

Yorkshire Forum for Water Customers
Minutes of Meeting
23 February 2023
Microsoft Team Meeting

Attendees:

Chris Griffin	Independent Member
Dave Merrett	Independent Member
Andrea Cook	Chair
Kursh Siddique	Independent Member
Jamie Ashton	Citizens Advice
Naila Hussain	Yorkshire Water
Richard Hepburn	Yorkshire Water
James Copeland (joined second half)	National Farmers Union

Apologies:

James Copeland (absent first half)	National Farmers Union
Tom Keatley	Natural England
Chris Offer	Yorkshire Water

Guests:

Paul Chapman	Yorkshire Water
Andrew Smith	Yorkshire Water
Oli Spoor	Yorkshire Water

1. Welcome

- a) Apologies were noted as above. Introductions were made with new YW members.
- b) Customer Forum chair raised concern over not having environmental sub-group in place yet. Company confirmed they are still looking into this.

Action 1: Company to follow up with Chair on update on environmental sub-group.

- c) Company provided action update from previous meeting, confirmed most are complete, outstanding actions are for an update on the environmental sub-group and report writer. Company provided an update on both items the report writer is being investigated and company is exploring recruiting.

- d) Company confirmed that current Chief Finance Officer FO and Director of Customer Experience will be leaving the business and confirmed the new CFO.

2. PR24 Critical Path milestones achieved/upcoming milestones Path

- a) Company delivered this update to provide Forum with visibility of some of the key milestones that it will be aiming to achieve in February and give a forward view of those in March with the purpose of providing oversight, giving the forum the opportunity to request more information at the next meeting. This is so the company can prepare the right content for the forum to allow them to give input or steer as well as some review.
- b) A slide deck was presented to the forum and the company gave an update on the critical path. The company explained the critical path was created in November, the company is four to five months in, and the critical path is the ideal path for delivery for the company's PR24 plan.
- c) The slide deck further covered the purpose of the critical path, the current progress, the milestones progress to date, this included milestones which are completed, on track, due to be completed, and those slipped.
- d) The company explained that milestones were categorised into blue, green, amber and red and explained what each of these represent for each milestone. The company further explained how many milestones there are and how many in each category.
- e) The company presented a slide with progress of against critical path February milestones, it discussed the key milestones and expanded on milestones in the red category. The company explained the critical activities which will be taking place in relation to the milestones for March and provided an overview of past activity.
- f) The company presented questions for the forum, asking whether there are any items on the critical path in February or March which they are interested in and would like to have raised at the next forum.
- g) The forum requested several points of interest to be raised, bill impact, WINEP, flexibility to factor sub-group issues into critical path, WACC, implications of DWMP and WRMP (such as cost efficiency, customer priorities), DWI (what's involved, cost implications), bespoke performance commitments (areas for consideration being customer views, how they are taken into consideration) and a plan review. Company thanked the forum for their input and stated these can be covered over the next months.

3. Items for future agendas

- a) Company and forum agreed these were covered in critical path update in terms of what to bring to next forums.

4. Long Term Delivery Strategy

- a) The company presented a slide pack covering the long-term delivery strategy. An explanation was given on the regulatory importance of the long-term delivery strategy and why it is important to the PR24 process.
- b) The company provided an explanation of what the long-term delivery strategy is and went into detail about what they five core chapters are in every company's long-term delivery strategy.
- c) The company presented a slide on 'scenario testing' and explained what this is.
- d) Ofwat refer to this as mandatory scenarios, the company explained these are the common reference scenarios. Ofwat state that there's a minimum which the company should be testing, in other words stress testing the plan against climate change, demand abstraction and technology. Therefore, companies must do this.
- e) The company explained how Ofwat have defined these in 'benign' and 'adverse' in terms of the terminology.
- f) A further slide was presented on adaptive planning with diagrams and an explanation was given to the forum on this.
- g) Forum member questioned on how the company would work out 'big ticket' items such as water export. The company explained this is based on the water resource management plan, this also has its own criteria.
- h) The company presented a slide on Customer engagement and explained how in the guidance Ofwat have highlighted the customer need customer engagement specifically referencing ambition, strategy and water and wastewater services.
- i) Furthermore, there was a detailed explanation provided on the 'Delivery Plan' this was explained through phase 1 and phase 2.
- j) Forum member suggested there could be an intervening session around the scenarios which the company aim to test.

Action 2: Company to take this away as a suggestion following the LTDS update specifically a session around the scenario testing and investigate arranging another meeting with the Forum.

5. Affordability & Acceptability

- a) Company presented a detailed slide pack covering acceptability and affordability testing including where the company is at with the research and discussed the preparation stage.
- b) Company thanked the forum for the feedback given from the last meeting for the four proposals from the research agencies.
- c) The company updated the forum on the agency tender process and confirmed the successful suppliers, DJS Research and Accent MR as a joint proposal. Details on the cost and what they are responsible were given.

- d) The company explained that this is a two-stage approach, DJS Research will undertake the qualitative stage of research and Accent MR will undertake the quantitative stage of research.
- e) A detailed slide was presented breaking down what the qualitative approach will cover and engaged in a discussion with the forum for their views on this. Another slide was presented breaking down the quantitative approach will cover and how this will be carried out, with discussion and questions from the forum.
- f) The company provided a detailed view of the research time schedule for both stages, acknowledging there are tight timescales to delivery activity but ensuring there is enough time allowed for the forum to review and provide feedback on materials. However, the timeline could change dependant on publication of Ofwat's final guidance. The company explained internal processes to be aware of.

6. Open Challenge Sessions

- a) Company confirmed it has received the final guidance from Ofwat on open challenge sessions. The company has already presented slides on Your Water Your Say open challenge sessions to the forum before however presented these slides only referencing to any updates for the forum. The company confirmed it has met the independent chair and gave details on this. Ofwat have asked that the company give as much info as possible for the chair.

Action 3: The Company to share the presentations which the company had presented for the chair (following the updated slides on the 'Your Water Your Say' from the company).

- b) The company explained that CCW expect companies to adopt a registration process and have attendees to follow this too, they would like the company to add an e-mail address for attendees to send them questions ahead of the event. CCW will be collating these questions and representing customers or attendees or allowing the chair to get sight of some of the common areas to allow a fair balance of discussion.
- c) Company also clarified that CCW have reduced the attendees' question and answer session from 90 to 60 minutes, the company have challenged back on this to ensure that attendees feel listened to
- d) The company explained the guidelines for the company presentation, this being limited to 15 minutes and covering four key areas, customer service priorities, the long-term outcomes, the LTDS and how that fits in with the five-year plan, environment outcomes and affordability as well as introducing the company and where it sits within the water sector and the geographic region.

- e) Ofwat also expect companies to start planning for the next event in October and November now. This will be an independent open forum to the one that will be running in the back end of May, beginning of June. It will be a new invite out and could be a new set of attendees.

7. Forum terms of Reference

- a) The company explained that it shared a draft terms of reference for the forum to review previously and considered feedback from the forum, which was predominantly around clarifying that the role of the forum was not a replacement for assurance which the company undertakes as part of the overall assurance of the business plan, but more so clarifying that the forum is independent and are providing independent assurance to the company which is over and above anything which management may undertake.
- b) The company stated that all comments were incorporated.
- c) The forum chair mentioned she forwarded questions around the nine-year term and discussed this with the company chair.
- d) Forum highlighted for the company to look at having representation on the forum from the environment agency.

Action 4: Company to investigate having a representative from the Environment Agency on the Forum.

8. AOB

- a) Forum chair would like to clarify on the topic of remunerations, whether or not there are fees for subgroup attendance. Forum Chair understanding is that independent members, meaning those that aren't employed by statutory agencies do get paid fees for subgroup attendance.
- b) Company clarified that the question was surrounding whether members are to be paid fees for open stakeholder events, where attendance is optional and not regarding subgroups.
- c) Forum chair stated that stakeholder events are open to everyone there can place a block on this however regarding subgroups it would be important to have as many people involved as possible.

Action 5: Company chair will discuss with company to clarify regarding remunerations surrounding open stakeholder events and get confirmation on this.

- d) Forum chair mentioned subgroups need to be looked into and set up.

Action 6: Company advised it is aware of subgroup importance and will continue to look into this.

Action 7: Company to have actions sent out to the forum.

Next meeting

23rd March via Microsoft Teams and Livingstone House

Actions

February 2023

No.	Action	Status	Due date
1	Company to follow up with Chair on update on environmental sub-group.	Company (Richard Hepburn)	
2	Company to take this away as a suggestion following the LTDS update specifically a session around the scenario testing and look into arranging another meeting with the Forum.	Company (Andrew Smith)	
3	Company to share the presentations which the company had presented for the chair (following the updated slides on the 'Your Water Your Say' from the company).	Company (Paul Chapman)	
4	Company to investigate having a representative from the Environment Agency on the Forum.	Company Chair (Richard Hepburn)	
5	Company chair will discuss with company to clarify regarding remunerations surrounding open stakeholder events and get confirmation on this.	Company (Richard Hepburn & Paul Chapman)	
6	Company advised it is aware of subgroup importance and will continue to look into this.	Company Chair (Richard Hepburn)	
7	Company to have actions sent out to the forum.	Company	

January 2023

No.	Action	Status	Due date
1	Oliver Spoor to send slides to Naila to be circulated to the Forum	Oliver Spoor / Naila Hussain	
2	Paul to provide Andrea with tender for / recruitment tender for public.	Paul Chapman	

3	Forum members to send through any questions they may have for Angie Nock.	Forum	
4	Danielle Skilton to forward the slide pack to Naila for circulation to the Forum.	Danielle Skilton / Naila Hussain	
5	Andrea Cook requested documents to be sent to YW admin to be circulated to forum.	YW attendees / Naila Hussain	
6	Naila to liaise with Chris Offer and Andrea to set up this meeting (Forum chair not available on Tuesday and Thursday morning).	Naila Hussain	

November 2022

No.	Action	Status	Due date
1	Forum Chair requested members to send comments to Company, to pull all comments together in terms of an overall response from the forum.	Forum	
2	Company to share information from Ofwat as it is released on published final methodology.	Company	
3	Company to circulate final plan to forum once complete and Forum to send in any questions they may have.	Company & Forum	
4	Company to provide a view of the business plan for the forum following the final methodology.	Company	
5	Forum to send in any questions it may have to the company once a view of the business plan has been shared.	Forum	
6	Head of regulation to discuss internally to ensure the environmental subgroups are back in the diary again.	Richard Hepburn	
7	Forum member requested whether there could be admin support provided from the company for capturing minutes etc. Head of Regulation to investigate this and provide a response.	Richard Hepburn	

8	Head of Regulation to follow on the action for the report writer and provide update.	Richard Hepburn	
9	Head of Regulation to look into Forum chair's request for having meetings with relevant individuals as needed (Public Value Committee / Dame Julia Unwin).	Richard Hepburn	