
467	Vulnerability	Email	Customers move in and out of financial vulnerability, usually due to circumstances outside their control. How might we obtain some information on how best to understand customer needs as they make this journey in and out of affordability?	Chair	BW	Included in vulnerability research report.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
468	Vulnerability	Email	There is no reference to the scoping of the definition of vulnerability and how you determine what to include and why you exclude particular types of vulnerability from the research. I place a lot of weight on this part of the exercise and would appreciate greater information on this aspect of the project.	Chair	BW	Included in vulnerability research report.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
469	Vulnerability	Email	I felt the voting on the 12 questions regarding bill choices was compromised slightly by the amount of information the participants were required to assimilate in the time available. You might consider simplifying the slides (or giving people more time) and improving the colour distinction between investment areas that increase or stay at current levels.	Report Writer	BW	Focus group documents changed for subsequent sessions.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
470	Environment	Email	When describing Bristol's impact on the environment, as well as covering the effect on wildlife in general terms (which you did), you could also include the effect that over-abstracting water from rivers and the ground might have on water habitats, etc. Connected with this, I feel you could make it clearer at the beginning that Bristol's water abstraction is regulated and limited through its regulatory (EA) licences.	Report Writer	BW	Focus group documents changed for subsequent sessions.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
471	Customer Engagement	Email	Try and avoid technical jargon if you can or put things in lay terms. For example, mention was made of turbidity, CCWater, climate change and megalitres without explanation. It would be useful to be able to illustrate what a megalitre of water looks like, e.g. how many Olympic-sized swimming pools could be filled, etc.	Report Writer	BW	Focus group documents changed for subsequent sessions.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
472	Customer Engagement	Email	One scenario covered was the breach of the canal. However, it wasn't clear on the wall map that the abstraction from the north was via canal (rather than the river).	Report Writer	BW	Focus group documents changed for subsequent sessions.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
473	Customer Engagement	Email	The top trumps exercise went well but it could be made clearer that the objective is to prioritise investment in the various resilience-related activities (rather than to determine the actual level of investment). I felt there was uncertainty amongst some participants over the relationship between the chocolate 'coins', the £ icons on the top trumps cards and the gold discs on the slide illustrating the current distribution of investment. I don't think you intended there should be any relationship between them. I also think that the slide showing the current level of investment should be normalised in some way to remove or explain more clearly the impact of the Southern Resilience Scheme.	Report Writer	BW	Focus group documents changed for subsequent sessions.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
474	Customer Engagement	Email	It was great that some participants wanted to introduce an additional top trumps card to cover 'Protecting the Environment' and that you let all the groups add this to their priority lists if they wished to. You might consider adding this card (or something like 'Increasing Environmental Resilience') for use at the remaining two events.	Report Writer	BW	Focus group documents changed for subsequent sessions.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
475	Customer Engagement	CESG 6 July 2017	With reference to Table 1 (Customer experience by attribute) on p5 in document "Customer Experience of Attributes Review", the Chair asked if the engagement results obtained so far were changing the way the business operates. In order to fulfil the Panel's assurance responsibilities to Ofwat with regard to engagement, the Panel needs to see where the engagement has produced changes in operations, policy or efficiency. BW replied that they were acting upon the results, for example on low pressure where a policy change and new information on the company website had occurred.	Chair	BW	BW will be capturing the decisions made as a result of the engagement findings and will issue quarterly updates. Quarterly updates on results and changes received by sub group.	06/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
476	Customer Engagement	CESG 6 July 2017	NSC asked whether councils with be used as a source of customer contact information for the engagement and the triangulation process. Councils are often contacted by water customers and would have information on bursts and other comments on service for example. The Chair added other stakeholders such as charities could also be contacted.	NSC	BW	BW will look at the information it already has from these sources and whether they need more.	06/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
477	Triangulation	CESG 6 July 2017	The Deputy Chair asked how BW will ensure consistency in the use of the triangulation results.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW replied that only four individuals will be involved so consistency should be achieved	06/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
478	Triangulation	CESG 6 July 2017	The Deputy Chair suggested a documented example of how the triangulation process has been applied and the results achieved would be very useful. The Chair added that the recent Drought Plan experience would be a good case study.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW agreed to do this	06/07/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
479	Triangulation	CESG 6 July 2017	NE wondered whether the diagram on p2 addresses the environment in an appropriate way. It is not clear how the BW environment team will use the engagement results or that the results will indicate how customers value the environment. As a Panel we would like to have an input into the engagement questions and how they're asked to ensure the breadth and depth of questioning is appropriate to achieve the desired outcomes. The Chair added that the Panel can bring a huge range of customer perspectives and the earlier we are involved the more we can enhance and add value to the process.	NE	BW	BW will consider this. Panel involved in wording of questionnaires.	06/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
480	Water Resources	CESG 6 July 2017	NE suggested BW refers to WINEP when determining the key environmental questions it should be asking. Questions to customers should explore how much they support the company's target on Biodiversity Index (to improve from the 2015 baseline).	NE	BW	BW said it would consider the WINEP.	06/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
481	Customer Engagement	CESG 6 July 2017	The Deputy Chair asked that the on-line panel respondents' segmentation be provided for each survey and results weighted to match the BW customer base segmentation.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW agreed to do this.	06/07/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
482	Customer Engagement	CESG 6 July 2017	The Chair noted the premise that technological change is excluded from the graph illustrating the hypothetical relationship between cost, value and service quality.	Chair	BW	NERA confirmed this but said that such change doesn't apply to water in this context. The Chair accepted this but will continue raise the issue of technological change as time goes on.	06/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
483	Water Resources	CESG 6 July 2017	There was discussion of the attributes being used for the valuation research, especially 'Environmental Services', for example that catchment management could result in operational cost reduction (reduced use of chemicals).	Chair	BW	BW confirmed this was not part of the valuation engagement (which is also high level) but will form part of testing the Plans with customers (eg WRMP).	06/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
484	Water Resources	CESG 6 July 2017	NE asked why the Stage 2 stated preference study was covering water resources but not wider environmental issues. There is linkage between them.	NE	BW	BW replied that the Stage 2 research report will be issued shortly. If the Panel has any comments on this they will be considered and changes made if necessary. Report has been issued [October 17] and the Panel had no comments on its content.	06/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
485	Customer Engagement	CESG 6 July 2017	The Deputy Chair noted that, with regard to the proposed Benefits Transfer Study, most of the source data referred to are stated preference studies from other water companies. Are these data comparable across attributes?	Deputy Chair	BW	NERA replied they are comparable in general terms	06/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
486	Customer Engagement	CESG 6 July 2017	The Report Writer asked NERA if the game being used contained any innovation.	Report Writer	BW	NERA responded that the use of such a tool for valuation purposes is innovative	06/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
487	Customer Engagement	CESG 6 July 2017	NSC raised the issue of traffic disruption and the need to consider this in the valuation research.	NSC	BW	BW agreed to look at its complaint data to see if meaningful data on such disruption could be obtained	06/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
488	Triangulation	CESG 6 July 2017	The Deputy Chair asked if outlier data points are considered before any discounting of them is made.	Deputy Chair	BW	NERA confirmed this and that all decisions will be recorded in the resulting report in order to provide an audit trail	06/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
489	Triangulation	CESG 6 July 2017	The Deputy Chair asked if the valuation questions used were similar to those adopted in the other engagement studies.	Deputy Chair	BW	Both DbD and NERA confirmed they were.	06/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
490	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 8	The Deputy Chair asked BW if it is going to refresh the online panel to bring it into line with results of the wider customer segmentation exercise.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW replied that not a big change is needed but it will actively try to recruit additional members to the panel.	12/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
491	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 8	The Deputy Chair said that disclosure is important for the research results that are used for decision-making. The Chair asked if the results of every piece of research undertaken will be run through the segmentation 'sieve' and would there be the opportunity to do additional research if a particular demographic is under represented? UWE (????) asked if there would be any deep dive into the customer segments.	Chair	BW	BW said it would map the results back to segments to test representation. It will be able to present the results at the next Panel meeting and have a discussion with the Panel about whether more research is needed.	12/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
492	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 8	The EA said that it is really important to have process checks to review the purpose of the research, how much control the research has on the outcome and on the bill. The Panel needs to keep pausing and checking this and would need a regular reminder of the context.	EA	BW	BW agreed that such a process needs to be introduced. Now part of the routine meetings	12/07/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
493	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 8	EA asked where are we on the journey and where are we aiming to get to.	EA	BW	BW said that this could be presented at the start of each Panel meeting and for each paper presented and agreed to do this.	12/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
494	Environment	Challenge Panel 8	NE referred to the BW paper entitled 'Customer Engagement into the environment'. EA and NE were meeting with Patric Bulmer later in the day to discuss its content but NE considered the paper contained gaps in BW's strategy, for example its ambitions around biodiversity and habitats and linkage of these with the results of its customer engagement.	NE	BW	BW agreed to update the paper accordingly. Updated document [dated January 2018] now on the fts.	26/02/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
495	Information Assurance	Challenge Panel 8	The Report Writer asked if BW's external assurance of its business plan submission will include the robustness of the linkage of the results of its customer engagement and its investment plan. This is a critical component of the plan.	Report Writer	BW	BW agreed to consider this. The 7 June PC and ODI sub group discussed this. BW's view was that judgement could not be covered by external assurance; it is for the BW Board to assure.	12/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
496	Triangulation	Challenge Panel 8	CCW said it would be very useful to have an example to show how triangulation works.	CCW	BW	BW agreed to provide this	12/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
497	Vulnerability	Challenge Panel 8	CCW questioned whether 20 customer interviews are sufficient given that there is a wide range of circumstances surrounding vulnerability.	CCW	BW	BM said that this may be considered further.	12/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
498	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 8	UWE (CS) suggested that festival-goers might be considered. This group often opposes Fluoridisation of water and bottled water is drunk because of this. It may be a small group and there may be misinformation and misunderstanding amongst it.	UWE(CS)	BW	BW said it has some data on this and can identify these types of people.	12/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
499	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 8	The Deputy Chair stressed the need to document the results of this engagement and the decisions taken, especially as these may benefit only a small number of people.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW noted this	12/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
500	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 8	WPD asked which were the biggest group on the BW's vulnerable customers register. It's the elderly in the energy sector.	WPD	BW	BW noted these questions and will respond in due course. Vulnerability report accepted.	12/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
501	Vulnerability	Challenge Panel 8	WPD also asked about BW's strategy for vulnerable customers.	WPD	BW	BW noted these questions and will respond in due course. Vulnerability report accepted by Panel and no queries raised.	12/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
502	Vulnerability	Challenge Panel 8	The Chair asked if there was any cross over between the forthcoming vulnerable customer engagement and with the wider customer segmentation data.	Chair	BW	BM said it will be looking at this	12/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
503	Vulnerability	Challenge Panel 8	The Deputy Chair asked how the non-registered or hard to reach will be picked up in the research.	Deputy Chair	BW	BM said its researchers will consult stakeholder organisations as a source of information and will also ask questions as they go to try and pick up these groups	12/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
504	Vulnerability	Challenge Panel 8	CCW asked whether there was any merit in surveying non-vulnerable customers as part of this project, perhaps as a control group. This may inform the acceptability of investment intended to help vulnerable customers.	CCW	BW	BW replied this is a qualitative survey but this was an interesting point nonetheless and it will consider it	12/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
505	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 8	The Chair asked what BW is doing about the slight deterioration on low pressure over last year.	Chair	BW	BW said it is looking to rezone its supply in certain areas but it will report back to the Panel on this. We have a project underway to reduce the number of people on the DG2 register and results will be reported through the regular assurance meetings.	12/07/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
506	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 8	Both NE and UWE remarked that 'deteriorating' is not a good way of communicating success on the Biodiversity measure and looks poor from the outside. BW should consider finding a more appropriate form of words such as "in line with expectation" or similar.	NE	BW	BW replied that the nomenclature used is as defined in the price determination.	12/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
507	Information Assurance	Challenge Panel 8	The Deputy Chair noted that Atkins had concerns over BW's reporting methodology last year. Were they happy this year?	Deputy Chair	BW	BW replied that they were as satisfactory improvements have been made and are ongoing.	12/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
508	Water Resources	Challenge Panel 8	The Chair asked BW if it is content that its customer research links to the environmental planning it is undertaking.	Chair	BW	BW said it is looking at testing of specific environmental projects with customers and has discussed this with EA and NE today.	12/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
509	Water Resources	Challenge Panel 8	The Chair added that customers may not be able to interact on specific schemes but on strategic longer term issues. EA said customers need to be taken on a journey to be sufficient informed to contribute.	Chair	BW	BW said it will be looking again at these issues next week and will update its environmental engagement paper. Updated document [dated January 2018] now on the fts.	26/02/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
510	Information Assurance	Assurance SG 21 July 2017	BW to address a cultural issue regarding ownership of information, particularly at source (e.g. at operational level).	Chair	BW	Covered in an assurance update meeting 13 June meeting. Cleared with changes	15/06/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
511	Information Assurance	Assurance SG 21 July 2017	BW's governance policies and procedures should be explicit in extending to third party data.	Chair	BW	Covered in an assurance update meeting 13 June meeting. Cleared with changes	15/06/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
512	Information Assurance	Assurance SG 21 July 2017	We challenge whether the third party data reporting processes are efficient. BW's assumption is that they are.	Chair	BW	Covered in an assurance update meeting 13 June meeting. Cleared with changes	15/06/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
513	Information Assurance	Assurance SG 21 July 2017	We asked how BW's data quality and its reporting processes compare with other companies. Atkins couldn't give a definitive answer (perhaps understandably)	Chair	BW	Atkins said they don't have any material concerns based upon their experience elsewhere	21/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
514	Information Assurance	Assurance SG 21 July 2017	Other companies use the former Ofwat confidence grading system to inform itself and its stakeholders of the quality of its reported data and use this information to benchmark and drive improvement where it is in the company's and the customers' interests. .	Chair	BW	BW said that ???? has already challenged the business on this. It was not clear whether he has directed the business to use confidence grades in future. We said we would welcome this	21/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
515	Information Assurance	Assurance SG 21 July 2017	We challenged the company to look at the Atkins assurance statement provided to the BW Board and published on the website as it is couched in language which, whilst probably acceptable to Ofwat, is not meaningful to customers.	Chair	BW	Assurance Plan language is now more customer friendly.	09/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
516	Information Assurance	Assurance SG 21 July 2017	Biodiversity Index – the reporting tool (and resultant data) is good but lacks full and complete documentation. Improvements have been made in the year but there is further work to do. We will note this in our report, particularly as the audit finding was 'amber' this time last year	Chair	BW	The sub group meeting discussion and resulting meeting notes cleared this challenge	21/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
517	Information Assurance	Assurance SG 21 July 2017	There was discussion of BW's intentions for the assurance of its PR19 submission. Atkins and the company are still discussing the scope of this, particularly the assurance of the linkage of customer and stakeholder needs and expectations to the PR19 investment cases and the justification of any investment where the link doesn't exist or is not fully clear. We said these are critical areas of assurance for the Panel (and presumably the BW Board). BW said that PwC is the company's assurance partner for PR19. We requested a presentation on the PR19 assurance region once it's finalised.	Chair	BW	Final methodology now available. This challenge was cleared by the data presented at the ODI meeting on 26 February 2018	26/02/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
518	Drought Plan	Email	What facility is there for imposing penalties on customers [both businesses and Households] who refuse to comply with TUBs, etc? How does BW intend to take this topic any further?	Deputy Chair	BW	The Water Industry Act 1991 and the Water Resource Act 1991 provide for enforcement of TUBs and drought orders respectively. Anyone found guilty of breaching a TUB can be fined up to Level 3 (an amount of £1000 under the standard scale of fines for summary offences in the Criminal Justice Act 1982 section 32). Offenders under drought order restrictions are liable to a fine not exceeding the statutory maximum (which is an amount of up to £5000). Conviction on indictment renders an offender liable to a fine with no specified upper limit. This is set out in the UKWIR Code of Practice and Guidance on Water Use Restrictions 2013, which Bristol Water signed up to. However, it does acknowledge that in practice it is likely to be much more effective to encourage a sense of community engagement by communicating clearly, directly with customers, and also indirectly with user groups and representative bodies. We could include some details around potential fines within our non-technical summary of the drought plan based on the customer feedback received requesting an understanding of this information.	26/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
519	Drought Plan	Email	Why were mechanical car washes only being turned off quite late in the process? Particularly as the banning of individuals cleaning of their own cars seems quite early in the process. What are BW's intentions on changing this?	Deputy Chair	BW	Due to the economic effects of restricting mechanical vehicle washes (and a number of the other categories listed under the Non-essential use ban drought order), it is considered best practice to implement TUBS in advance of applying for a drought order to restrict non-essential use. This is set out in the UKWIR Code of Practice and Guidance on Water Use Restrictions 2013 with the phased approach being set out in Table 2A of this document. Under TUBS restrictions, individuals are still allowed to clean their cars with a bucket and sponge (just not use a hosepipe to do so). Following customer feedback, Environment Agency feedback and testing our drought plan via a drought exercise, we have moved all the restrictions associated with non-essential use ban drought order into drought management zone 5 (restricting operating a mechanical vehicle washer was previously proposed to be implemented in drought management zone 6). Therefore these restrictions will now be implemented earlier in the drought management process.	26/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
520	Drought Plan	Email	There were several comments about water conservation being a continuous process and should be being undertaken by all. What intentions does BW have to draw customers attention to the need to reduce their water footprint in a changing climate?	Deputy Chair	BW	In table 16 of our drought plan we set out that we will implement an ongoing water efficiency campaign to maintain the water efficiency culture developed during the drought. As set out on page 19 of our drought plan statement of response, the feedback received from customers will also be used to influence the ongoing development of water resource options to support the update of our water resource management plan (WRMP1), specifically with regard to the use of water efficiency campaigns.	26/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
521	Drought Plan	Email	As an increasing number of BW's customers now work from home, why should businesses have less restrictions than households? What are BW's intentions regarding ensuring equality of drought restrictions across its customers base [except for vulnerable persons]?	Deputy Chair	BW	This is very similar to challenge #519 in terms that the restrictions on businesses will have a financial/economic implication for those businesses, whereas this is not commonly the case for customers that work from home. If it is the case, there is a process by which customers can apply for 'discretionary concessional exceptions' to the TUBS restriction via the representation process if they feel they have a justified case. The process for this is set out in our draft Drought Plan on p46 and 47 and is in line with the UKWIR Code of Practice and Guidance for Water Companies on Water Use Restrictions (2013).	26/07/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
522	BW Performance	Email	With respect to the new methodology, I gather that water companies are being asked to retrospectively submit figures and that, due to the change in calculations, the revised figures are likely to be inaccurate and worse than previously reported. In the following year, the figures are likely to improve as the right measurements will be in place for the new system. Hence, the worse of the blip is likely to be short-term, although still greater than the current method of calculating leakage. Can you please update me on the position within Bristol Water and the impact that will be made on the company's leakage returns. If this does affect Bristol Water adversely, can you please let me know how and when you plan to communicate this to customers.	Chair	BW	In summary we are still awaiting approval of the shadow figures so there is a possibility it could change but our current calculations show our shadow figure for 16/17 would be 49.1 MI/d up from 46.42 MI/d. This is mainly caused by following the night flow period component requirements, which has moved from using the 50th percentile night flow to the arithmetic mean of all readings between 2am and 4am. Other aspects of the calculation largely remain consistent. Our understanding is that our changes are of a much lower magnitude compared to others but we will need to wait and see. Ultimately the level of leakage has not changed and this methodology change will be explained through the basket of changes in the PR process as it will be a shadow measure for this AMP.	15/08/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
523	PR19 Methodology	Email	As a result of the Ofwat draft methodology there is a requirement for a dialogues between BW and the Panel on: Performance Commitments to be supported by long term ambitions [p51 and 62]	Deputy Chair	BW	Final methodology now available. This challenge was cleared by the data presented at the ODI meeting on 26 February 2018	26/02/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
524	PR19 Methodology	Email	As a result of the Ofwat draft methodology there is a requirement for a dialogues between BW and the Panel on: 2. Common PCs – what changes do BW have to make to comply with the given definitions? [p56]	Deputy Chair	BW	Final methodology now available. This challenge was cleared by the data presented at the ODI meeting on 26 February 2018	26/02/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
525	PR19 Methodology	Email	As a result of the Ofwat draft methodology there is a requirement for a dialogues between BW and the Panel on: BW forecasts of PC service levels for 2019/20 [p65]	Deputy Chair	BW	The 7 June ODI sub group meeting was presented with BW forecasts of all PCs. This challenge to be cleared with no changes.	07/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
526	PR19 Methodology	Email	As a result of the Ofwat draft methodology there is a requirement for a dialogues between BW and the Panel on: Water Developer Performance results to be added to the industry comparative data table that you demonstrated to the Panel in May 2017 [p86]	Deputy Chair	BW	Final methodology now available. This challenge was cleared by the data presented at the ODI meeting on 26 February 2018	26/02/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
527	PR19 Methodology	Email	As a result of the Ofwat draft methodology there is a requirement for a dialogues between BW and the Panel on: DWI Compliance Risk Index definition and how it affects BW [App 2 p10]. As the CRI is in both the Draft and Final documents, the challenge still stands.	Deputy Chair	BW	The DWI definition for CRI has now been circulated and has no problems for customers. This challenge can be cleared.	18/04/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
528	PR19 Methodology	Email	As a result of the Ofwat draft methodology there is a requirement for a dialogues between BW and the Panel on: Long list Asset health PC and BW performance [App 2 p26 Table 2.4]	Deputy Chair	BW	Final methodology now available. This challenge was cleared by the data presented at the ODI meeting on 26 February 2018	26/02/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
529	PR19 Methodology	Email	As a result of the Ofwat draft methodology there is a requirement for a dialogues between BW and the Panel on: New AIM definition and does it now mean BW have some sites to consider? [App 2 p33]. BW do not have any AIM sites but Ofwat require them to have a similar PC which needs to be discussed with the CCG.	Deputy Chair	BW	This challenge was covered by the discussions at the 2 PC and ODI sub Groups held recently.	18/04/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
530	PR19 Methodology	Email	As a result of the Ofwat draft methodology there is a requirement for a dialogues between BW and the Panel on: Independent assurance of data sources for Cost Benefit Analysis [App 2 p44]. I would also add assurance on how BW use the CBA results.	Deputy Chair	BW	At the 7 June PC and ODI sub group, BW explained that external assurance had been obtained where appropriate. This challenge to be cleared with no changes	07/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
531	PR19 Methodology	Email	As a result of the Ofwat draft methodology there is a requirement for a dialogues between BW and the Panel on: Data on marginal costs to be explained CCG [App 2 p46]	Deputy Chair	BW	BW will cover this as part of our discussions on ODI calculations. At the 7 June PC and ODI sub group BW provided marginal costs where appropriate. Challenge to be cleared with no changes.	07/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
532	PR19 Methodology	Email	As a result of the Ofwat draft methodology there is a requirement for a dialogues between BW and the Panel on: BW to provide update on current performance as demonstrated in May 2017 and how this converts to the new Common PCs [App 3].	Deputy Chair	BW	Final methodology now available. This challenge was cleared by the data presented at the ODI meeting on 26 February 2018	26/02/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
533	PR19 Methodology	Email	As a result of the Ofwat draft methodology there is a requirement for a dialogues between BW and the Panel on: How many Business Plans are BW doing and how many do the Panel need to review? Particularly interested in who is reviewing the BP for the new retail market. [C6]	Deputy Chair	BW	There are 3 plans (price controls) which are applicable to us (Water resources, Network+ and Retail Household), Retail Non-household not being applicable as we have exited this part of our licence to water2business. We will (try to!) present the material as one plan in order to a/make it holistic from a customer perspective and b/make life simpler for the Panel. Our understanding is the panel would just provide one report to cover all scope in the business plan.	31/08/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
534	PR19 Methodology	Email	As a result of the Ofwat draft methodology there is a requirement for a dialogues between BW and the Panel on: Does BW have any projects to come under the Direct Procurement now that Ofwat seem to have reduced the cost level to £55m to £85m? [C 7]	Deputy Chair	BW	Our current working assumption is 'not applicable' however we have not completed analysis of all proposed schemes but we are aware of the framework we would need to apply.	31/08/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
535	Customer Engagement	Email	KH queried where BW sits in relation to other companies with regard to customer contacts, GW stated that BW is below ODI target. Comparative data to be circulated to Panel	Deputy Chair	BW	The recent PC and ODI sub group meetings demonstrated that comparative information is being used to assist target setting.	18/04/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
536	Customer Engagement	Email	?? stated that links between technical and customer engagement areas of BW don't yet appear to be fully joined-up at Challenge Panel meetings. ?? agreed to bring customer engagement section of the Engagement Plan on Environment matters to September's Tripartite meeting.	Deputy Chair	BW	This is now a way of working.	10/01/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
537	Customer Engagement	CESG 22 Sept 2017	The Chair said that any research has some value but that any weaknesses in the results need to be recognised and the results used accordingly.	Chair	BW	BW agreed there will be a need to absolutely clear on the assumptions it makes.	22/09/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
538	Triangulation	CESG 22 Sept 2017	The Deputy Chair said that the BWCP will require more detail on what BW does with the results and the associated justification.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW agreed and will provide this once a decision has been taken on if and how the results are to be used.	22/09/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
539	Triangulation	CESG 22 Sept 2017	The Report Writer noted the difference in results between households and non-households.	Report Writer	BW	BW replied that this probably reflected a different view of the risk of supply interruption.	22/09/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
540	Customer Engagement	CESG 22 Sept 2017	The Deputy Chair asked whether the profile of customers used in the study matched the overall customer base.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW replied that the sample was representative	22/09/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
541	Drought Plan	CESG 22 Sept 2017	The Deputy Chair noted that one of the consequences of a prolonged drought would be that customers would be asked to work from home. This exacerbates the supply problems for domestic customers. The Deputy Chair asked BW to consider this impact in more detail.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW will do this but NERA added that this is associated more with the Drought Plan rather than the valuation exercise.	22/09/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
542	Customer Engagement	CESG 22 Sept 2017	The Chair asked how robust the resulting data are.	Chair	BW	BW replied that some 300 customers had used the tool. Their profile was not equally spread across the various segments so the results have been weighted to match the average customer base	22/09/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
543	Triangulation	CESG 22 Sept 2017	The Deputy Chair asked which WTP values will be taken forward to the triangulation exercise.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW replied that the results from the model that does not look at differences before and after the event will be used	22/09/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
544	Triangulation	CESG 22 Sept 2017	The Report Writer stressed the need for clear documentation of the triangulation methodology and the assumptions made to ensure consistency and repeatability. The Deputy Chair supported this view.	Report Writer	BW	BW agreed this is very important, particularly to enable the Panel to review the work done and the results.	22/09/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
545	Customer Engagement	CESG 22 Sept 2017	NSC asked if there was any geographical segmentation of the valuation results, eg by urban or rural respondents. The Chair also agreed this was important.	NSC	BW	BW said there wasn't any such segmentation but will look at this.	22/09/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
546	Triangulation	CESG 22 Sept 2017	The Deputy Chair added that it will be important to understand which valuation and triangulation methods have been applied to each attribute.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW replied that this will become clear at the end of the triangulation process and will ensure the Panel is made aware of this.	22/09/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
547	Triangulation	CESG 22 Sept 2017	The Chair said the Panel will need to know that the triangulation methodology is comparable and compatible with Ofwat, CCWater and others' guidelines and expectations.	Chair	BW	NERA said it is, especially with Ofwat's guidance and that a systematic judgement approach combined with CBA is being adopted	22/09/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
548	Triangulation	CESG 22 Sept 2017	The Chair said the Panel needs to understand where the research methods used have strengths and weaknesses and whether the principles of triangulation are consistent with Ofwat and CCWater's expectations. It also requires: Two more worked up examples (one supply side and one demand side) and More information on the relevance to customer segmentation including rural/urban and high/low water usage.	Chair	BW	Provided in the Triangulation methodology	22/09/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
549	Vulnerability	CESG 19 Oct 2017	The Chair enquired about the segmentation of the participants used in the vulnerability research and whether there was any skew.	Chair	BW	BM replied that participants were selected on the basis of vulnerability risk factors rather than demographics. BW agreed to 'retrofit' the profiles of participants into the company's customer segments adopted in other research so comparisons could be made.	24/04/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
550	Vulnerability	CESG 19 Oct 2017	The Deputy Chair wondered whether this distinction should have been considered in other research.	Deputy Chair	BW	BM added that bill payers often answer research questions with their households in mind	19/10/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
551	Vulnerability	CESG 19 Oct 2017	The Deputy Chair asked why there is a low understanding of BW amongst certain groups, eg the Centre for the Deaf and the Eye Clinic (social services).	Deputy Chair	BW	BW replied that in most cases it is because the company doesn't have a relationship with these groups but the company recognises there are opportunities to improve this in future.	19/10/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
552	Vulnerability	CESG 19 Oct 2017	The Chair asked if BW or BM consider that the vulnerability research has missed a particular customer sector and whether there may be still a hidden vulnerable group.	Chair	BW	BM replied that rural customers and rural poverty haven't been included because these are difficult groups to reach as there are often fewer social structures in place.	19/10/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
553	Vulnerability	CESG 19 Oct 2017	The Deputy Chair noted that people may not consider themselves to be vulnerable even though they are and he asked how the research had dealt with this. NSC added that customers that don't ask are often the most in need.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW replied that the research has been guided by the definition of vulnerability rather than the perception of it.	19/10/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
554	Vulnerability	CESG 19 Oct 2017	BM outlined some common themes that emerged from the research such as financial worries, negative attitudes towards organisations, mental health issues, the importance of informal networks, getting help and support and resilience to crises over time. The Chair agreed these are important issues and that organisations should adopt behaviours that help people who are experiencing them.	Chair	BW	BW agreed that more empowerment of staff to make decisions to help such people may be required.	19/10/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
555	Vulnerability	CESG 19 Oct 2017	The vulnerable customer research outlined the difference between a claimant, a customer and a client and suggested the relationship of vulnerable customers with Bristol Water is uncertain. The Chair noted that this is an important slide. The Deputy Chair asked what relationship does BW want to have and how can it achieve it?	Deputy Chair	BW	BW replied that the answer will mean different things to different people as some see themselves as customers, some as clients.	19/10/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
556	Strategy	CESG 19 Oct 2017	The Deputy Chair asked why just the BW executives are being asked to contribute to the stakeholder workshops and not all staff.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW accepted this to be a fair challenge and will consider extending the workshop to more staff.	19/10/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
557	Triangulation	CESG 31 Oct 2017	The Deputy Chair said he was comfortable with BW's other research methodologies (with the exception of MaxDiff) as they were tried and tested. He considers the triangulation methodology should be peer reviewed as it's new. The Chair agreed and added that the innovation around the triangulation was welcomed but that the Panel would like BW to commission an external review and report on the triangulation methodology.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW noted this request and said it will seek internal approval for a peer review to be undertaken. BW response: We have not yet put forward a proposal to the steering group on this, as we wanted to get internal sign off first. The request from the CCG was for us to commission a third party to review the triangulation report, this has not been budgeted for as yet and so will be a question for the PR19 programme as to whether it is worth resourcing. There is a halfway house suggestion that Richard and I each ask someone in our organisation who has not been involved in the process to provide a review, although this of course is less independent. We'll pick this up and get a proposal put forward asap. We have not commissioned a 3rd party review of the triangulation report but instead we have commissioned sensitivity testing with Nera and DbyD, as per the email correspondence with the CCG. The CCG have received the methodology for this and updates are provided in the customer sub-groups. Results will be shared with the panel when available. The 'Acceptability Testing Survey Report' contains the results of the NERA and Traverse work. It provides a single 'Expected Willingness to Pay' value for each of the attributes BW need for its Cost Benefit Analysis work. The confidence level for each attribute values is also high. This clears this challenge with changes.	22/06/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
558	Triangulation	CESG 31 Oct 2017	The Chair said that customer insights from the qualitative research are valuable and their use should be included in the triangulation methodology. The principles need to be labelled and referenced together with the insights derived from them and any boundaries they may create. This, plus the following points need to be written into the methodology: Increasing the robustness of the exclusion of outlier data points; Clearer rationale for choosing deliberative valuations for the leakage triangulation; More evidence to justify the outcome of the leakage triangulation.	Chair	BW	DbD agreed that the methodology should be extended to include these.	31/10/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
559	Triangulation	CESG 31 Oct 2017	The Deputy Chair said that there also needs to be linkage of triangulation results back to the original research reports and that consistent nomenclature was also required.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW agreed.	31/10/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
560	Triangulation	CESG 31 Oct 2017	More explanation of the running of high or low sensitivity tests should be given.	Chair	BW	BW response: As the CBA hasn't happened yet I don't think we can provide much more information at this point. We can put it on the agenda for a future sub-group to have the regs team talk through the process. The 'Acceptability Testing Survey Report' contains the results of the NERA and Traverse work. It provides a single 'Expected Willingness to Pay' value for each of the attributes BW need for its Cost Benefit Analysis work. The confidence level for each attribute values is also high. This clears this challenge with changes.	22/06/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
561	Triangulation	CESG 31 Oct 2017	BW's PR14 valuations had been discounted for non-domestic rota cuts but had been included in the leakage triangulation. Greater explanation of the logic and justification for this needs to be included in the triangulation report.	Chair	BW	BW response: As per the methodology chart on page 9 we exclude valuations which are outliers with no methodological explanation. The PR14 valuation is an outlier for both rota cuts and leakage, but in the case of leakage there is a methodological rationale, described in the table on page 28.	10/01/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
562	Triangulation	Email	What happens if the Challenge Panel disagrees with the view of BW or experts regarding conclusions arrived at, sets of result values or triangulation methods, etc	Chair	Panel	If there is disagreement with the views of company's experts then the following actions should be taken: Ask the company to undertake an independent peer view of its work and let the Panel know the outcome; If the company chooses not to do this or if the Panel disagrees with the peer reviewer's findings then the Panel should set out its views in its report to Ofwat explaining the challenges it has posed to the company, its capability to challenge, the engagement it has had with the company on the issue, the evidence it has to support its position and the materiality of the issue.	16/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
563	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 9	MDC asked if BW has mapped pipes that are at risk of bursting through old age or poor ground conditions. MDC cited the example of a big burst in Glastonbury last year.	MDC	BW	BW said it has such information and that its pipe rehabilitation programme is risk based. Its Southern Resilience Scheme will be completed next summer and will further increase network resilience.	24/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
564	BW Performance	Challenge Panel 9	EA asked how much water was lost during the Willsbridge burst and the impact on leakage as this information was missing from the case study presented to the Panel.	EA	BW	BW established later in the meeting that some 7 Ml of water was lost. It will update the case study accordingly and also mention this in its mid year performance report	24/11/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
565	Tariffs	Challenge Panel 9	The Deputy Chair asked whether BW was likely to face a large revenue correction at the end of the five-year period. BW replied this was unlikely, as inflation will come into play. The Deputy Chair noted that cumulative revenue correction would be a useful addition to the company's tariff presentations.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW suggested that a predicted correction would be perhaps more helpful and agreed to do this in future.	24/11/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
566	Triangulation	Challenge Panel 9	The Deputy Chair reported that the sub-group was happy with the comprehensive triangulation process but he had made some comments to BW by email on the presentation and the quality of the results (as expressed through confidence levels). Concern had been raised that many of the triangulation results had been assigned a low confidence level and BW was asked how it considers this will affect the use of the triangulation results. The Deputy Chair said that he would like to see the outcome as soon as it is available	Deputy Chair	BW	As a way forward BW said the results will be put into the company's optimiser and sensitivity testing will be undertaken. It is unable to assess the materiality of any issues at this point in time.	24/11/2017	Acknowledged. Changes made.
567	Customer Engagement	Challenge Panel 9	EA said that it considered that BW had done a comprehensive job on its customer research to date but wondered to what end. At some point the company will need to set out how particular research results influence future bills and the extent of this influence.	EA	BW	BW agreed and said that it intends to document this in its strategy (both short and long term) and it plans to present this to the Panel in January	24/11/2017	Acknowledged. No change required.
568	Water Resources	Challenge Panel 9	The Deputy Chair noted the WRMP lacks a 'golden thread' linking customer views and priorities with decisions on water resource schemes. The Panel will need to understand this linkage. BW said that its modelling has done this. The Deputy Chair requested the methodology or explanation from BW together with an example to illustrate its use	Deputy Chair	BW	Closed with publication of WRMP. Golden thread reflected in Bristol Water Clearly and Draft Business Plan as well as WRMP. "Community and Environmental Resilience" focus on leakage and water efficiency, not Cheddar 2 is the thread	29/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
569	Triangulation	CESG 8 Jan 2018	The Chair said the Panel required clarity on the choice of one WTP value over another for each service attribute to be able to assess the robustness of the methodology. The deputy Chair added that the triangulation report needs improvement in this respect.	Chair	BW	BW agreed. NERA Acceptability test results now available on fts and it clears the queries raised in the challenge. No changes.	10/07/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
570	Information Assurance	CESG 8 Jan 2018	The Report Writer asked about the company's assurance regime, particularly covering the bridge between the engagement results and the performance commitments and investment cases. The Chair added clear evidence and examples will be needed of where the customer has influenced or impacted the investment cases. BW said this is a specific part of the assurance regime.	Report Writer	BW	BW agreed to share the assurance regime with the Panel. The recent meeting where the Assurance Plan for PR19 was discussed has cleared this challenge.	18/04/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
571	Customer Engagement	CESG 8 Jan 2018	The Chair asked why the financing research had been performed in addition to the 'agreed' engagement strategy.	Chair	BW	BW replied that financing is critical to the company and it is mindful of the outcomes from the PR14 CMA process.	08/01/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
572	Customer Engagement	CESG 8 Jan 2018	Online panel (with a cash prize £200 for participants). The Chair challenged this saying the incentive may influence the type of respondent. An alternative may be to give away water saving devices for all who participate. The Chair also said that if BW keeps asking the questions it's always asked it'll never find out what the customer really thinks or in which direction they've moved.	Chair	BW	BW agreed to consider this. Due to a drop off in responses we have refreshed our online panel. WE now have 2,542 panel members made up of roughly 1,600 new members and roughly 900 re-joins. While providing water efficiency devices is a good suggestion, many of the devices available are not applicable to all customers due to different fixtures and fitting as well as property types. A lot of respondent comments in the previous panels said that we should increase the prize draw to offer two prizes so we have taken on board the customer feedback. This looks like it has had a positive response as the most recent panel received 1524 responses. The panel is broadly representative of our customer base.	24/04/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
573	Customer Engagement	CESG 8 Jan 2018	The Chair asked if Wessex will influence BW's A&V action plan and vice versa. Can the Board of one company affect the policy of the other? This would appear to be strategic issue. For example, what if customers of BW wish to help vulnerable customers and Wessex's less so.	Chair	BW	BW replied that customers of both companies pay their bills to Pelican. The research has been undertaken jointly but ultimately each Board might adopt different strategies.	08/01/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
574	ODI	ODI/PC 8 Jan 2018	A number of points and actions were raised by the sub-group at this meeting which BW are asked to consider and act upon whilst developing its PC and ODIs. The sub-group requests sight of the more-developed PCs and ODIs by the end of February so it has the opportunity to comment on them before they are finalised in March.	Chair	BW	Final methodology now available. This challenge was cleared by the data presented at the ODI meeting on 26 February 2018	26/02/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
575	Tariffs	Email	Bad Debt implications of BW's 7,000 Voids and the implications of current charging proposals as in email.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW response; You are right in your summary that Ofwat are concerned that void levels could mask the true level of bad debt and therefore needs to be understood and compared 'in the round' with the link to Affordability and deprivation. Bristol Water have responded. Please see Voids – Benchmarking and Proposals in the 'Documents' folder on the FTS. Now read and it clears the challenge.	24/04/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
576	ODI	Challenge Panel 10	NE remarked that the devil is in the detail with regard to the PCs and there will be a need to have appropriate metrics associated with them, for example on Biodiversity. NE is keen that BW is only rewarded for over performance.	NE	BW	BW acknowledges this and recognises that Ofwat want ODIs to be challenging. The 7 June PC and ODI subgroup made clear the Panels aim of seeking stretching incentives; BW accepted this position. Challenge cleared with no changes	07/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
577	Information Assurance	Challenge Panel 10	The Report Writer suggested there is an apparent lack of independent challenge (as the BWCP seemed to be the only source of this). BW replied that the engagement framework and PR19 process is being assured by PwC. The Report Writer suggested that the Panel should be made aware of PwC's role in more detail and have the opportunity to have contact with them to hear their findings and the evidence they have that customers' views, preferences and priorities have adequately and appropriately informed the Plan. The Chair added that PwC should also assure the Panel that that BW is on track against each of the nine assessment areas identified by Ofwat in its proforma. A RAG rating would be sufficient.	Report Writer	BW	BW agreed to go away and think about how the link can be demonstrated and how the Panel might be briefed by PwC. The Panel received an update on the work by PwC on 26 February 2018 and again on 9 August 2018. At 9 August meeting it was accepted that this challenge would not be cleared until after the acceptance by BW Board of the PwC final report which is not expected until 24 August. On the 24 August the BW Board received an update from PwC part of which confirmed: PwC report on financial data table assurance, please note the following comments from our Data Table Assurance Partner, 'PwC 'I can confirm we have closed out all the queries for App26': 'PwC 'I've confirmed with ' and ' that we have enough (evidence) now to mark these issues as closed.' PwC will issue a final report shortly. PwC has confirmed that the open actions identified in report '4c. Bristol Water August Board Report final draft' as circulated in the Final Board pack are now closed. 'PwC 'I can confirm that based on this, and the review ' has been doing around the Board statements evidence tracker, I believe the 2 items we flagged as "in progress" in our August Board report should be ready to move to "closed".'	30/08/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
578	Information Assurance	Challenge Panel 10	EA said it wishes to see more clarity particularly on the relationship between Ofwat's annual performance assessment ('Prescribed') and the proposed business plan assurance regime.	EA	BW	BW said its Draft Assurance Plan for 2018/19 will highlight this link. The Assurance plan for 2018/19 has now been issued, so this challenge is cleared.	18/04/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
579	Strategy	Challenge Panel 10	The Panel made numerous suggestions on how the long term strategy document could be improved; see meeting notes for details.	Chair	BW	BW thanked the Panel for its helpful feedback on its draft strategy. The company will consider and act upon the points raised (as detailed above) as it further develops its strategy and it will present its updated document before the next Panel meeting in April. Final methodology now available. This challenge was cleared by the data presented at the ODI meeting on 26 February 2018	26/02/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
580	ODI	PC, ODI and Assurance sub group	The Deputy Chair asked if the three proposed outcomes have been tested with customers. BW said not yet. The Chair said that it would be best to include the fourth outcome of Corporate and Financial Leadership as well or present the existing three as the 'Proposed Ofwat Outcome'.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW agreed the latter would be best. BW have included the fourth outcome and shared with customers as it is in both Bristol Water Clearly and the Draft Business Plan. Challenge cleared with changes	20/06/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
581	ODI	PC, ODI and Assurance sub group	NE suggested that 'Local Community Resilience' should be retitled 'Local Environment and Community Resilience'.	NE	BW	BW agreed and will present this change for internal approval. This change was made for the BW Draft Business Plan, see page 17, so this can be closed with changes.	15/06/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
582	ODI	PC, ODI and Assurance sub group	The Report Writer noted that BW's presentation of the linkage between the results of the customer research and the proposed PR19 PCs was very useful but that some indication of the strength of the linkage would also be helpful. The Chair added the Panel will need a qualitative assessment of high and low priorities for customers.	Report Writer	BW	BW said it will articulate this once the triangulation exercise is complete. BW state that this is captured in the Delivering Outcomes for Customers Paper which shows the different strengths of research and how it has linked to the PC development. Challenge completed with changes.	20/06/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
583	ODI	Email	Regarding customers, I note that you intend explain the changes in your leakage performance to your customers in your APR commentary; would you consider explaining all the proposed changes in the same way?	Deputy Chair	BW	You make a good point, we highlighted the explanation of leakage in the APR commentary as it is of particular importance as to the impact on Ofwat. Where there are other changes that are worthy of comment (SIM, Biodiversity etc, but not unplanned interruptions), then we would include the text in the commentary. Report now published and our Annual report updated.	05/03/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
584	Vulnerability	CESG 7 March 2018	The Chair noted that customers' ability to choose a channel of communication with the company will depend on the data BW has collected and BW was asked if it has plans to link in data and intelligence on network performance.	Chair	BW	BW replied that improved network intelligence is part of its asset management strategy but the thinking on linking this to customer data is at an early stage. In house leak monitors would be a useful technological development in the longer term.	07/03/2018	Acknowledged. No action before Ofwat report
585	Vulnerability	CESG 7 March 2018	The Report Writer asked how the proposed strategy informs the PC associated with vulnerability. BW replied that the percentage of customers on the Priority Services Register will be a KPI but that the vulnerability PC will be wider than this. CCWater asked if the PC will include the satisfaction of people on the register.	Report Writer	BW	BW said they are considering this. This can be seen in the draft vulnerability and affordability strategy. Report read and confirmed the vulnerability strategy contains the required direction.	29/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
586	Environment	Email	We are becoming aware of a concern with BW eel screening on the River Axe; it appears that the work would have no effect due to the downstream tidal sluice at Brean Down having a detrimental effect on the eel population – only one eel being found when last monitored. My concern on behalf of customers is that it appears BW is about to carryout work at customer expense which will have no effect on the postulated problem due to the sluice. Would not the money be better spent on other work that would benefit the eels and/or the customer?	Deputy Chair	BW	These points were discussed at the Environmental Tripartite meeting on 7 June 2018 and it became clear that BW also held the view that no work should proceed on eel screening until the problem at the Brean Down tidal sluice is resolved and an EA exemption received.	07/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
587	Environment	Email	In the Atkins report on the audit of the draft WRMP, I have noted there are 3 Ambers under the Methodology heading and 2 Ambers under the Data heading, ie 5 Ambers in total, 20% of the areas audited are in the Amber classification. Atkins state that '...much of the data were not finalised at the time of the audit'. The report mentions that the SELL has dropped in comparison to PR14 and draws attention to the '...very low incremental costs...for leakage control...'. The report also mentions the continued use of 1976 data in 2 areas, one of which has lead to an increase in the headroom allowance for groundwater as an interim measure. It is not clear if this increased headroom has any effect on BW plans and thus costs that the customer would bear. Clarification of the concerns in the Atkins audit report on the draft WRMP is needed to ensure the customer is receiving value for money.	Deputy Chair	BW	The Environmental Tripartite meeting on 7 June 2018 discussed these points and BW gave assurances that Atkins had been asked to audit the subsequent BW work and that BW expected all the Ambers to become Green such that they would receive a clear assurance report.	07/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
588	Information Assurance	Email	BW should always be striving to reduce the risk level of all its data items, thus I would request that BW include a section that sets out what BW is doing to achieve this reduction in risk level for each item	Deputy Chair	BW	We have included additional information that helps to explain (potentially) where some of the data items could be improved in future years. However, for some areas the risk will always be present and is difficult to reduce due to the complexity and impact of some data items, so what we have to increase is our mitigation and control framework. We have tried to do this for our 2017/18 plan and will continue to look for ways to strengthen this.	10/04/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
589	Customer Engagement	Email	Two questions were asked at the start and again at the end of the workshop; cost of finance and level of profit. The former made it into the 'Headline findings' but level of profit did not, even though the percentage who thought it was too high increased to over 50% at the end of the workshop. This seems a significant result, what actions are BW intending to take to implement the views of their customers.	Deputy Chair	BW	Probably best if we consider this as a challenge and respond in that way. Profit does not feature in the plan, thus not required before the Ofwat report.	06/08/2018	Acknowledged. No action before Ofwat report
590	Research Results	CESG 20 April 2018	The Deputy Chair noted that the material being used for acceptability testing has suggested levels for service targets and he wondered if these are now fixed as some do not appear to be stretching, eg the Biodiversity Index improvement is less than 1%.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW considers this target is stretching but accepts it has further work to do to demonstrate this to the Panel. Document C3 contains an extensive explanation on pages 257 to 260 of why the current increase in target of one BI point per year is stretching; this is accepted. Challenge cleared with no changes.	20/04/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
591	Business Plan	CESG 20 April 2018	The Deputy Chair noted that BW's plans seem to increase bills in all three improvement plans presented in the draft Plan.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW replied that forecast efficiency improvements will result in lower bills in two cases (before inflation effects).	20/04/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
592	Business Plan	CESG 20 April 2018	The Report Writer enquired where the innovation is in the mass communication plan.	Report Writer	BW	BW said initiatives such as Social Media Champions, the Crowd Source Platform. Go Social Jam, the Monthly Community Fund and the Tap Challenge are all innovative for the water sector.	20/04/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
593	Business Plan	CESG 20 April 2018	The Deputy Chair asked how BW is going to capture the outcomes from the mass participation communication plan. The Report Writer added that the mass communication plan was not necessarily a robust engagement process.	Report Writer	BW	BW agreed, but that the results will have value and will be gathered, analysed and used as anecdotal evidence in the final Plan. Cleared with no changes.	20/04/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
594	ODI	Challenge Panel 11	EA said it would not be happy if the incentive associated WTW Waste Disposal Compliance PC was reputational only. Such compliance is a statutory requirement and should be penalty only.	EA	BW	BW replied that Ofwat had indicated that the incentive should be reputation-based but it appreciates EA's position. It will look at again at this PC. At the 7 June PC and ODI sub group BW confirmed that this PC incentive would be penalty only.	07/06/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
595	ODI	Challenge Panel 11	MDC mentioned BW's recent prosecution regarding traffic disruption in Somerset.	MDC	BW	BW replied it is not proposing a specific commitment associated with traffic disruption but there may be scope for including it in local community satisfaction. BW have not accepted it into the current local community satisfaction list of topics.	15/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
596	Resilience	Email	Discussion required on the effect of the Ofwat 'Putting Balance Back' consultation on BW customers.	Chair	BW	Extensive update of current position as it affects BW before the consultation outcome is known. Topic discussed in depth on 17 July after the results of the Ofwat consultation became known. Challenge cleared with no changes.	18/05/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
597	ODI	PC/ODI 7 June 2018	BW presented an alternative plan for the 'Supply Interruptions' PC, a slower plan more favoured by customers. They said this is a clear example of where customers have had influence. It will be for the BW Board to decide in June which plan to adopt based on the Business Plan package as a whole. The Chair said BW will need to fully justify if it goes against customers wishes.	Chair	BW	BW agreed and will do so. C3 page 103 to 112 contains an explanation of why BW have made changes to their proposal, mainly introducing a 2tier incentive arrangement, but I am having difficulty finding the reason for not going with customer preference of the lowest cost except the Ofwat mandate. to be discussed on 2nd. BW will not be going with the alternative plan due to the Ofwat mandate. The alternative plan would have kept our target at 4.2 mins throughout the AMP; we have instead adopted the upper quartile challenge. Cleared with no changes	07/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
598	ODI	PC/ODI 7 June 2018	The Deputy Chair replied that the Panel would need to consider carefully the proposed target and deadband for the 'Mains Bursts' PC as the industry upper quartile performance is forecast to improve but the company isn't. There appears to be no long term vision for asset health. The Chair said BW should inform customers about the health of its assets and how it will be managing them.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW agreed to set out its asset management strategy to clarify and update Panel members on what is being replaced, spent and in place generally on asset management. It will also consider Including this in its Business Plan BP to ensure it's clear it has plans in place to look after and improve its mains. See p 114 - data around upper quartile perf is not robustly comparable so not aiming for UQ - The stretch in the targets has been determined using expert knowledge. As this is an asset health performance commitment, the targets have been informed by engineering expertise about what improvements can be made in the future. We have a relatively old network and a significant proportion of mains laid during the post-war period (when poorer quality materials were used), which may be contributing towards the below average performance. We have however proposed a 2024/25 target that is more challenging than that proposed in our draft Business Plan. Cleared with no changes	07/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
599	ODI	PC/ODI 7 June 2018	The Deputy Chair noted that the company's historical performance for 'Unplanned Outage' PC had been better than the proposed target of 1.72% in some years. CCWater also questioned why the forecast performance increases in 2018-19 and 2019-20.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW replied it has had benign conditions in recent years but it will look again at this when the end of year figure for this year is confirmed. C3 pages 119 to 126 contain the discussion on this concern but I cannot find anything to answer the challenge. Historical data is not that reliable as BW has not had to report it before. It is not comparable at this stage so it is hard to understand how we are challenging ourselves Have used expert knowledge to calculate data. In terms of how challenging it is, this is not an area that directly affects the customer (they are more concerned with outages that result in supply interruptions). This is also why we have not proposed any rewards for this performance commitment. Cleared with no changes.	07/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
600	ODI	PC/ODI 7 June 2018	The Deputy Chair said the Panel would prefer the alternative plan for 'Water Quality - Taste and odour' PC if there's no material customer impact.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW said it may go for the alternative in this case as this measure is less about investment, more about operations and improved customer communication to reduce contacts. It will state in its Plan how it intends to educate customers on this issue. I cannot tell from the 17 July slides nor C3 if the alternative plan has been adopted or not. Nor anything about education of customers. The alternative plan did not have dead bands, BW have gone with the original but have out performance dead bands which means BW will not get a reward if go above target until 2024 due to not aiming for UQ performance. BW have just agreed additional resource into the contact centre to focus on proactively communicating and educating customers on these types of issues via social media and the website. Cleared with no changes	07/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
601	ODI	PC/ODI 7 June 2018	The Deputy Chair questioned why the tier one penalty is greater than tier 2 for 'Water Quality - Taste and odour' PC.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW agreed to look at this again. See page 145 of C3 Tier 1 penalty is now lower than tier 2 (therefore extremely poor performance now results in a higher penalty) Challenge cleared with changes made.	07/06/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
602	ODI	PC/ODI 7 June 2018	The Deputy Chair questioned why there was no glidepath for 'Unplanned Non-Infrastructure Maintenance' PC and therefore possible inconsistency with other PCs.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW replied this is an asset health measure and no glidepaths are allowed under the Ofwat methodology. It was agreed BW should make this clear in its Plan. See p 161-167 in C3. I cannot find any reference to glidepath in C3 No glidepath is being proposed for this performance commitment. This approach aligns to Ofwat's methodology for serviceability metrics; the target has been reset for the next five-year period. The level of stretch in the targets has taken into account our historical performance. Cleared with no changes	07/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
603	ODI	PC/ODI 7 June 2018	For the 'Population at Risk from Asset Failure@ PC, the Deputy Chair asked about the proportion of the population that live in centres of 10,000 or more are at risk. BW replied around 30%. He asked about the numbers that are supplied by one source what the figure will be at the end of the 10-year period. The Chair added there is more vulnerability in rural areas.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW agreed to include narrative that provides population breakdowns See SC email dated 8 August 2018 as follows; Our target for 2030 is to improve the resilience of our water supply network so that an issue with one of our critical assets (e.g. one of our key pumping stations, service reservoirs or mains) does not affect more than 10,000 people. At the end of AMP6 (2015-20), 832,886 people (68.6% of the total population served) will be at risk of losing supply if one of the mains serving them fails and cannot be fixed within 24 hour period. Our AMP7 (2020-25) target is to provide resilience to 542,886 people (44.7% of the total population served), with the remaining 290,000 people (23.9% of the total population served) addressed in AMP8 (2025-30). Challenge cleared with no changes	07/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
604	ODI	PC/ODI 7 June 2018	The Deputy Chair asked if the proposed 'Raw Water Quality of Sources' PC target would be good enough for the environment. BW replied that other companies do not have targets. This PC is activity driven and BW considers it is doing all that it can physically and sensibly do. The Chair asked if BW had opportunities to work with partners to deliver more against this PC, in a similar way that SWW is doing on its moorlands	Deputy Chair	BW	It was agreed BW needs to provide further information and context to show its proposals are stretching and appropriate. See p 238-247 in C3 The write up shows that any delivery of phosphorus will be beneficial to the environment and page 246 lists the likely partnership extensions being sought. Challenge cleared with no changes.	07/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
605	ODI	PC/ODI 7 June 2018	For the 'Biodiversity Index' PC the Chair noted that customers are willing to pay for environmental improvements, but this can't be easily quantified. Perhaps BW can identify partners to work with to tap into external expertise? Perhaps use this as pilot with specific initiatives to follow? The Chair would like to see a PC and targets that say something like this.	Chair	BW	BW agreed to keep this PC under review and keep the Panel informed of any developments. See p 247-60 in C3. The recently issued note from Patric Bulmer indicates that bw now intend to work with various partners in carrying out this PC both in auditing and overview. Challenge now cleared with changes.	07/06/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
606	ODI	PC/ODI 7 June 2018	For the 'AIM' PC the Deputy Chair considered whether there could be any community benefit from any penalty.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW said that money will come off bills but BW are considering general reinvestment. Update from 17 July 2018 meeting: BW said that money will come off bills but BW are considering general reinvestment We are awaiting final comments from the area EA contacts. The customer benefit for this scheme is sustainable abstraction, as although this lies in the Wessex Water area and there are more abstractions in this area that are Wessex's, this is our abstraction. Local customers benefit from better abstractions downstream, and in the local environment. Customers do not see a border for the environment that aligns to water company boundaries. There are many examples of water sources outside of water company boundaries (e.g. Purton, Gloucester & Sharpness Canal, Elan Valley in Wales supplies Birmingham, Wembleball Reservoir on Exmoor that supplies South West and Wessex etc).	17/07/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
607	ODI	PC/ODI 7 June 2018	For the 'AIM' PC the benefiting catchment is in Wessex Water's supply area and not BW's.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW were asked to set out its customer benefit policy for the Panel. Update from 17 July 2018 meeting: We are awaiting final comments from the area EA contacts. The customer benefit for this scheme is sustainable abstraction, as although this lies in the Wessex Water area and there are more abstractions in this area that are Wessex's, this is our abstraction. Local customers benefit from better abstractions downstream, and in the local environment. Customers do not see a border for the environment that aligns to water company boundaries. There are many examples of water sources outside of water company boundaries (e.g. Purton, Gloucester & Sharpness Canal, Elan Valley in Wales supplies Birmingham, Wembleball Reservoir on Exmoor that supplies South West and Wessex etc).	17/07/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
608	Water Resources	Email	Discussion required on Ofwat's consultation on Water Trading and Procurement and its likely effect on customers	Deputy Chair	BW	BW noted and looked forward to the discussion, update from 17 July meeting The publication of the trading code consultation is a step required by Ofwat. We carried this out now to coincide with the timing of Ofwat's new guidance. We do not have any specific water trading plans (none are required in the Water Resource Management Plan), other than changes to the Newton Meadows arrangements with Wessex. The code only applies to new trades (i.e. Newton Meadows arrangements with Wessex as per the WRMP would not count). We can guarantee we will not claim any trading rewards following this publication for 2015-20. Future trades will depend on regional and national opportunities, but none are apparent currently. We are currently working on the "Bid Assessment Framework" which is another PR19 expectation of Ofwat's, which we will share with the panel when complete as it will provide more context for the future for trading, although we have no specific plans. We plan to consult on the BAF shortly.	17/07/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
609	Water Resources	Assurance SG 13 June 2018	NSC asked if BW would be installing a water fountain in Weston Super Mare. NSC has received lots of correspondence requesting this.	NSC	BW	BW said it would check and would do so if possible. Cleared as not required before the Ofwat report.	13/06/2018	Acknowledged. No action before Ofwat report
610	ODI	Assurance SG 13 June 2018	For the 'H2: Raw water quality of sources' PC, the EA said that BW needs to identify the work it is planning to do in AMP7.	EA	BW	BW said it will be set out on the Business Plan. NE is satisfied that there is no risk of double counting now due to the changes made by EA to the WINEP. Challenge cleared with changes.	13/06/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
611	ODI	Assurance SG 13 June 2018	The Report Writer challenged why the forecast data for '11: Water Poverty' PC shows a significant increase.	Report Writer	BW	BW replied this was in anticipation of Universal Credit being introduced in Bristol this year. It considers the forecast may be conservative however. Not now required before the Ofwat report	13/06/2018	Acknowledged. No action before Ofwat report
612	ODI	Email	After email discussions between the EA and NE there seem to be 3 concerns with the 'Biodiversity Index' PC. These are that there should not be any overlap between the BW work included in the BI PC and what is in the Biodiversity Action Plan line in WINEP; the level of ambition in setting the target and the amount of stretching in setting the incentive levels; and finally on a first calculation the rate of reward seems to be inappropriately high.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW believe these concerns have been addressed through correspondence, they will make sure there is a succinct summary of the response for the challenge log. There was an error with the incentive by a factor of 10. This challenged caused BW to review and this has been amended. See slides 17.7.18 Level of ambition - 200 point improvement based on looking at a site and seeing what can be improved if you didn't have any constraints at the site. Although the improvement e.g. hedge laying can take 1 day it takes 3 years to plan due to constraints to overcome. these 3 points of the BI PC have been cleared and thus this challenge but through discussion several more challenges were raised. Cleared with changes	17/07/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
613	ODI	Email	After email discussions between the EA and NE there seem to be 3 concerns with the 'Raw Water Quality of Sources' PC. These are that there should not be any overlap between the BW work included in this PC and what is in the WINEP; the level of ambition in setting the target and the amount of stretching in setting the incentive levels; and finally on a first calculation the rate of reward seems to be inappropriately high.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW believe these concerns have been addressed through correspondence, they will make sure there is a succinct summary of the response for the challenge log. These 3 points on the Raw Water Quality PC were cleared by an email from NE after discussions with BW and EA. Cleared with changes	17/07/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
614	Research Results	CESG 26 June 2018	Customer consultations options - The Deputy Chair said that it is not possible to understand where the preference percentages have come from. They don't tie up with the two Traverse reports he has read. BW replied that the figures have come from other research as well, eg the online panel. The Chair said a note should be added explaining the source of the figures.	Chair	BW	BW agreed to address this. As per our conversation, the final consultation results which outline the overall preferences for each plan from all of the individual research pieces (as per slide 5 of CCG subgroup presentation 26th June) were calculated by looking at all the individual responses and taking an average of them all rather than applying a weighting to the different research pieces. This clears this challenge with no changes.	26/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
615	Research Results	CESG 26 June 2018	The Chair asked how the suggested plan contributes to resilience, asset health, etc. BW needs to be clear that when it departs from customer preferences it needs to articulate clearly why it is doing this and why customers will get a better service.	Chair	BW	BW agreed this has to be made clear in the Plan. There are 11 of the 26 PCs that have been directly surveyed with customers of these there are 6 PCs where the customers have indicated that they would prefer a slower improvement than BW are showing with their 'suggested' plan; the main reason being to receive a lower bill than the 'suggested' plan would entail. BW have challenged themselves and are now providing the 'suggested' plan at a lower expected bill profile to go some way towards fulfilling their customers expectations. This process is limited in the extent that some PCs could be at a slower increase as they are linked to other PCs that the customer wishes to see proceed at the 'suggested' rate. BW have then prioritised 3 PCs (leakage, customer experience and affordability) which the customers have indicated are important for further improvement but at the same cost as the whole package. BW to provide an update in the near future. BW have inserted an update of how their Board have responded to this challenge in several places in their Business Plan section A1. Section 'A plan driven by our Board' is probably the best.	30/08/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
616	Research Results	CESG 26 June 2018	Vulnerability Assistance – The Chair said that the slide needs to show how many people were consulted together with the source of the results shown.	Chair	BW	BW agreed to do this. The slide has already been sent out to the group but the data is sourced from the online panel (1,233 customers) and the representative survey (1,000). This clears the challenge with no changes	26/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
617	Research Results	CESG 26 June 2018	The Chair asked about the relationship between multi-coloured customer experience boxes in the Strategy document and the outcomes in the Business Plan.	Chair	BW	BW agreed that this should be included in the Strategy document so that the internal focus is clearly aligned with the Business Plan. BW agreed this coloured chart is for internal use only and BW will share the customer strategies with the CCG for PR19 as they are completed. this clears the challenge with no changes.	26/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
618	Research Results	CESG 26 June 2018	BW has quarterly relationship meetings with business retailers. BW travels to them. The Deputy Chair asked who pays for cost of BW's administration of business retailers.	Deputy Chair	BW	It was agreed that this issue should be discussed after the Business Plan has been submitted	26/06/2018	Acknowledged. No action before Ofwat report
619	Research Results	CESG 26 June 2018	The Deputy Chair said the Panel will need to see all the relevant documentation on this engagement before it's used as it's a specific question in the Aide Memoire.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW agreed to put this on the FTS and provide a link. This has been done 25.7.18 Report found and additional email received 7 August: For this challenge on the Retailer engagement we have tried at every account meeting to ask the Retailers for their comments on the draft business plan and there has been very little response. I have updated the paper with the two comments we have had. The engagement has been hard as they have been asked by every company for comment and also as a new market there is a lot of innovation and we are leading with new ideas around communication which is exceeding their expectations. As they are comfortable with our work and plans and we are having regularly engagement there has been very little comment on the plan. Challenge cleared with no changes	26/06/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
620	Research Results	Email	NERA Acceptability Testing Study report: Can BW confirm that the 'expected' WTP values as determined by the authors and shown in Table 4.1 on page 47 have been used in all the Cost Benefit Analysis that BW will rely on in its final Business Plan?	Deputy Chair	BW	slide 26 In most circumstances but not all such as leakage, as customers only wanted leakage reduction when the bills come down. We therefore stuck to the medium. All in DOFC. Cleared with no changes	17/07/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
621	Research Results	Email	NERA Acceptability Testing Study report: As these results are so important for BW, what independent review of the values are BW going to carryout and if not could the reasons be explained?	Deputy Chair	BW	This was testing with customers the values from the triangulation values. We are not doing any further independent reviews. Cleared with no changes	17/07/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
622	Research Results	Email	NERA Acceptability Testing Study report: The 'Social Renters' group of customers seemed to have the lowest acceptability, what consideration are BW giving to support to this group?	Deputy Chair	BW	Covered with the affordability strategy, they supported the improvements but at a lower cost. Cleared with no changes	17/07/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
623	ODI	Challenge Panel 13	NE said there is still a lack of transparency on Biodiversity targets and incentives and evidence of customer support for these. EA added that there needs to be clear distinction between business as usual activity and ambition in the selection of the targets.	NE	BW	See p 247-60 in C3. The recently issued note from Patric Bulmer indicates that there are now no overlaps between the work that BW intends for this PC and the work covered by the WINEP PC. Challenge now cleared with changes.	13/08/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
624	Research Results	Challenge Panel 13	The Chair asked the company to select examples of where it has not considered customers views.	Chair	BW	BW agreed to do this. There are 11 of the 26 PCs that have been directly surveyed with customers of these there are 6 PCs where the customers have indicated that they would prefer a slower improvement than BW are showing with their 'suggested' plan; the main reason being to receive a lower bill then the 'suggested' plan would entail. BW have challenged themselves and are now providing the 'suggested' plan at a lower expected bill profile to go some way towards fulfilling their customers expectations. This process is limited in the extent that some PCs could be at a slower increase as they are linked to other PCs that the customer wishes to see proceed at the 'suggested' rate. BW have then prioritised 3 PCs [leakage, customer experience and affordability] which the customers have indicated are important for further improvement but at the same cost as the whole package. BW to provide an update in the near future. BW have inserted an update of how their Board have responded to this challenge in several places in their Business Plan section A1. Section 'A plan driven by our Board' is probably the best.	30/08/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
625	Research Results	Challenge Panel 13	The Deputy Chair noted that the issues on slide 3 are important to but there is a lack of clarity on how the percentages were derived and how the overall bill recommendation was arrived at. The Chair asked for some case studies plus a flow chart to illustrate this	Deputy Chair	BW	After a meeting with BW I am now clear how these percentages were arrived at; checked by someone else and verified by a third person. It is clear they have been correctly calculated from the raw data. However I am not aware of any case studies or flow chart. Cleared with no changes	06/08/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
626	ODI	Challenge Panel 13	The Chair asked for more clarity on why the community initiatives were chosen and the difference they will make to customers.	Chair	BW	The community measure benefits will include: educational support and advice on how to use less water; free drinking water available; a positive impact on the environment; helps improve water efficiency; reducing traffic interruptions; availability of quality recreational experiences; improved information to customers; improved efficiency; Support for vulnerable customers will be more accessible. If initiatives included in the survey change the CCG will be consulted, as stated in p279 of C3. The full list is in SC email dated 8 August 2018. Challenge cleared with no changes.	10/08/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
627	ODI	Challenge Panel 13	EA noted the AIM PC and incentive still needs working through as it cannot support it at present.	EA	BW	See p 270-278 in C3. The EA state that the onus is on the company to agree an AIM scheme with the EA – not the other way around. So far the company have not agreed an AIM scheme with EA. EA are not requiring an AIM site, EA are happy if there isn't one. The Panel have a concern regarding the issue of whether customers should be paying for this when it's outside BW's area. Challenge to remain outstanding and needs including in the BWCP report.	10/08/2018	TBC
628	ODI	CESG 17 July 2018	The Chair said she would like to see the Board consider its Corporate Responsibility focus and status after the Business Plan submission as she considers it to be still ill-defined	Chair	BW		17/07/2018	Acknowledged. No action before Ofwat report
629	ODI	CESG 17 July 2018	NE said it would be good to have a linked condition in the BI PC that by end of period a report should be produced in readiness for PR24 discussions which clearly sets out the scope for enhancing BI scores across each landholding including a thorough assessment of operational constraints – the idea is that this would remove the possibility of this uncertainty (which appears to have led in part to a lack of ambition) continuing.	NE	BW	BW said its BI Action Plan will be produced and will cover this. See p 247-60 in C3. Following the issue of the note from Patric Bulmer, email discussion with EA and NE, and finally agreement at BWCP meeting #14, there is acceptance of the Panel view that as this is a new PC there is uncertainty regarding the amount of stretch [ambition] there is in the targets, incentive levels and rates. BW have accepted that an annual review of BI performance should be undertaken by an independent organisation overseen by Natural England and that the Panel should be involved in the discussions. Challenge to remain outstanding and the changes brought to the attention of Ofwat.	13/08/2018	TBC
630	ODI	CESG 17 July 2018	The Deputy Chair suggested the need to set out what BW will do in connection with the BI PC in preparation for the start of AMP7 and for a continuing overview during AMP7. The Chair asked if BW has a specific plan for its BI PC and how it be monitored.	Deputy Chair	BW	BW said this is still in preparation. See p 247-60 in C3. As a result of the discussion expressed in challenge #629 the plan and overview are now clarified. Challenge can be cleared with changes.	13/08/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
631	ODI	CESG 17 July 2018	EA agreed that BW needs to articulate the BI PC more clearly. It is still unclear what the BI activity will be and what work the company would be doing anyway. Also the reasoning why should a reward be earned for going beyond this	EA	BW	See p 247-60 in C3. As a result of the discussion expressed in challenge #629 the overlap with other work and the yearly review of the target and outcome are now clarified. Challenge can be cleared with changes.	13/08/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.

	Subject	Source	CHALLENGE DESCRIPTION	RAISED BY	RESPONDENT	OUTCOME, COMMENTS, RESPONSES	UPDATED	STATUS
632	ODI	CESG 17 July 2018	NE has suggested an addition to the BI PC where 50% of the existing Biodiversity Action Plan Priority Habitat (these are defined nationally under the NERC Act) on landholdings should be managed consistently with achieving a 'Good' classification - this removes the risk to the company of not knowing what is operationally possible because it refers only to existing habitat.	NE	BW	This appears to have been rejected by BW. See p 247-60 in C3. The change proposed by NE to the BI PC has not been accepted by BW as the change in challenge #629 is being progressed. Cleared with no changes.	13/08/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.
633	ODI	CESG 17 July 2018	EA agreed the BI PC definition should be tightened to give the Panel the assurance it needs. NE added the Panel is currently stuck with uncertainty. A clearer definition will also satisfy Ofwat's recent questions on this PC. The Chair said that clarity on measurement is needed to bring the commitment to life. CCW added that more transparency on what the number actually means is needed together with justification that achieving 50 BI points is stretching.	EA	BW	BW agreed to consider all these points and improve the BI PC and ODI documentation. See p 247-60 in C3. As a result of the discussion expressed in challenge #629 a clearer understanding of how this PC will operate and be managed is now available and the level of stretch will be monitored are now clarified. Challenge can be cleared with changes.	13/08/2018	Acknowledged. Changes made.
634	ODI	CESG 17 July 2018	EA noted its concern over the proposed deadband on the waste disposal PC. BW has to achieve 100% compliance on waste disposal and so EA can't support the deadband because legally it could be taking action on any compliance less than 100%. It will note this in the Panel's report.	EA	BW	BW acknowledged this position. See p 260-265 in C3. I can understand the reasons both sides are taking the stance they are; due to uncertainties over new consents, etc, we may not be able to reach a consensus about the deadband. BW have included an underperformance penalty deadband; although their target in AMP6 is to achieve 100%, their baseline has been forecast to achieve 96% compliance due to a new discharge consent now in place for the fisheries at Blagdon. The Environment Agency cannot accept a deadband on a legally binding Statutory Obligation. Refer this to Ofwat in the BWCP report.	13/08/2018	TBC
635	ODI	CESG 17 July 2018	The Deputy Chair added that the Panel will also note the proposed deadband on the water quality PC for the same reason	Deputy Chair	BW	BW acknowledged this position. See p 95-102 in C3. I do not fully understand how the penalty will work to clear the challenge, discuss on the 2nd. In Ofwat's final methodology statement the regulator states that "we recognise that CRI is a new measure and intended to be a more demanding metric of water quality compliance than its predecessor. Companies can take this into account when proposing any penalty deadbands." The inclusion of the deadband is therefore a reflection that this is a new performance commitment. As the stretch is to achieve full compliance (0 CRI points) we have therefore proposed a penalty deadband for this metric (set at the current upper quartile level of performance i.e. the Company would start paying a penalty if its performance is worse than the UQ level). Cleared with no changes	02/08/2018	Acknowledged. No change required.