

# Customer Engagement and Triangulation

PR19 Research and Triangulation	PR19 Outcomes							
	Safe, Secure, and Reliable drinking water	Long term resilience of supplies for our own customers and to support the South East Region	Low Leakage	A service tailored to individual needs, at an affordable price	An improved environment, supporting Biodiversity	Being recognised by the community as a good corporate citizen	Recognised by stakeholders as having a culture of Health and Safety through all our activities	Other
<p><b>Accent- Qualitative research into outcomes</b></p> <p>We did some baseline research in November 2016, using four focus groups.</p> <p>Our aim was to explore whether PR14 outcomes were still relevant and reveal any issues that were important to customers. Firstly, we looked at whether we should carry on/maintain certain things such as affordable bills. The other was to introduce new initiatives e.g. drinking water quality improved, and addressing water pressure issues.</p> <p>(Appendix 2.3)</p>	<p>Drinking water quality- taste, appearance, limescale, odour</p> <p>Address water pressure issues</p>	<p>Metering promotion</p> <p>Protecting future water supply</p>	<p>Avoiding waste/reducing leakage</p>	<p>Modern billing and customer service- smart meters, e-billing, online account management, app</p> <p>Multiple communication channels</p>	<p>Renewable energy to reduce operating costs</p> <p>More context around how much we spend improving the environment</p> <p>Information on reducing pollution</p> <p>More ambition towards renewable sources</p>	<p>Education &amp; information</p> <p>Increased social responsibility supporting local communities</p> <p>Looking after vulnerable customers and leading community initiatives</p> <p>Education- work within community, metering programmes, schools and colleges</p>		<p>Staff satisfaction and advancement information</p> <p>Customers are spontaneously looking for Portsmouth Water to be more ambitious than the PR14 measured initially suggest. Despite having an arm's length relationship with us, many customers are seeking a water supplier that is forward thinking and understands customer, community and global challenges.</p>
<p><b>Customer Advisory Panel (CAP report)</b></p> <p>Our Customer Advisory Panel met over 5 different sessions. We had members of Portsmouth Water who would present to the panel of customers certain topics. These topics were based on our outcomes.</p> <p>Our first CAP session was exploratory in nature and used to identify spontaneous reactions to Portsmouth Water &amp; explore issues such as affordability, metering, billing, customer service, leakage, water quality, etc. The aim was to ask the panellists' to advise us of our key priorities going forward.</p> <p>The 2<sup>nd</sup> CAP focused more on water quality issues and information about their water supply. We carried out a blind taste test and had presentations on hard water.</p> <p>The 3<sup>rd</sup> CAP was on compulsory metering and wider issues of</p>	<p>CAP 1- All appreciate the reliability of the water supply</p> <p>CAP 1- Would like softer water</p> <p>CAP 1- Taste and hardness drove overall score down, however reliability of supply and few interruptions, no hosepipe bans and customer service created a high score of 8.7.</p> <p>CAP 1- Water hardness is a big issue. Also taste. Low water pressure is another minor issue.</p> <p>CAP 2- Most people changed their mind on taste of hard water &amp; greater tolerance to it.</p> <p>CAP 2- Overall blind taste test of 3 different waters shows us that soft bottled water came back with a lower score than our tap water.</p> <p>CAP 5- 4 minute target relating to water supply interruptions is initially seen as reasonable but would benefit from being set in context. A target</p>	<p>CAP 1- Are very happy with the current situation on hosepipe bans</p> <p>CAP 1- Limited appetite for metering unless it saves money or becomes necessary to conserve water</p> <p>CAP 1- Would like more education on water efficiency.</p> <p>CAP 1- Meeting the needs of new housing developments in the area &amp; an increase in the local population is a concern.</p> <p>CAP 1- Introduce SMART metering, educate and maintain network. Can monitor own usage.</p> <p>CAP 1- A secure water supply is vital, we need to be proactive rather than reactive.</p> <p>CAP 1- Aging infrastructure is mentioned with a general concern.</p>	<p>CAP 1- Show some concern about leakage in general but don't regard leakage as a specific problem in their area</p> <p>CAP 1- Feel that we need to prepare for water supply issues by addressing weaknesses in infrastructure</p> <p>CAP 1- Are unconvinced about the cost of repairing a leak and would like more detailed information</p> <p>CAP 1- Concerned that leakage is at the expense of the customer so maintenance of pipes is essential.</p> <p>CAP 3- Many find it hard to accept that it is not cost effective to fix more leaks.</p> <p>CAP 3- Believing that if the water supply is under pressure from population increase and climate change then more needs to be done to ensure</p>	<p>CAP 1- Generally satisfies with the level of customer service and interruptions to supply but would like some more communication channels e.g. webchat</p> <p>CAP 1- Find it difficult to compare with other utility companies if we are good value for money. Not clear from the bill where the money is going.</p> <p>CAP 1- Many welcome online billing but older generation &amp; financially insecure feel pushed into it.</p> <p>CAP 1- most customers don't want a meter due to current bill reasonable enough, large households believe it will increase bill, don't want to worry about cost.</p> <p>CAP 1- Feel there should be more information on help available who struggle to pay bill.</p> <p>CAP 1- Some feel that webchat/text back service would help as another way to contact us or contact them.</p>	<p>CAP 1- Protecting the environment not at top of mind priority.</p>	<p>CAP 1- Low awareness of local community activities. We should promote more on bill &amp; get customers involved.</p> <p>CAP 1- Few knew of any community or environmental projects supported by us. Should have a Water Day in the local park. Include information with bill and promote what we do. Also work with schools, talks, water bottles offered.</p> <p>CAP 2- Better education on benefits of hard water, how water is treated, what water contains, dispel myths.</p> <p>CAP 2- Being educated has changed their view on water hardness. Greater appreciation of water, its sources and treatment.</p> <p>CAP 4- When voting for whether our customers should pay more for leisure facilities at Havant Thicket compared to not paying, the votes came in at: 7 people</p>		<p>CAP 1- We are still often confused with Southern Water.</p> <p>CAP 5- Would welcome reassurance that these schemes have taken into account the housing development across the region.</p> <p>CAP 5- PW seen as a local company serving local people not really comparable with companies like Virgin, Sky or British Gas. Expectations of the sophistication of customer service initiatives were consequently lower.</p> <p>CAP 5- members felt water was less of a pressing priority for them, in terms of needing to interact with the provider, than other utilities.</p> <p>-smaller bills</p> <p>-no choice over provider</p>

<p><b>resilience. We also wanted to discuss the pros and cons of selling water to neighbouring water companies.</b></p> <p><b>The 4<sup>th</sup> CAP was so that we could cover further topics on Havant Thicket and metering/compulsory metering.</b></p> <p><b>The 5<sup>th</sup> CAP was to gain an insight into what our customers thought on our social tariff and improvements in the business. As well as looking at asset management and our resilience schemes.</b></p> <p><b>Our aims were to understand what our customers views are on our outcomes and ask them to prioritise them to give us a better understanding of what is most important to consider first. It also allows the customers to be educated on many different topics.</b></p> <p><b>Many of the discussions are on our leakage strategy, proposed metering strategies and the development of Havant Thicket reservoir.</b></p> <p><b>(Appendix 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.16 &amp; 2.22)</b></p>	<p>based on the mean average lacks transparency. Some members suggested figures should be reported by geographical zones rather than an average across the entire PW region.</p>	<p>CAP 3- They understand the pressures that some regions are facing and believe that sharing resources is the right thing to do.</p> <p>CAP 3- they want to know that their own water supply is protected.</p> <p>CAP 3- They want to be assured that other water companies in other regions are doing all they can to meet resilience challenges and that the customers in other regions are doing all they can to reduce their water consumption.</p> <p>CAP 3- Recognise Havant Thicket as a long-term strategic plan that is to the benefit of other water companies and their customers – therefore they need to share the development costs and not simply purchase the water.</p> <p>CAP 3- 12/17 of the people asked felt that it was acceptable for us to introduce a hosepipe ban in a serious drought. With a few panellists inclined to pay more to avoid hosepipe bans.</p> <p>CAP 3- 9/17 panellists felt that it is never acceptable to introduce stand posts even in extreme droughts.</p> <p>CAP 3- Others think there may be an economic argument to collect water in the most cost effective manner.</p> <p>CAP 4- Panellists were asked to rank their preferred option to metering. Education on water usage (SMART metering) had the most votes. Then it was for all customers when they move address followed by when properties are empty for more than 6 months. Followed by on a selective basis when customers move address. The least favourable was compulsory metering for all customers and half the supply area.</p>	<p>that water companies are not wasting it.</p> <p>CAP 3- Reducing leakage was the highest priority for most of the panellists. They felt there wouldn't be such a need for metering or a reservoir. And with population growth &amp; climate change we needed to do more to conserve water.</p> <p>CAP 3- Those that did not see leakage as a top priority pick up on that fact that some leaks were undetectable. And also recognise us as doing better on leakage than other water companies.</p> <p>CAP 4- Some feel we need to go further and are prepared to pay more to fund this. And reluctant to accept 15% as it is a low cost option.</p> <p>Cap 4- Whilst there is some support for stretching the target beyond 15%, It was felt by some that moving beyond 8MI/d would not be cost effective.</p> <p>CAP 4- Some like the control and prefer for us to improve leakage over metering and building a reservoir.</p>	<p>CAP 2- Said that is softening water goes ahead that everyone should pay extra even customers on low income. Thought that £14.77 was a reasonable amount on top of bills to soften water, but now do not want this.</p> <p>CAP 3- Dual billing gives customers an opportunity to adapt their consumption behaviour without the fear of an increase in their water bill.</p> <p>CAP 4- Some felt that if were to stretch our target past 15% then they are prepared to pay for increases of £40 to their bill per year.</p> <p>CAP 4- Some feel that 15% is acceptable for now so they don't pay for increases.</p> <p>CAP 5- Paying for resilience schemes is likened to paying an insurance policy.</p> <p>CAP 5- The Social Tariff scheme is seen as a positive initiative. The majority support funding it and reaching 8,000 customers if not more. However participants want reassurance that the scheme reaches those in genuine need &amp; ensures reasonable water usage.</p> <p>CAP 5- CAP member happy with service by PW but going forward suggest that online account management, an APP and extended opening hours would be of interest.</p> <p>CAP 5- However, some suggest that an online account or APP would most suit those customers interested in managing their water meter.</p> <p>CAP 5- CAP members willing to support the 5 planned schemes through an annual bill increase of 51p.</p> <p>CAP 5- Supporting those in need is seen as 'morally' the right thing to do. Also expressed a few concerns on the scheme. Some unaware of the scheme yet they fund it. Others feel squeezed and yet still do not qualify. We don't take into consideration other outgoings. And those on the tariff may be using more water than needed.</p>		<p>saying they are not prepared to pay for this, 10 people said they are &amp; 1 said not at all as they do not support us building Havant Thicket. The idea of paying for leisure facilities divides opinion.</p> <p>CAP 5- Suggestions that PW should work with other organisations in the community to reach those in need.</p> <p>CAP 5- Call for the social tariff scheme to be prominently advertised on bills.</p>		<p>-bill payment &amp; change of address seen as main touch points unless something goes wrong.</p>
---	--	--	---	---	--	---	--	---

		<p>CAP 3- There is an expectation amongst panellists that there would be a wider consultation if plans to share water resources were to go ahead.</p> <p>CAP 3- There was some concern about investing in assets because some saw it as benefiting customers outside of the Portsmouth Water area more than it benefited Portsmouth Water customers.</p> <p>CAP 4- There were some strongly opposed to metering. In which some prefer to fund leakage reduction over having a meter. They say freedom of choice is key.</p> <p>CAP 4- panellists proposed that we could roll out compulsory metering to identify high consumption but as SMART meters and for bills to remain the same.</p> <p>CAP 4- Cons to SMART metering is the cost at around £500 to install. Also limited impact on objectives to get customers to switch to metering. Pro is that it seems the fairest option as no cost passed onto wider customer base &amp; customer retains choice.</p> <p>CAP 4- Few objections to Havant Thicket &amp; understand the need to supply other areas. Some raise questions over the size of it but not the purpose of it.</p> <p>CAP 5- Majority are willing to accept bill increase associated with implementing resilience schemes relating to oil spills, Farlington deficit, Gosport and Waterlooville.</p> <p>CAP 5- CAP members felt reassured that such detailed planning and modelling had gone into ensuring water resilience. But are still concerned about whether all the new housing developments have been factored in.</p>		<p>CAP 5- members uncertain whether PW should set a target on the number of people on the social tariff.</p> <p>CAP 5- Members identified several areas where communication from PW would be appreciated. Messages related to service interruptions were key.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-service interruptions including impact on local traffic</li><li>-Water saving ideas</li><li>-Billing information including contributions to schemes</li><li>-Havant Thicket and other large schemes.</li></ul> <p>CAP 5- members had little experience with PayPoint &amp; saw no direct benefit. However, felt it was useful for people who pay at bank or post office.</p> <p>CAP 5- divided opinion on Live Chat, although no-one had used it to communicate with PW. Some said more convenient than telephone. However, some had been frustrated with Live Chat due to long introductions, standard scripted responses &amp; inability to pick up on the nuances of a verbal communication</p> <p>CAP 5- Overall members displayed most interest in online account management &amp; extended opening hours.</p> <p>CAP 5- members saw a text service as a useful means of communicating important issues such as service disruption. There is also a potential to use it more widely if linked to an online account.</p>				
--	--	---	--	---	--	--	--	--

<p><b>ICS PC &amp; ODI Customer Survey results</b></p> <p><b>What we did:</b> ICS Consulting conducted a survey (see outline below). The survey received 630 responses.</p> <p><b>How we did it:</b> <b>Phase 1:</b> A qualitative phase of focus group research to provide evidence of typical customer views on PCs and ODIs. This initial phase was also designed to provide evidence to assist the design of the quantitative (Phase 2) research.</p> <p><b>Phase 2:</b> A quantitative phase of survey research was conducted with a sample of 630 household customers and residents. This survey was designed to allow the estimation of the incentive structures and levels supported by PW customers.</p> <p><b>Survey Design &amp; testing phase-</b> Cognitive Interviews – 4 cognitive interviews were undertaken in the vicinity of Havant during December, 2017.</p> <p><b>Hall Test</b> – one hall test, comprising 15 interviews, was carried out in Gosport, in January 2018.</p> <p><b>(Appendix 2.17)</b></p>	<p>The outcome “Safe, Secure and Reliable Drinking Water” is the most important priority for all customers. This strength of importance does however differ across different demographic groups. For example, older customers (age 60+) place the highest relative importance on this outcome, whereas younger respondents (age 18-29) attach a lower relative importance.</p> <p>Unplanned outage is the only measure that attracts no support for either an underperformance or outperformance incentive.</p> <p>Underperformance on the Safe &amp; Secure outcome would carry the largest potential penalty for PW. This is consistent with the high priority that customers place on this outcome. There is less appetite for rewarding PW for outperformance on its commitments under the Safe &amp; Secure outcome.</p>	<p>Customers generally prefer a penalty only structure for operational and asset health PCs.</p> <p>The data does support a symmetric reward for the bursts asset health measure.</p> <p>Drought resilience is supported with a penalty only incentive structure.</p> <p>The PCC commitment under long term resilience is also supported with a penalty/reward structure with a slightly higher penalty rate for underperformance.</p> <p>Third most important outcome is resilience.</p> <p>On PCC, people felt it was a good target but were unsure what good looked like, especially as some noted that ten litres, per property, per day did not ‘sound like much’.</p>	<p>A penalty structure is most notably supported for the commitments relating to water quality, leakage and supply interruptions.</p> <p>The second most important is low leakage, followed by long term resilience</p> <p>While it was laudable for PW to be thinking about upper quartile performance, people tended to think it was a little ambitious given the current trend data. There was a view that 10 litres per property per day was not that much, although they recognised leakage on the customer properties was out of PW’s control.</p>	<p>Affordability, vulnerability are supported with a penalty only incentive structure.</p> <p>The fourth most important outcome is customer services and affordable bills.</p> <p><b>Affordability</b> – In principle, people agreed with the idea of a social tariff and supporting those on low incomes, but they did have some issues about the extent to which other customers would have to cross-subsidise such a scheme.</p> <p>Some people thought a better measure for PW would be to ensure it maintains its position as having the lowest water bills in the country. This was seen as being a benefit to the majority as opposed to the few.</p> <p>Customers think that we should not only adjust the bill for people on low income but as people who are working hard to get paid more, get their bills increased, it should be that bills are made affordable for everyone.</p> <p><b>Vulnerability</b> – The measure was understood and people liked the idea of collaborating with other agencies. However, the proposed satisfaction target of 70% was perceived as rather low, and not very challenging, especially in the context of PW’s strong performance in many other areas. Customers suggested a more stretching target of 85%.</p> <p>Although most customers had no issues with paying their bills, all within the £80 - £120 range, they would be more sympathetic to any bill increases if they ‘knew where their money was going’. It should be noted that know-one knew that PW had maintained a flat bill profile from 2015-20, there was just an assumption that there water bills were increasing along with all their other bills.</p> <p>People were also asked what the pain threshold would be for annual increases in their water bills. Most people were unwilling to pay more than £5 a year for service improvements. However, there were a couple of people who took the view</p>	<p>The outcome “An improved environment, supporting Biodiversity” was overall the lowest ranked outcome, but support for this outcome was stronger in the 18-29 age group and the AB social-economic group.</p> <p>The environmental measures (AIM, biodiversity and river restoration) attract support for a symmetric penalty/reward structure.</p> <p>Outperformance on the Environment outcome provides the largest potential for PW to deliver financial rewards.</p> <p>There was quite a good understanding of biodiversity in the context of the water environment, with people referring to wildlife, wetlands and streams. People welcomed the idea of more stakeholder collaboration but thought this should just be part of business as usual rather than having to pay extra for this. They also felt that PW should focus its efforts more widely on other sites, rather than just PW sites.</p> <p><b>Abstraction Incentive Mechanism (AIM)</b> – People felt strongly about this and wanted Portsmouth Water to go further than the legal minimum, even if it meant a small increase in the bill to accelerate some of the planned schemes.</p> <p>Customers wanted PW to demonstrate their responsibility towards the planet and the bigger environmental picture. And, there was a strong challenge from customers as to why they didn’t</p>	<p>Customers felt there should be more information on what we are achieving e.g. through working with the environment and biodiversity, should be plastered over our social media/website. Also said about Facebook, which is something we do not have at the moment.</p> <p>Customers say they don’t hear enough about the many excellent things the company is doing; as such, there was a desire to see and understand more. Communication is clearly one aspect of conveying the messages, but there should also be opportunities to involve customers at various sites, in a more hands on way whether they be water treatment works, river improvement schemes etc.</p>		<p>The main finding is that customers <u>do</u> prefer differing structures of penalty and reward across the different performance commitments.</p> <p>Moreover, there is strongest support for penalties for underperformance. There is, however, <u>no</u> support for enhanced penalty rates for underperformance or enhanced reward rates for outperformance.</p> <p>When customers were shown comparative industry performance information, they were impressed with PW’s performance across many of the metrics.</p> <p>Phase 2 results: Customers are generally supportive of performance targets and believe they do provide incentives for companies to deliver better performance.</p> <p>Customers have a clear preference for financial penalties over rewards, but also believe both forms of financial incentive are more effective than reputational incentives.</p> <p>The balance of incentives supported by the customer evidence are towards penalties rather than rewards and are well within the -/+ 3% range proposed by Ofwat in its PR19 methodology.</p>
---	---	---	--	--	--	---	--	---



				<p>that if the service is going to be improved, they wouldn't mind paying for it.</p> <p>The annual equivalent bill impacts (which assume an even profile of outcome delivery over the 5 year regulatory period) equate to a range for the Return on Regulatory Equity (RORE) of about -2.3% to +0.8%.</p>	<p>know about the various environmental initiatives.</p> <p><b>Carbon reduction</b> – everyone thought this was a good measure and again, customers were positive about PW playing its part in reducing carbon emissions.</p>			
<p><b>Vulnerability Report</b></p> <p>The Vulnerability survey was aimed at 156 different agencies/charities that vulnerable customers may use. We designed a questionnaire on Survey Monkey and emailed each agency/charity to ask their opinion on how we perform as a company on helping our most vulnerable customers and ask them what more we could be doing to help.</p> <p>34 agencies/charities responded.</p> <p>Our aim for the survey was to help us to understand our vulnerable customers better and to gain an insight in how we should develop a bespoke performance commitment and see if we could do more with individual agencies and charities.</p> <p>(Appendix 2.10)</p>		<p>Organisations are most aware of metering at 74.29% out of 100%</p>		<p>Organisations least aware of our Priority Services register with only 31.43 % aware</p> <p>Organisations equally aware of WaterSure, social tariff and Arrears Assist at 71.43%</p> <p>Organisations have engaged with our Customer Support Advisor with 38.24% knowing about assistance schemes through her</p> <p>-Helpline for the vulnerable -Payment cards</p> <p>Rated our 'Problems Paying' section on our website with an average score of 7</p>		<p>Organisations aware of assistance schemes by use of company literature the most common at 41.18%</p> <p>Organisations equally use our website and contact Customer Services for information on our assistance schemes at 32.35%</p>		<p>Train customer services on identification of vulnerable customers</p>
<p><b>Student Customer Survey Report</b></p> <p>There were three people from Portsmouth Water- Our Engagement Officer, our Customer Support advisor and a Customer Service Advisor who attended Portsmouth University's Fresher Fayre.</p> <p>They were there to talk with students about general billing and water queries. But mainly our aim was to encourage the students to sign up for a prize draw which allowed us to ask them for their contact details so we could then email them with a follow up survey to get the chance to win a prize voucher (a £100 voucher for a retail shop of their choice).</p> <p>The survey was sent out to 502 students out of 688 students and we received 40 back. The survey consisted of questions focusing on</p>	<p>66.67% of students use tap water, 24.44% use bottles water and 15.56 use filtered tap water, only 2.22% use fridge dispenser water.</p> <p>When comparing their water to home 55.56 noticed no obvious difference, and 33.33% said it was worse. Only 11.11% said it was better.</p> <p>When asked how long would it be acceptable to have their water off for, 38.64% said between 2-3 hours, followed by 31.82% between 1-2 hours, 15.91% for 4-5 hours, 13.64% for under 1 hour and 0% for 5 plus hours.</p>	<p>Students were asked if bills today should include some money to be used to ensure reliable supplies for future generations. 48.89% said Yes, this is important to them and 33.33% said it is important but not to pay for now for future generations. Only 17.78% said they were not bothered.</p> <p>Students were asked how charges should be set. 40.91% said Customers should be able to choose and not forced to have one. 36.36% Said all properties should have a meter so they pay for what they use.</p>	<p>When asked how important it is that we decrease the amount of leaks we have, the average score was 9 out of 10.</p>	<p>When asked if they would support people on low incomes with paying more on their own bill, 40.91% said they don't mind. 31.82% Said no they do not agree with paying more and 27.27% said yes it is fair.</p> <p>When they were asked if we are good value of money, 39 out of 43 (90.70%) said Yes we are good value, and 4 (9.30%) said no.</p>	<p>When asked how important nature is to students, the average score was 8 out of 10.</p> <p>Environmental projects voted most favourable if we had funding.</p>	<p>When students were asked how they would find out more about an unplanned interruption to their supply, 57.78% said they would use social media, 53.33% said they would use out website, 46.67% would phone us, 24.44% would email us, 22.22% would visit neighbours and through word of mouth and 0% would visit us.</p> <p>Students were asked if we had some community funding that we could use for certain projects, how they would spend it. Environmental projects were voted most favourable, then learning projects e.g. gardening, water treatment. And school programmes and community events were voted least favourable.</p> <p>When asked if they pick up the phone to call us, how long are they prepared to wait for, 27.27%</p>		

<p>water quality, resilience, leakage, affordability of their bill and customer service, communication methods and working within the community and education.</p> <p>The student survey was developed as a means to find out more of what our future customers think about us and moving forward how best to communicate with them. We were interested to hear their views and discuss plans for the future.</p> <p>We felt hat this type of engagement was effective and can be continued at other student fresher fayres over the next coming years. This will ensure that we are continually engaging with this demographic.</p> <p>(Appendix 2.11)</p>						said 2-3 minutes. Followed by 25% at 1-2 minutes, 22.73% for 5 + minutes, 15.91% for 3-4 minutes and 9.09% up to 1 minute.		
<p><b>The Consumer Council for Water (CCW)- Water Matters Views on their water services (2016)</b></p> <p>This Water Matters report is an annual household satisfaction tracking survey commissioned by The Consumer Council for Water (CCW). Commissioned first in 2006, Water Matters aims to identify household customers’ views of water and sewage services across England &amp; Wales and monitors changes in these views over time.</p> <p>The survey was carried out between 10/10/16 and 15/01/17 and consisted of 5,420 telephone interviews with household water bill payers.</p> <p>There was a minimum of 150 interviews carried out for all water only companies.</p> <p>Our aim was to understand how our customer’s feel we are performing compared to other water companies.</p>	<p>Overall satisfaction of water supply is very high at 93%. Reliability is at 96%, The colour/appearance is 94%, Safety of drinking water is at 90%, Water pressure at 89%, Taste and smell at 87%, Hardness/softness of water at 71%</p> <p>Hardness/softness of water on a downward 5 year trend for Portsmouth Water.</p> <p>Improved communications on Hardness/softness of water may improve perceptions of value of money and our likelihood of customers to promote our services &amp; be satisfied with our improved levels of service.</p>	<p>More than three-quarters (78%) are confident that their water supply will be available in the longer term without being subject to hosepipe bans.</p> <p>On a satisfaction with aspects of water supply data table- we had a 100% on reliability of water supply. With a 5 year upward trend.</p> <p>Confidence in the long-term supply of water is at 76% which is middle of the industry average percentage.</p>		<p>In 2016, 73% of customers are satisfied with value for money over the industry.</p> <p>Our 5 year rolling average for customers who are satisfied with value for money is at 80.4% compared to industry average of 72.6%.</p> <p>In 2016, more than 6 in 10 (63%) customers agree that their charges are fair.</p> <p>3 in 4 (74%) agree that the water charges are affordable.</p> <p>High level of agreement that bills are clear at 85% clear on how much needs to be paid.</p>		<p>In 2016, 12% of customers are aware of, or subscribed to WaterSure.</p> <p>Awareness of social tariffs remains low at 5%.</p> <p>Awareness of priority services has fallen significantly since 2015 by 6% &amp; is now 44%.</p> <p>Awareness of how long you can trial a meter has fallen in the last 5 years.</p> <p>Of those that contacted their water company, 81% are satisfied with their overall contact experience. Reasons for lack of trust: Too expensive/poor value at 14%, untrustworthy/dishonest at 14% and Only want to make money at 13%.</p>		<p>Contact with the company at individual WoC level puts Portsmouth Water as the only water company to display a significant upward trend over the last 5 years.</p> <p>The main reason for contact in the industry is billing related at 34% followed by reporting of a leak at 11%.</p> <p>Primary reason for dissatisfaction with Customer Service is lack of communication/informatio n provided at 37%. Further reasons include poor value for money at 17% and poor service at 14%.</p>

<p><b>The Consumer Council for Water (CCW)- Water Matters Staying afloat: Addressing Customer Vulnerability in the water sector (2016-17)</b></p> <p>This report from The Consumer Council for Water, September 2017 is to show the progress that the water industry is making in supporting customers who are financially vulnerable and those who need extra help with the services provided by their water and sewage companies. The data in this report is taken from information that companies voluntarily share with them, their research or other publically available information.</p> <p>Throughout the report CCW give an overview of the current situation and their thoughts on where the industry should be aiming to make improvements for customers in the future.</p> <p>Our aim was to understand more of what we could do to improve the way we support our vulnerable customers.</p>				<p>In 2014-15 there were 13.5 million people living in low income households, 21% of UK population. Child poverty projected to rise between now &amp; 2020.</p> <p>The industry reported to have delivered financial support to 780,000 people.</p> <p>WaterSure is capped on average measured usage for some utility companies. Customer awareness of WaterSure has increased by 12% compared to 8% in 2015.</p> <p>Offering a charitable trust.</p> <p>Our Debt Write off scheme is very low compared to the industry.</p> <p>Social Tariff take up is in its first year and is at a high percentage compared to other utilities.</p> <p>Decrease in Water Direct (DWP) of 46%.</p> <p>Further communication about the trial meter option is needed.</p> <p>Payment holidays, debt advice, flexible payment plans, water saving devices and audits should also be considered further.</p> <p>Around 3 million households in England &amp; Wales do not consider their water charges to be affordable.</p> <p>Overall result 81.1 (From 79.9 last year).</p>		<p>We are very low in comparison to the number of our customers on the Priority Register.</p> <p>Offering a translation service.</p> <p>There could be sign language/subtitles videos on our website.</p> <p>Accessible website that can have background colour changed, font changed, content read aloud or translated.</p> <p>Use organisations such as Mind and Alzheimer’s UK to help us to be dementia friendly and conscious of mental health issues.</p>		
<p><b>CCWater Research Report (2017-2018)</b></p> <p>CCWater have published a report on the findings of our performance over the last year and compared to our previous years.</p> <p>The information shown in the report is a set of graphs showing our performance from 2011-2017. The set of questions are based on being overall satisfied with their water supply, being satisfied with value for money, views on fairness and affordability of charges, integrity, awareness of consumer rights and responsibilities, satisfaction with and views on contact experience, water on tap, and finally their</p>	<p>Overall satisfied with their water supply- PW at 95% &amp; average is 92%.</p> <p>Satisfied with colour and appearance of tap water- PW at 97% average is 91%.</p> <p>Satisfied with taste and smell of water- PW at 90% average is 86%.</p> <p>Satisfied with hardness/softness of water- PW at 49% average is 55%.</p> <p>Satisfied with safety of water- PW at 91% average is 91%.</p> <p>Satisfied with reliability of supply- PW at 99% and average is 97%.</p> <p>Satisfied with water pressure- PW at 89% and average is 86%.</p>	<p>Aware of option to have a free water meter- PW at 72% and average is 69%. An upward 7 year trend.</p> <p>Aware of option for customers who ask for a meter to be fitted to then go back to a rateable value charge with 12 months (we now do up to 2 years) - PW at 30% average is 24%. Upward 7 year trend.</p>		<p>Satisfied with value for money of water services- PW at 79% average is 72%.</p> <p>Agree their water charges are affordable- PW at 87% average is 77%.</p> <p>Agree that total water and sewage charges are affordable- PW at 85% average is 75%.</p> <p>Agree that charges are fair- PW at 72% average is 62%.</p> <p>Likely to contact company if worried about paying bill- PW at 78% and average is 74%.</p> <p>Aware of or on WaterSure Tariff- PW at 9% average is 9%.</p>				<p>Agree their water company cares about the service they provide to their customers- PW at 68% average is 71%.</p> <p>Trust their water company- PW score when 10 is trust completely and 1 is not at all. PW scored 8.20 and average is 7.69.</p> <p>Satisfaction when contacting water company with query in the last 12 months- PW at 16% average is 18%.</p> <p>Reason for contacting company was to complain-</p>

likelihood to recommend us as a provider of water services.				<div>Aware of other schemes offered which provide lower charges to help customers who struggle to afford their bills- PW at 3% and average is 3%.</div> <div>Aware of Priority Services- PW at 51% and average is 44%.</div>				<div>PW at 4% average is 6% (low base).</div> <div>Overall, satisfied with the way their query was handled- PW at 88% average is 84%.</div> <div>Likelihood to recommend PW as a provider of water services. Percentage that said extremely likely for PW is 48% and average is 38%. Significant increase since 2016.</div>
<div>Institute of Customer Service Report (ICS)</div> <div>The survey completed is to identify our strengths and weaknesses compared to the UK and sector scores. To also understand the mix of channels our customers use and how satisfaction varies by channel. It also looks at the range of organisation scores in our sector and identify the opportunities for differentiation. And lastly, to track progress against our previous Business Benchmarking surveys (if applicable).</div> <div>The survey sample is selected and provided by Portsmouth Water. Typically we provide around 200 responses from people in our organisation. We choose a sector benchmark from 1 of 13 sectors. The UKCSI has an online panel of 10,000 customers and representative of the UK population. They receive 3000 responses per sector and customers choose which organisation they want to rate. The survey takes place at a time agreed by the Institute and our organisation. It is then published in January and July. Our organisation’s scores are based on the same basis as the UKCSI.</div> <div>(Appendix 2.8)</div>	When asked how we should improve, some people said their water quality such as chalky, cloudy water. Also keeping the same quality all the time. Also quicker notification when interruption to supply occurs.	When asked how we should improve, some people said we should be nationalised, meter readings should be uploaded online and submitted by them. Also it was said that we should publicise meters more as they noticed a big saving.	When asked how we should improve, some people said improve leakage.	<div>Helpfulness of staff (over the phone) benchmarked at 8.9 compared to UKCSI Overall of 7.8. Same for competence of staff compared to UKCSI at 7.7.</div> <div>-Ease of getting through on the phone benchmarked at 8.6 compared to UKCSI overall at 7.4.</div> <div>-On time delivery (over the phone) benchmarked at 8.2 compared to UKCSI at 7.7.</div> <div>-Handling of queries benchmarked at 8.2 compared to UKCSI overall at 7.8.</div> <div>-Availability of support online is benchmarked at a low score of 6.5 compared to UKCSI overall of 7.9.</div> <div>-On time delivery (online) benchmarked at 6.8 compared to UKCSI at 8.3. And ease of finding what you want online benchmarked at 7.1 compared to 8.2.</div> <div>-Speed of response in writing benchmarked at 7.2 compared to UKCSI overall at 7.3.</div> <div>-When asked how we should improve, many people said cost, customer care, online services, attention to administration detail and paperless bills.</div> <div>Said there needs to also be better communication with direct debits and more information given on products, online services with paperless bills showing water usage.</div>		When asked how we should improve, some people felt that there should be more awareness and help available for single occupiers and on benefits.		<div>When asked how we should improve it was mainly on our communication, customer service and have more attention to administration detail.</div> <div>Portsmouth Water’s Business Benchmarking is at 81.1 and the UKCSI overall figure is at 78.2. Utilities is scored at 75.1. This puts us above the UKCSI and other utility companies. We are also second best in our sector. With a score of 81.1 compared to the industry leader at 81.8. Our score has increased from 79.9 in July 2016 to 81.1 in July 2017.</div> <div>Complaint made that lower management need replacing as MD had to step in to rectify the issue. Also to inform the customer when the complaint is being resolved and at the time it concludes.</div>
<div>Service Incentive Mechanism (SIM)</div> <div>Ofwat independently undertake telephone surveys of customers who have contacted their water company in the last 3 to 4 months. This is conducted every quarter (date not always the same). They have</div>	<div>2015-16 Score &amp; Position- 4.47 Clean water</div> <div>2016-17 Sore &amp; Position- 4.35 Clean water</div> <div>2017-18 Score &amp; Position- So far- Clean water at 4.39</div> <div>2017-2018 Q3 Weighted score:</div>			<div>2015-16 Score &amp; Position- 4.67- billing, 4.47, Overall 89.5 and 1<sup>st</sup> in industry.</div> <div>2016-17 Sore &amp; Position- 4.60 billing, 4.48 overall score.</div> <div>Overall score 88 and 1<sup>st</sup> again in industry.</div> <div>2017-18 Score &amp; Position-</div>				



<p><b>compared us to all other fresh water and waste water services across England &amp; Wales. We are rated on our billing and operational satisfaction. This creates a weighted score. We have results from 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18 and lastly 2018-19.</b></p> <p><b>Aim:</b> Assess and compare customer satisfaction levels in the water industry based on operational needs and billing needs.</p>	<p>Clean Water: 1<sup>st</sup> with score of 4.62. Q3 Weighted WOC Scores: Clean Water: 1<sup>st</sup> with score of 4.62</p> <p>2017-2018 YTD Weighted score: Clean Water: 4.39 in 3<sup>rd</sup> place YTD Weighted WOC Scores: Clean Water: 4.39 in 1<sup>st</sup> place</p> <p>2018-2019 YTD Weighted score: Clean water: 2<sup>nd</sup> place with a score of 4.49 YTD Weighted WOC Scores: Clean Water: 1<sup>st</sup> place with score of 4.49</p>			<p>So far billing at 4.58, overall 4.49 and 4<sup>th</sup> in survey.</p> <p>2017-2018 Q3 Weighted score: Billing: 3<sup>rd</sup> with score of 4.60 Overall score of 4.61 and 2<sup>nd</sup> place Q3 Weighted WOC Scores: Billing: 1<sup>st</sup> with score of 4.60, Overall score at 4.61 putting us 1<sup>st</sup></p> <p>2017-2018 YTD Weighted score: Billing: 4.58 in 4<sup>th</sup> place Overall, 4.49 and 4<sup>th</sup> place YTD Weighted WOC Scores: Billing: 4.39 in 1<sup>st</sup> place, Overall 4.49 and in 1<sup>st</sup> place</p> <p>2018-2019 YTD Weighted score: Billing: 1<sup>st</sup> with score of 4.69 Overall 1<sup>st</sup> place with score of 4.59 YTD Weighted WOC Score: 1<sup>st</sup> with score of 4.69 Overall: 1<sup>st</sup> with score of 4.59</p>				
<p><b>Complaints Analysis</b></p> <p>Every complaint from April 2015 until January 2018 has been reviewed. This is so we can understand what complaints we are generating more of.</p> <p>Knowing the number of complaints for certain departments allows us to understand what our customers feel is most important and allow us to know what we as a company need to improve on to prevent further complaints.</p> <p>So far we have had 1109 complaints from April 2015 to January 2018.</p>	<p>‘Water quality’ complaints are the 2<sup>nd</sup> most common with 44 since April 2015.</p> <p>‘No water/interruption to supply with no warning’ complaints received were 6<sup>th</sup> at 37.</p> <p>‘Low pressure’ came 14<sup>th</sup> with 16 complaints received since April 2015.</p> <p>Only 1 complaint on ‘Lead’ received.</p>	<p>‘Mains renewal’ came 10<sup>th</sup> with 22 complaints received since April 2015.</p> <p>Only 1 complaint on ‘Compulsory metering’ received</p>	<p>‘High consumption query’ is the 3<sup>rd</sup> most common complaint with 43 since April 2015.</p> <p>‘Lack of communication with leak repair’ came 17<sup>th</sup> with 14 complaints received since April 2015.</p> <p>‘Leak not repaired’ complaints received are at 11 since April 2015.</p>	<p>‘Billing disputes’ are the most common complaint with a total amount of 268 since April 2015.</p> <p>‘No reply to correspondence or phone call’ came 4<sup>th</sup> on number of complaints received since April 2015 at 42.</p> <p>‘Difficulty getting through to relevant department’ came 8<sup>th</sup> with 22 complaints received since April 2015.</p> <p>‘No e-billing facility’ complaints came in at 8 since April 2015.</p> <p>‘Affordability of bill’ had 5 complaints received since April 2015.</p>	<p>‘Environmental issues’ complaints received are 2 since April 2015.</p> <p>‘Contamination to marinas’ had 2 complaints received.</p>		<p>‘Dangerous driving of company vehicles/use of mobile phones/litter being thrown from vehicle’ had 11 complaints since April 2015.</p> <p>‘Injury caused due to fault in apparatus’ had 3 complaints received since April 2015.</p> <p>1 complaint on ‘Employees urinating in back of van and emptying contents onto grass verge’ received.</p> <p>‘Poor reinstatement’ came 5<sup>th</sup> with 41 received since April 2015.</p>	<p>‘Admin error’ such as direct debit being taken too early came 7<sup>th</sup> with 37 complaints received since April 2015.</p> <p>‘Missing payments’ came 9<sup>th</sup> with 22 complaints received since April 2015.</p> <p>‘Bad customer service on phone/out on road/on visit’ came in at 11th with 20 received since April 2015.</p>
<p><b>Unwanted Contacts Analysis</b></p> <p>Our monthly unwanted contacts report has been analysed to reveal the most common (top 20) unwanted contacts we receive into the business. An unwanted contact is a telephone call that is selected as unwanted into the business if say the customer should have already been provided the advice in a previous call (which makes it a repeat call) or the customer is</p>	<p>‘No Water’ number 1 in unwanted operational contacts from 2015 to 2018- overall figure of 5460.</p> <p>‘Low pressure’ unwanted operational contact second highest for 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18 with a total of 2573.</p> <p>‘Chlorine, taste and odour’ is at 7<sup>th</sup> place in unwanted operation contacts in 2015-16, 17th in 2016-2017 and 16<sup>th</sup> in 2017-2018 with 201 overall contacts.</p>		<p>‘Check meter (Job)’ number 1 in unwanted billing contacts overall, with a figure of 1861.</p> <p>‘Waste of water’ is at number 8 and 9 in unwanted operational contacts from 2015 to present</p> <p>‘Possible burst main on carriageway’ came in at 18<sup>th</sup> in 2015-16, 20<sup>th</sup> in 2016-17 and 20<sup>th</sup> in 2017-18 with total overall unwanted contacts of 118.</p>	<p>‘Card Payment (Capita down)’ unwanted billing contact was 4<sup>th</sup> overall from 2015 to 2018 with a total of 866 contacts.</p> <p>‘General billing enquiry’ is number 6 in unwanted billing contacts from 2016 to present</p> <p>‘Direct debit query’ was at 7<sup>th</sup> in 2015-16, 8<sup>th</sup> in 2016-17 and 4<sup>th</sup> in 2017-18 with 556 total unwanted contacts.</p>		<p>‘Bill Explanation/Design’ came in at 9<sup>th</sup> place in 2015-16, 14<sup>th</sup> in 2016-17 and 18<sup>th</sup> in 2017-18 with 226 unwanted contacts in total.</p>		<p>‘Refund query’ unwanted billing contact came in at 3<sup>rd</sup> in overall from 2015 to 2018 with 1082 contacts.</p> <p>‘Stopcock seized’ had an overall of 1117 and came in at 4<sup>th</sup> and ‘Stopcock not holding’ had an overall of 671 and came in at 5<sup>th</sup> top contact.</p> <p>‘Stopcock box needs cleaning’ has had 580</p>

<p>complaining over the phone, or there could have been an error made by us that has caused a customer to call in when there shouldn't have been any need too. For example their water quality or supply is not good and they have needed to call us to report.</p> <p><b>Aim:</b> It was important that we can understand the most common unwanted contacts we receive into the company that could be prevented. We can now look forward to find ways to stop these calls being made to us.</p>	<p>'Brown/Black/Orange Discoloration' was 19<sup>th</sup> in 2015-16, 13<sup>th</sup> in 2016-17 and 21<sup>st</sup> in 2017-18 with total overall contacts of 127.</p> <p>'Lead' was at 13<sup>th</sup> place in 2015-16, 19<sup>th</sup> in 2016-17 and 18<sup>th</sup> in 2017-18 with total contacts of 146.</p>		<p>'Waste of Water' came in at 11<sup>th</sup> place in 2015-16, 9<sup>th</sup> in 2016-17 and 10<sup>th</sup> in 2017-18 with 188. Followed by Waste of water on private land with 134 contacts.</p>	<p>'Customer Move' is 2<sup>nd</sup> overall highest unwanted contact with 1289.</p> <p>'Chased Payment' was 8<sup>th</sup> in 2015-16, 4<sup>th</sup> place in 2016-17 and dropped to 13<sup>th</sup> in 2017-18 with total unwanted contacts of 492.</p>				<p>contacts overall and came in at 6<sup>th</sup> in all three years.</p> <p>'For Information' was 6<sup>th</sup> in 2015-16, 7<sup>th</sup> place in 2016-17 and 6<sup>th</sup> again in 2017-18 with 682 unwanted contacts.</p>
<p><b>Workplace by Facebook- Employee engagement</b></p> <p>Workplace is a new form of online social media. It is created by Facebook as a communication tool for work colleagues to come together on one shared page to talk and share ideas amongst each other in a professional capacity. We set this up on a trial basis to survey a group of 30 employees from all over the company. There were around 3 to 6 questions per week sent out on Workplace and it allowed everyone to have an open discussion over 6 weeks.</p> <p>The topics were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Safe, secure, reliable drinking water</li><li>• Resilience in the South East region</li><li>• Leakage</li><li>• Customer service, affordability &amp; vulnerability</li><li>• The environment</li><li>• Being a good corporate citizen</li></ul> <p><b>Aim:</b> We wanted to understand what our employees hear from our customers so we can gain more of an insight into what our customers want from us and allow us to innovate and improve our service.</p> <p>(Appendix 2.9)</p>	<p>-Hardness -Cloudy water -Taste of water compared to bottled -Colour of water and particles in water- usually after burst main -Water softeners -Dishwashers and washing machine queries relating to hard water -Soap not lathering- we recommend different products that perform better with hard water. -Moving to this area from another area of UK or abroad and noticing change in water taste and wondering if safe to drink</p> <p><b>On lead piping:</b> -Do not understand ownership boundaries -Concerned about health risks -Think that lead poisons the water</p> <p><b>On unplanned interruptions:</b> -Most customers understand the need for this -Ok as long as they have had plenty of notice, but not too far in advance that they forget</p>	<p>-Most customers expect the water to always be running -Older generation may understand more the importance of this -Hosepipes are acceptable in a 1 in 20 drought -Metering -Subsidising appliances that truly save water -Lower flow shower heads -Because we have such a high security of supply customers fail to fully appreciate resilience</p> <p><b>On metering:</b> -Highlight the sewage and drainage potential savings against our savings</p>	<p>-Educate customers on how it will affect them directly. Such as price increase and poor pressure. -Make sure customers know what they are looking for -More visible signage on vans to show what a leak looks like -Most people said to leave at two free leak repairs -We should be attending to leaks within 5 working days and repaired within 10 working days</p>	<p><b>On vulnerability:</b> -Tailor more communication with customer trends/change in pattern to paying their bill. -Community events where we invite customers to us and events in village halls. -Introduce a payment holiday for certain circumstances such as loss of job or illness. -Exchange more information with Southern Water on vulnerable customers.</p> <p><b>On Affordability:</b> -Suitable payment plans -Incentive schemes -Early intervention and financial advice to customers before the sum of the bill gets too large -Be more flexible with timings -Before going from Blue Bill to Red reminder, have an amber letter to encourage dialogue before demand</p> <p><b>Communication channels:</b> -Offer e-billing or portal to view bills and pay. -Option to sign up to text or mail alerts for interruptions &amp; other relevant events. -A live Chat function on the website</p>	<p>-Some of our efforts and achievements should go in the media -We should continue to have a pro-active attitude to biodiversity -Engage with our customers through the media -Social media should also be used as a tool -We need to emphasize the general scarcity of water, increasing demand and population, and the changing environment (climate change)</p>	<p><b>On lead piping:</b> -More information on lead pipes on the website under FAQ in addition to Pipework section-clearer layout</p> <p><b>On unplanned interruptions:</b> -Offer them a text service in daylight hours before an interruption -Are we doing more to work alongside other companies at the same time to minimise disruption -Maximising the use of social media and giving the customer more information about planned interruptions -Proactive communications when we are working in that area -Go on local radio stations</p> <p><b>On resilience:</b> - Sending printed material with other correspondence to promote water efficiency -Continue with stands and fetes to promote and community talks -Water saving devices and also promoting Save Water, Save Money website -Advertising in local press and radio stations -Promotion showing water scarcity for the future</p> <p><b>On Metering:</b> -More information on our website -Leaflets distributed with bills/reminders -Target small families/single occupiers -Engage with organisations to promote to older customers -Use AddressBase or GIS to identify streets with high majority of unmeasured</p>	<p>-Can get upset when with parking/accessing and traffic when our gangs are on a job</p>	

						<p>customers and target them with leaflet drops or mailings</p> <p><b>On leakage:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-School competition to create signage to promote leak awareness</li><li>-Community talks and attendance at fetes and science fairs</li><li>-Promote more to businesses (high users) and internal leaks</li><li>-Offer money off scheme to use independent plumbers to prevent waste of water</li></ul> <p><b>On Brand awareness:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Stronger bill messaging and building the brand</li><li>-Working with Southern Water to create two bills that do not confuse customers</li><li>-Intentional rather than passive branding</li><li>-Presence at large Portsmouth events with key message on who we are</li><li>-Promote/advertise at more events in West Sussex to show we cover a wider area</li><li>-More community spirit and promote our achievements more</li><li>-Sponsor swimming clubs</li><li>-More emphasis that we are the fresh water supply rather than waste water</li><li>-Communicate our story/history better</li><li>-Consider a marketing agency for ongoing awareness or PR Agency for press releases &amp; media</li><li>-Educating our customers on how water reaches their taps and how water is healthy.</li><li>-Sponsor a water drinking app to promote healthy lifestyle and drinking our water is a good benefit.</li><li>-Promote good results from surveys and achievements to our customers.</li></ul> <p><b>On the Environment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Community environment projects- offering an incentive to a community group who does the best at promoting water efficiency.</li><li>-Invite customers to volunteer their time to help with onsite working parties.</li><li>-Get involved in children and family environment projects to promote water efficiency. Maybe a children and parent gardening club that also promotes saving water</li></ul>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

						<div>-We should fund toilets at Staunton or new showers at Horizon Leisure Centres.</div> <div>-Work more with Portsmouth City Council, Havant, Chichester etc to sponsor sustainable drought tolerant flower displays</div> <div>-Have an annual community park event such as what the Kingfishers did for Water Aid. This could be a legacy of ours.</div> <div>-Have an open day at our head offices at the weekend to show how we offer a first class service and demonstrations on what we do.</div> <div>-Corporate meetings with other utility companies</div> <div>-Council events</div> <div>-Visiting more schools and universities- do talks and educational lessons</div> <div>-Offer help and support to voluntary organisations in the community</div> <div>-Our own high achievement award to being a sustainable customer and water efficient in the community</div> <div>-Company talks at schools, Women’s institute, and community centre related groups.</div> <div>-Work with Waitrose and ask our employees to choose a charity and the charity with the most tokens gets the donation.</div> <div>-Attend the LAC Awards (Looked after children) in care</div>		
<div><b>Hard Water Questionnaire</b></div> <div><b>Our Water Quality department surveyed 150 customers when sampling at a customer’s property. We wanted to know what they thought about water hardness and how they manage the limescale in their property.</b></div> <div><b>The topics discussed with the customers were based on if they had to use any additional cleaning product in their washing machine or dishwasher. Or if they have had to replace any household appliance due to a build-up of limescale, or if they use a water softener in their home. We also asked how much they approximately spend on managing water hardness.</b></div> <div><b>Aim:</b></div>	<div>130 people out of 150 said they know that there is hard water in our area of supply.</div> <div>121 people said they do not use Calgon or a similar product in the washing machine/dish washer. The people that were using it were using it mostly monthly.</div> <div>92 people compared to 55 said they use products that remove limescale.</div> <div>128 people said they haven’t needed to replace any items in their property due to limescale. The 21 people that did said they have replaced kettles, washing machines, boilers and taps.</div> <div>132 people said they do not have a water softening device. The other 15 people have water fridge filters/jugs or parts on boiler.</div>			<div>When managing Water hardness out of 150 people, 73 do not spend anything but 35 people spend around £10-£15.00 per year. 2 Out of 150 people spend more than £100.00 per year.</div>				



<p>It was important for us to understand what our customers know about their water hardness in their area of supply and if they would want to improve it.</p>								
<p><b>Metering Data- 1<sup>st</sup> Trial</b></p> <p><b>Use of Invenio Systems</b></p> <p><b>What we did:</b> We are looking into different ways of increasing our meter penetration and reducing PCC in our area of supply. A number of possibilities are being considered including a ‘Not for Revenue’ metering project. We are also going to discuss the possibility of change of occupier metering and metering of void properties within a forthcoming Customer Advisory Panel.</p> <p><b>How we did it:</b> In order to develop our strategy we have conducted two small scale trials to help us assess the impact of communication on meter uptake rates, benefits of delivering a targeted campaign Vs random selection and increasing our understanding of why customers resist metering.</p> <p><b>Aim:</b> To provide customers with consumption information to encourage them to switch to a measured charge.</p>		<p>We promoted metering over the phone to customers who we determined were likely to save money by switching their charging basis to measured, based on the number of occupiers in the property. From these conversations, we kept a record of those customers who we were confident would save money, but were not keen to switch to a measured charge.</p> <p>From this exercise, we identified 61 customers who we believed would save money on a water meter. We wrote to them advising a device was going to be fitted, and then proceeded to install the Invenio Systems device on the external stopcock. Our analysis showed that on average, 24 customers would save money based on their Portsmouth Water bill alone, 35 customers would save money based on their Southern Water bill alone and 32 customers would save on their combined bills.</p> <p>Only two customers had contacted us but to discuss the high consumption levels recorded. No customers have opted for a water meter.</p>		<p>Following the outcome of the trial we wanted to understand why customers continued to resist metering, even though just over half of customers would save money by switching. We undertook an activity to engage with the top 10 customers, who would save money.</p>				
<p><b>Metering- 2<sup>nd</sup> Trial</b></p> <p><b>Gosport Metering Project</b></p> <p><b>What we did:</b> Dumb meters installed on external stopcocks at 52 properties.</p> <p><b>How we did it:</b> Reviewed areas where mains renewals have recently taken place and identify 60 properties for meters to be installed. No prior communication with customers and no assessment of customer type made when selecting roads.</p> <p><b>Aim:</b></p>		<p>The meters were read on 19 December and we conducted some analysis taking into account the variance of water use throughout the year. Our analysis showed that on average 30 customers would save money on their combined Portsmouth Water and Southern Water bills. We are currently in the process of designing customer communication to advice customers of our findings and will track the response rate received.</p>						

<p><b>To install meters at properties where mains renewals had taken place and communicate usage information to encourage customers to switch to a measured supply.</b></p>								
<p><b>Interruptions to Water Supply, survey 1</b></p> <p><b>What we did:</b> We sent out a questionnaire, by post, to customers who may have experienced an outage for a period of time whether it was planned or unplanned. This was also sent by Survey Monkey as an online questionnaire. We had 4 replies in writing and 15 replies online. Not all online replies were completed.</p> <p><b>Aim:</b> To understand if we are doing enough for our customers in a planned and unplanned interruption to their supply. And to see if the way we communicate the interruption needs to change. We also want to know if an outage really does affect them, during and after it has happened.</p> <p><b>(Appendix 2.18)</b></p>	<p>4 people replied to say they did experience an interruption to their supply and they did notice the water was off however didn’t cause them and disruption with their daily routine.</p> <p>4 people said they were aware that the water was turned off. We then asked on the paper survey if this interruption disrupted their daily routine or cause you any problems, and 4 people said ‘No’.</p> <p>4 people said there were no issues with the water supply after water was turned back on.</p> <p>3 people said that 2-3 hours is acceptable to have the water off for. 1 person said more than 3 hours is acceptable. Online, 6 people said more than 3 hours. 4 people said between 2-3 hours. 3 people between -2 hours and 2 people said under 1 hour.</p> <p>Online there is 14 people who said they had experience an interruption to their water supply and 1 person who said they hadn’t.</p> <p>Online, there were 14 people who said they did realise the water was turned off.</p> <p>Online, 14 people said they had no issues after the water was turned back on. Nobody said ‘Yes’.</p> <p>Online we asked if the issue was resolves quickly and effectively. This was also not well received. 12 people said ‘N/A’ and 1 person said ‘No’. Nobody said ‘Yes’.</p>	<p>Online we asked if by having the water turned off, did this disrupt their daily routine or cause them any problems. 13 people said no and 1 person said yes. The question was asked again. Unfortunately when this survey was sent out it should have been proof read as it appears the same questions are asked again in a different way. The second time they answered, there were 6 people who said ‘Yes’ it did interrupt their daily routine and 9 people said ‘No’.</p> <p>In the event of an unplanned interruption 3 people said It would disrupt their daily routine and 1 person said it didn’t.</p>		<p>1 person also said they like the idea of a text service in a planned and unplanned interruption to their service.</p> <p>3 people felt that a representative was needed on site to answer queries in an emergency. And the other 2 felt it wasn’t needed. Online, 9 people said ‘Yes’ and 5 said ‘No’.</p> <p>Online, we asked if the information about the interruption was on our website. If they used the website did they find it with ease and suitable. 10 people said ‘N/A’ as they may have not looked online. 2 people said ‘Yes’ and 1 person said ‘No’.</p> <p>5 people replied to say that in an interruption to supply and in an unplanned interruption they prefer a card through the door opposed to a phone call/text service/email/social media, website or in person.</p> <p>2 people said they also like a phone call in both unplanned and planned interruptions.</p> <p>In an unplanned interruption 1 person said they would like someone there in person to communicate.</p> <p>All 15 people replied online to say they prefer an emergency warning card opposed to other methods of communication in a planned interruption. In an emergency 13 people said a card through the door, 1 said telephone and 1 said text service.</p>				<p>1 person felt the need to compliment on the gangs work as he felt they worked really hard and was very impressed.</p> <p>5 people felt they trusted us a supplier. Online, 14 people said ‘Yes’ they do trust us and 1 person said ‘No’.</p> <p>Online we asked who the interruption affected. This question didn’t seem well responded too. 11 people said ‘N/A’ and 1 person said ‘Me’. The other 3 people didn’t reply.</p>
<p><b>Future Issues; Resilience, metering &amp; the environment- Working with local schools</b></p> <p><b>We have been working with local schools (Havant Academy, The Cowplain School, Ark Charter Academy) and asked students in year 10 and 11 to complete water diaries to monitor their usage. We</b></p>		<p>-The children at Havant Academy believe that there is a moderate chance that there will not be sufficient supplies of water in the next 25 years with an average importance score of 6 out of 10.</p> <p>-52% of the children believe that future bill payers (themselves) should pay for future resources whilst a</p>	<p>-When voting at the end of the workshop with Charter Academy there were 17 votes towards improving leakage. This was the second highest option compared to a reservoir, metering and desalination plant.</p>	<p>-On average the children were willing to pay £50 on top of the average bill to secure future supplied, although there was a wide range of responses.</p> <p>-Charter Academy were asked who should pay for increasing water needed in the future. Before the workshop all of the pupils said it should be a mixture of current and future customers. Compared to Meoncross school who felt it should</p>	<p>-It is a priority that the water we abstract does not damage the environment with an average importance score of 9 out of 10.</p> <p>-Pupils at Charter Academy felt that before the workshop that the environment is very important and the water</p>			

<p>also asked them how they would improve the amount of water we have in the South region. Soon after the water diaries were completed we visited each school and held a workshop with the students to educate them on the environment and how we are resilient with our water supply. We then asked them the same questions as what they completed in their water diary again at the end of the workshop to see if their informed views have changed their answers.</p> <p><b>Aim:</b> We want to be able to educate our future generation into the importance of being resilient and where their water comes from. But also understand how they feel about the importance of the environment and ways we can ensure we have a sufficient supply of water in the future.</p> <p>(Appendix 2.12, 2.13)</p>		<p>further 25% believe a mix would be appropriate.</p> <p>-The average score before the workshop with Charter Academy school was 4.8 pupils who felt that there will not be sufficient water available in this area in 25 years’ time. After workshop this went up to 6.8 as the average score.</p> <p>-The Cowplain School scored 5 (from 1 to 10) when asked if they think there is any risk that we will not have sufficient water available for this area in 25 years. The student’s acknowledged there is a moderate risk. After the workshop we discussed potential ways to be resilient and they said we should focus on metering and having a reservoir.</p> <p>The Cowplain School were asked before the workshop what options they would propose to ensure we have enough water for future generations. They voted for ‘water efficiency’ as the best method. After a more informed lesson they voted again. This turn it was voted that metering would be the best option (47%) followed by reservoir (32%), then leakage (19%) and lastly desalination (2%).</p>		<p>be all future customers. After the workshop there was then a mix of answers but still leading was ‘mixed customers’.</p> <p>-Charter Academy were also asked how much customers should pay extra to make sure we have enough water in the future. Based on the average bill at £100. Before the workshop pupils were quite unsure with the average amount being £29. After the workshop and they had a more informed choice the average amount came out at £6.</p> <p>The Cowplain School were asked how much they would pay for increasing water needed in the future. They believed that the bill should go up for both current and future customers.</p> <p>When The Cowplain school were asked how much extra customers should pay they agreed that current customers should pay less at an average cost of around £28.80. Whereas future customers should pay more at an average cost of around £42.40 on top of their current bill.</p>	<p>we take does not harm it with a score of 8.8. This went up marginally after the workshop to 9.1.</p> <p>-The pupils at Charter were asked at the end of the workshop to vote for their favourite option to water scarcity and ensuring we have enough for future demand. Overall the highest at 60 votes is a reservoir (Havant Thicket). Leakage at 17 votes and Metering at 9 votes. This is assumed to be linked to the preference for more environmentally friendly options.</p> <p>-Pupils understood that climate change and population growth were contributing factors towards not having enough water supply for future demand.</p> <p>The Cowplain school scored a 10 when we asked them how important is it that the water we take does not harm the environment.</p>			
<p><b>Havant Thicket stakeholders</b></p> <p><b>What we did:</b> There were two types of engagement planned. The first was aimed at stakeholders such as regulators, local authorities and environmental NGO’s. And secondly we spoke with over 2100 customers of ours through an online survey.</p> <p>We also have research on what Southern Water propose to be doing going forward with the help of Havant Thicket.</p> <p>(Appendix 2.20)</p>		<p>There was general support for Havant Thicket: An asset for the local community – green infrastructure.</p> <p>Good to share resource within the region</p> <p>Enhances overall resilience to drought</p> <p>Asked questions on whether Havant Thicket will attract visitors to the area And if it can be used for recreational use? Also questioned how will any facilities be funded?</p> <p>When asked if they supported our plans to build Havant Thicket reservoir as a regional water source and facility, 87%</p>		<p>The key questions around cost/funding of Havant Thicket were:</p> <p>-Clarity as to who is paying for the reservoir</p> <p>-What if Southern change its requirements?</p> <p>-What is the impact on Portsmouth Water customers?</p>	<p>Worried about the impact of the reservoir and pipelines on existing environment.</p> <p>Said Havant Thicket is an important freshwater habitat for birds.</p> <p>Views that there would be an impact of increased traffic in the area and impact on local housing both short and longer term.</p> <p>Environmental expectations for Havant Thicket are that we create woodland connectivity, extend areas of parkland, restore native woodland, create a</p>			

		<p>said ‘yes’ they are happy with this and only a small 2% said ‘no’. 11% said ‘don’t know’.</p> <p>When asked if they support our plans to share water with our neighbours, 80% said ‘yes’ they do support it and 8% said ‘no’. 12% said ‘don’t know’.</p> <p>Our key stakeholder is Southern Water who provide waste water to our area of supply. However, we also supply them with fresh water. They propose they will increase the bulk supply to our Hampshire zones from Portsmouth water company from 15 MI/d to 24 MI/d (+9 MI/d from their network).</p> <p>But once Havant Thicket is built Southern Water propose they will Take a further bulk supply from PWC to SWS Hants zones following the completion of Havant Thicket (+21MI/d on average).</p>			mosaic of habitats and create a new wetland edge & open water habitat.			
<p><b>Developers Research</b></p> <p><b>In April 2016 Community Research Ltd was appointed to carry out research with our developers. This was to elicit satisfaction ratings and actionable insights about their experience of dealing with Portsmouth Water, throughout the lifecycle of development.</b></p> <p><b>The fieldwork took place over three weeks in April 2016. Followed by a 2<sup>nd</sup> report done in March 2017 and then a 3<sup>rd</sup> report done in April 2018.</b></p> <p><b>Participants from the developer’s community were recruited from a list that we gave them. This included large and small building companies, self-lay organisations and consultants. Contacts from 9 difference organisations were interviewed.</b></p> <p><b>Aim:</b> <b>Our aim was to understand what our developers need from us to enable them to do a better job.</b></p> <p><b>(Appendix 2.2, 2.5 &amp; 2.19)</b></p>	<p>-A request from a major housebuilder for Portsmouth Water to supply pressure information in bar at that capacity enquiry stage, which is important when planning three-storey houses.</p> <p>-Would like water pressures to be shown in ‘Bar’ as it makes a difference when building three-storey houses.</p>			<p>-Overall view was positive with 8 out of 9 developers reporting to be ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’. This result exceeds our 70% satisfaction target set out in the ODI.</p> <p>-Ease of communicating with PW at all 3 stages of development process drives satisfaction levels, recognising we are a small organisation who gives personal service.</p> <p>-Looking ahead- we should look to streamline the application forms and amalgamate into batches for larger developments.</p> <p>-Praised for providing contacts of our whole team to one developer.</p> <p>-A lot more approachable than other water companies and helpful.</p> <p>-Always had good service and said that we are more old-fashioned traditional companies.</p> <p>-Would like response times quicker.</p> <p>- The costs at all stages of the process were generally felt to be in line with, or slightly below, those of other water companies.</p> <p>-In 2017 survey satisfaction levels were slightly lower than the 2016 survey. We still passed our 70% target set out in the ODI. This was in terms of delays to disconnection of temporary supplies and issues with the installation of new meters.</p>			<p>-All of those who had knowledge of Portsmouth Water’s conduct on site said that the company always complies with site Health &amp; Safety requirements, with staff wearing the correct PPE.</p> <p>-2017 survey reported that PW conduct themselves appropriately 80% of the time. Tidiness could be improved and clocking in and out of the site.</p>	<p>-Two developers mention that PW team have previously let them down during construction/commissioning.</p> <p>-One developer was worried about upcoming retirements as communication and advice is so good that they were worried it wouldn’t continue.</p> <p>-Quality of work is not as good as customer service in the office. Ask for a supervisor to attend as they have to supervise our contractors to do work they paid for.</p> <p>-Would like us to stay on site to get the work completed as it causes delays when we are called off site.</p>



				<p>-2017 survey shows that communication could be better as we have had retirements/personnel changes.</p> <p>-2017 survey shows that Terms &amp; Conditions found to be clear, issued within an acceptable timeframe and reasonable in terms of cost.</p> <p>- There was mention that Wessex Water provides a faster and cheaper service.</p> <p>- With a few exceptions, the costs at all stages of the process were generally felt to be in line with those of other water companies. Although reported that Thames Water are not charging for a mains application at the moment and Wessex Water had lower costs at the initial stages of a capacity enquiry.</p> <p>-Nobody from PW asks for feedback after they have finished. Also would like more senior people to visit the site to see how it is getting on.</p>				
<p><b>Retailers survey</b></p> <p>A questionnaire was sent out by Survey Monkey to a group of 9 retailers. We wanted to find out if they had any priorities or concerns regarding wholesale services from our company and any improvements that could be made.</p> <p>We received 3 responses.</p> <p>(Appendix 2.23)</p>	<p>We asked if the retailers had done any work with customers to understand their priorities and concerns regarding the wholesale services received from us or generally. One retailer replied to say that customers are keen to ensure that the supply of water to their business is clean and secure, as water is a key part of their business.</p> <p>-Another replied to say that regarding wholesale services they would like timey responses that are accurate/high quality. They say that delayed responses are a key contributor to unwanted contact.</p>			<p>We asked if PW bilateral portal provide easy visibility of the information they require. All 3 retailers said ‘Yes’.</p> <p>-SWIM Pool is one retailers preferred option for interacting with wholesalers as it provides direct B2B communication. They said they generally do not like to use Wholesaler portals as this involves re-keying/manual effort.</p> <p>-Another person also felt the SWIM pool option was the best.</p> <p>We asked them at times of unplanned and planned interruption, have retailers found the information provided by PW sufficient for them to communicate effectively with their customers. This was a split answer. 1 person said ‘Yes’, 1 person said ‘No’ and another said ‘Don’t Know’.</p> <p>-One retailer said they would prefer proactive (outbound/push) communications that are specific to their SPIDs/customers only. Also with clear information as to the nature, impact and any actions required from them as a retailer.</p> <p>-Another retailer commented by saying they have always been kept well updated by PW, particularly regarding customers using large amounts of water in their area.</p> <p>We also asked if there are any services, either free or chargeable that you value that are offered by other wholesalers but not PW. Again</p>				<p>We asked if our Wholesale service desk is working effectively to allow them to provide high levels of customer service. All 3 retailers said ‘yes’ and no comments were made.</p> <p>We also asked if retailers had any issues with the settlement process where PW has been at fault. All 3 retailers said ‘No’.</p> <p>We asked if they found any issues with the quality of the data that PW has supplied to MOSL, either as part of our initial data upload or on an ongoing basis. 1 retailer said ‘No’ and the other 2 retailers said ‘Don’t Know’.</p> <p>When asked if they would like to see PW offer an Accredited Entities Scheme for the activities identified in the Code, 2 retailers said ‘Yes’ and 1 said ‘No’.</p>

				<p>this was a split answer. 1 retailer said ‘Yes’ 1 retailer said ‘No’ and 1 said ‘Don’t Know’.</p> <p>-One retailer said that Non Primary charges and policies across all wholesalers need more standardisation as it's confusing for customers not dealing with just one retailer.</p> <p>-Another retailer said that they are not aware of PW doing a meter reading service.</p> <p>We asked If retailers have any issues with the design or structure of our wholesale tariffs. 1 retailer said ‘Yes’ 1 said ‘No’ and the other said ‘Don’t Know’.</p> <p>-1 retailer said wholesale charges need standardisation.</p>				
<p><b>Community Research- Qualitative Research with Non-Household Customers</b></p> <p><b>What we did:</b> We had community research done for us to reach out to several high non-household water users and water critical small businesses and asked them about our outcomes and performance commitments. There were 14 Non-Household customers who took part in the survey.</p> <p><b>Aim:</b> We wanted to explore a set of draft outcomes and performance commitments intended to inform our business plan for 2020-2025.</p> <p>(Appendix 2.21)</p>	<p>Almost all participants regarded a ‘safe, secure, reliable water supply’ as the most important outcome for Portsmouth Water to deliver.</p> <p>Participants were impressed by the minutes lost to supply interruptions being set at 4 minutes. However, many didn’t pick up that this was based on an average.</p>	<p>The third most important outcome voted by participants is: Long term resilience of Portsmouth Water’s own supplies for Portsmouth Water’s customers and to support the South East of England.</p> <p>The potential development of Havant Thicket winter storage reservoir was not widely known amongst participants. Developing the capacity to share water supplies with other water companies was widely supported.</p> <p>A performance commitment around smart metering was welcomed. Had also suggested compulsory metering of all domestic customers to reduce consumption.</p> <p>Growers have an eye for the future and asked us to consider rain water harvesting with them to help them save more water as they are high water users.</p>	<p>Participants said that ‘Low Leakage’ is their second most important outcome.</p> <p>Whilst, participants found the current level of leakage surprising they were not unduly concerned and most accepted the performance commitment to reduce leakage by 15% from 2019/20.</p> <p>Several highlighted that targets need to be achievable as well as challenging.</p>	<p>Many participants suggested that their organisation’s water bill was dwarfed by their energy costs but they were still very conscious of the cost of water.</p>	<p>Participants voted this as the fourth most important outcome: An improved environment supporting biodiversity.</p>	<p>Participants were most dismissive of the outcome ‘being recognised by the community as a good corporate citizen’. This is apparently not as relevant as the others.</p>	<p>Almost all participants were dismissive of the outcomes relating to a ‘culture of health and safety’. This is apparently not as relevant as the others.</p>	<p>With the opening up of the retail market several participants said that they found it confusing and inconvenient.</p>
<p><b>ICS Quantitative Research- Performance commitments &amp; stretched targets</b></p> <p><b>What we did:</b> ICS Consulting received 411 responses to the survey they carried out. The results are based on data weighted to reflect the</p>		<p>Temporary usage bans (17.3% for a target of no bans) had lowest level of disagreement.</p> <p>Optional metering received the highest support (just over 7 in 10 supporting), with change of occupier lowest (just over 6 in 10 supporting).</p>		<p>Affordability was also voted the lowest level of disagreement (17.4%).</p> <p>Addressing vulnerability was also voted low (14.5%).</p> <p>And 4<sup>th</sup> most common reason to trust PW is that PW keep bills low.</p>			<p>Award of RoSPA was also voted very low (15.8%)</p>	<p>The highest ‘Don’t Knows’ were: Void properties (27.5%), AIM (27.1%), D-Mex (27.1%). These are less familiar with customers and this likely to be reflected in a higher proportion of ‘Don’t Knows’.</p> <p>There is a very high level of trust in PW continuing to</p>

<p>demographics of the Portsmouth Water are by age, gender and SEG.</p> <p>Aim: The main focus was to assess levels of customer support for Portsmouth Water’s proposed PC targets for the 2020-25 period. This was a follow up survey to the main PC/ODI customer research carried out in May 2018.</p> <p>(Appendix 2.24)</p>		<p>PW’s plans for managing future water supplies was the 3<sup>rd</sup> most common reason to trust PW.</p>						<p>supply households with high quality drinking water over the next 25 years.</p> <p>About 84% of respondents said they had complete trust in or mostly trusted PW.</p> <p>12.5% expressed neither trust nor distrust and only 1.2% expressed any level of distrust.</p> <p>Factors that made them trust PW are for example never having to experience any issues with their water services. The 2<sup>nd</sup> most commonly selected response was PW being a local company.</p>
<p><b>Water Resources Management Plan Consultation (WRMP)</b></p> <p>What we did: Sent out email with link to survey on the Draft Water Resource Management Plan (DWRMP) to around 33,000 customers.</p> <p>This was sent by online survey to get as many responses back to see if we need to adjust our plan for final submission. We had 2084 back in total.</p> <p>(Appendix 2.20, 2.27)</p>		<p>Customers supportive of hosepipe bans during a drought but less supportive of stand posts. Only in severe droughts. (86% agreed on hosepipe bans)</p> <p>Metering understood and support was positive. The scheme with the most support was to install meters for information purposes.</p> <p>Change of occupancy metering and installing meters to all households in the area had slightly less support. Many of the customer comments said that metering should be a choice and not compulsory. The CAP (Customer Advisory Panel) also agreed on this.</p> <p>Many stakeholders feel that we should contact Defra to appeal compulsory metering in our area of supply.</p> <p>Most stakeholders said that Portsmouth Water’s target for reducing PCC by 140 l/h/d to 132 l/h/d is unambitious.</p> <p>94% agreed that it is important to use water efficiently.</p> <p>Generally supportive of ‘greywater-recycling’ systems in new homes.</p>	<p>Mixed feedback for leakage ambitions. 95% supported our plans to reduce leakage by 15% but another 10% felt we could do more. The CAP thought leakage should be our priority.</p>		<p>Environmental groups were mainly supportive of the development of Havant Thicket as it means that Southern Water will reduce their abstraction from the Rivers Itchen and Test.</p> <p>There were also comments about the positive effect on biodiversity such as freshwater birds. However, questions were raised about the loss of terrestrial habitat.</p> <p>It is evident from the customer comments that there is a consensus for environmental protection, particularly during the construction of the reservoir. There were concerns about the loss of habitat as a result of the flooding the thicket.</p> <p>Many people called for the relocation of animal species and replanting woodland before construction takes place to mitigate environmental impacts.</p> <p>Customers asked about any emergency plans that will be put into place</p>	<p>Customers are most excited about the benefits that the reservoir would provide for the local community. This includes using the water for water sports, wildlife benefits and somewhere to walk and ride bikes. The CAP expressed a desire for ‘low-key’ amenities such as walks and cafes.</p>		<p>When asked if they trust us to continue to supply your drinking water for the next 25 years, 97% said ‘yes’ and only 3% said ‘no’.</p>

		<p>84% of customers surveyed supported our plans to provide an enhanced groundwater source but require more information or uncertain of what this is.</p> <p>In regards to the Havant Thicket reservoir, 80% of customers supported the development plans and a large proportion of customer comments were in favour of the reservoir. However, there were a number of uncertain customers.</p> <p>Some councils wanted reassurance that the cost of developing the reservoir and its operation will not have an impact on customer bills. They do, however, as do the company, recognise that the reservoir is an important resource to enhance regional resilience and that it will provide environmental benefits.</p> <p>Many of our customers have been following the development of Havant Thicket for many years and were keen for work to begin as soon as possible.</p> <p>When asked if they support our approach to providing your water supplies in the future, 83% said ‘yes’.</p>			<p>should the reservoir banks fail or it should overflow.</p> <p>Councils welcomed the proposal as it helps to ensure the security of future water supplies but were concerned about the effect that the visitors may have on the local road infrastructure, in particular, the volume of traffic.</p> <p>Some customers raised questions about the construction of pipelines, the impacts that this may have on the environment and disruption to infrastructure.</p> <p>Councils also questioned the effect that the pipeline may have on safeguarding of land and the impact that this would have on proposed developments.</p>			
<p><b>Bill Profiling &amp; Company Specific premium</b></p> <p><b>What we did:</b> ICS Consulting have conducted a further survey on our bill level and how we finance the business. It summarises how we should factor in small company premium, pay as you go and bill profile. There were four focus groups (31 people in total) undertaken in July 2018, and lasted 90 minutes. Reps from South East Water and our Customer Challenge Group also attended to oversee.</p> <p>(Appendix 2.26)</p>		<p>Some customers felt that we should take out another loan at a better rate to finance resilience. Also said about borrowing off someone else, like when you move your cards around.</p> <p>Said there is no incentive to pay of the scheme early as we will be penalised.</p> <p>Most people felt it was a sensible strategy to pay more now for future water supply security.</p>		<p>Generally happy with the average bill at £100 and quite ‘smug’ compared to other bills. Said it is good value for money.</p> <p>Satisfied they receive a low bill and good customer service. Said that you wouldn’t normally get that.</p> <p>Felt they get a better service with a smaller company.</p> <p>Majority of the people surveyed agreed with the small company premium and that they were happy to pay £0.80 to cover this. Felt like it wasn’t much at all and happy to absorb this cost.</p> <p>Felt it was a bit harsh that smaller companies have to pay more interest. And also felt that out</p>		<p>Most of the people surveys had little idea about the community activities that we do.</p> <p>Majority were impressed that we had employed a vulnerability officer to support customers in vulnerable circumstances.</p> <p>Mixes views on the extent to how the Priorities Services register should be communicated. Said it seems pointless if not many people using it. However, some said if we were to promote it more then we use more resource, time and money. We also don’t want people to abuse the system. There needs to be a fine balance.</p>		<p>Surprised by the size of area we supply.</p> <p>Feel that by being part of a smaller company employees will have a sense of being part of a family.</p> <p>Agreed you get a more personal service with us being a small company.</p> <p>Local knowledge is beneficial.</p> <p>With us being a small company there are views that there is likelihood of less bureaucracy.</p>



				<p>company longevity should count for something.</p> <p>People reasoned that because we provide upper quartile service that an extra 80p was not an issue.</p> <p>Zero appetite to lose the 80p extra on the bills if it meant merging with another company.</p> <p>Felt it was impressive that we have the lowest bills in the country whilst still having to pay this premium and simultaneously achieving high levels of service.</p> <p>Customers prepared to add an extra £1.00 to bill over the next 5 years to generate some revenue to invest into the business.</p> <p>Although customers appreciated the bill decreasing by £1.00 due to being penalised for water quality they also felt that because we are locked into the loan we are being penalised twice. Which in turn could harm the level of service.</p> <p>A strong sense that we need to invest into our services to avoid problems in the longer term and cost more to fix then.</p> <p>When people realised that their water bills were going to reduce in real terms, people were very pleasantly surprised, especially ‘in a world where everything is going up’.</p>		<p>Views were it was quite good we don’t always should about what good things we have done as it would seem pretentious.</p>		<p>Disadvantage of being a small company that they felt we would have less money for resources &amp; development. Large companies can also achieve greater economy of scale in regard to price &amp; purchasing power.</p> <p>Views were that employees would feel more involved in the business if we all are working together.</p>
<p><b>Customer Affordability Survey</b></p> <p><b>What we did:</b> We sent a survey out to 200 of our customers. Half were shown as having arrears on their account with us and the other half were previously in arrears with us. The survey asks questions on affordability so we can understand their needs more, and help us to improve the way we handle customers who find themselves financially vulnerable. There were 92 people who responded overall from both groups.</p> <p>Secondary engagement was also done where we emailed half of the people who responded with</p>		<p>There was 59.52% that agreed they would have a water meter if it would save them money.</p> <p>When asked if they are aware of the savings from having a water meter, most of the people we asked said they were not. We understand their needs to be more meter promotion to this demographic.</p>		<p>34.12% who have a household income of less than £10,000. Followed closely behind with 28.24% who have a household income between £10,000 &amp; £20,000 per annum.</p> <p>When asked how they find budgeting their finances, 51.16% say that they find it hard to budget but 50% find it easy.</p> <p>However, when asked how they feel budgeting for our bill, the results shows that 74.42% say that they do struggle to budget for our bill compared to 25.58% who don’t.</p> <p>A lot of people made comments to say they would like us to provide more information on the tariffs/schemes we offer to help</p>		<p>When asked if they thought we were helpful &amp; considerate, 90.91% of the people said we are.</p> <p>One particular customer commentated to say they felt non-judged due to a mental illness &amp; that we were informative. This is great to know that we are helping our most vulnerable customers.</p>		<p>No replies from the secondary engagement.</p>

<p>information on the social tariff and metering.</p> <p>How we did it: Online through Survey Monkey Emailing directly</p> <p>Aim: To understand what our financially vulnerable customers need from us and to inform them on the schemes we do to help them to save money.</p> <p>(Appendix 2.14)</p>				<p>them save money and information on metering.</p> <p>From the small percentage that said we are not helpful &amp; considerate they suggest they may have felt that way because we did not help them or explain the reasons behind the bill prices.</p> <p>The results show that most of our customers (80.68%) would choose to communicate through email, followed by telephone call (38.64%) and Live Chat (26.14%).</p> <p>Direct Debit (65.12%) is the most preferred payment option followed by going to a PayPoint outlet (19.77%).</p> <p>69.32% of the customers that were asked had not heard of the schemes we offer to help with the affordability of their bill with us. And that 81.61% of our customers are not on the schemes that we offer.</p> <p>When asked about the value of our bill, they feel our bills are acceptable and very good value for money. Not one person felt that it was of poor value, however 51.16% could not decide on whether our bill is of good or bad value.</p>				
<p><b>Metering Option Feedback</b></p> <p>What we did: Feedback cards were given out after every meter installation. The data has been analysed from August 2015 to present. The feedback cards collected information about how the service was overall.</p> <p>How we did it: Feedback cards were distributed by Cappagh when meters are installed.</p> <p>Aim: Our aim was to understand how our contractors are performing and if customers are generally satisfied with the meter installation.</p>				<p>From August 2015 to present we have had 612 customers say that the information that was given was satisfactory. Whereas only 10 said it wasn't.</p> <p>Customers were also asked if their standard of service was either good, poor or acceptable. 595 customers voted good, 6 voted poor and 23 voted it acceptable.</p>		<p>Customers were asked if their meter number and reading was given when the meter was installed. 591 customers said they did get the information, whereas 26 said that had not.</p> <p>Customers were also asked if they requested an appointment, was it kept too. There were many times this question would not be applicable however 313 of our customers said it was kept, and 6 said it wasn't.</p>	<p>Our customer were asked if the work that was done when fitting a water meter, was done in a neat and tidy manner. There have been 610 customers who agreed it was left neat and tidy, but 6 who said it wasn't.</p>	
<p><b>Interruptions to Supply, survey 2</b></p> <p>What we did: We put a survey online for our customers to fill out who may have</p>	<p>Most of the people that answered (81%) said that they did have a disruption to their water supply or water pressure on that day.</p> <p>Only 6% said it caused problems in the long term (beyond 4 hours)</p>			<p>84% of the customers who responded felt that social media i.e. Twitter would be the best way to communicate with us about an unplanned interruption to their supply. Followed by our website at 55% and a text service at 45%. An</p>				<p>A fantastic result is that all 35 people who completed the questionnaire said they trusted us as their water supplier.</p>

<p>been effected by the interruption to their supply after the bad weather we had at the beginning of March. With the temperature changing so dramatically there was a large amount of bursts and low pressure calls. We wanted to ask those customers how they felt we performed at this time and if there is more we can do to communicate in an emergency better.</p> <p>35 Customers responded.</p> <p>How we did it: Online survey</p> <p>Aim: To understand how we perform at a time of high interruptions to customers supplies and understand if we can communicate more effectively.</p> <p>(Appendix 2.15)</p>				<p>emergency warning card is only at 19%.</p> <p>When asked how they would choose to contact us, again most people said through social media (32%) followed by text service at 29%.</p> <p>All 35 people (100%) of the customers who responded to the questionnaire said that they felt our online and social media communication was suitable and helpful to them.</p> <p>When our customer are asked how they think we communicated with them on the Saturday, we had some interesting responses. The great outcome is that 61% sad we were ‘very good’ and 23% said ‘good’. However, there were 6% that said just ‘ok’ and 10% who said there could be ‘some improvement’.</p>				
<p><b>Low Water Pressure</b></p> <p>The Company has a register of properties that are continually at risk of receiving low water pressure. We currently have 70 properties on our ‘at risk of low pressure’ register.</p> <p>A telephone survey was undertaken of customers who have properties at risk of receiving low pressure. Of the 70 properties on the register, we attempted to make contact with 55 (79%). The survey was undertaken to ascertain the appetite of customers, who regularly receive reduced pressure, for Portsmouth Water to undertake works that would enhance their water pressure.</p> <p>The customers were informed that works to enhance the pressure were subject to survey, but may require some installations (booster pump sets) internal to the property. They were advised that for any internal installations, Portsmouth Water would fund the initial installation cost, and the customer would be responsible for the ongoing running and maintenance costs.</p>	<p>Results from the survey of the benefit for us to undertake work to enhance their pressure (see below results out of 55 properties contacted):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Yes, they would be interested- 16 (29%)</li><li>• Yes, they would be interested (subject to survey)-22 (40%)</li><li>• No, they are happy with existing water pressure-3 (5%)</li><li>• No, they would not be interested-8 (15%)</li><li>• No answer (did not answer or number not in use)-6 (11%)</li></ul>							

<div>(Appendix 2.25)</div> <div>Adoption of supply pipes</div> <div><div>What we did:</div><div>Looked at research online by Defra &amp; the Welsh Government (2013-14). Then followed up by looking at UKWIR research on the customer view to supply pipe ownership.</div><div>How we did it:</div><div>Online research and report research.</div><div>Aim:</div><div>Our aim to find out if the adoption of customers supply pipe is an achievable way to reduce leakage and improve water quality. To also understand if there is a need for this or whether metering and reducing leakage should be our number one priority.</div></div>	<div>Overall, the level of service expected was higher in an emergency than in a non-emergency situation across all audiences.</div> <div>In an emergency most customers (household, business and other affected parties) said they expect water to be there in 3 hours. They were expecting resolution time within 48 hours in an emergency and up to 7 days in a non-emergency.</div> <div>Overall, most of the customer agreed that water quality and leakage would be improved with the transfer. They also felt that the speed and quality of repairs would be improved with the transfer. Other parties had a divided opinion on that the speed and quality of repairs would be improved with their transfer of ownership/responsibility. They felt their current approach was better, which may have incorporated a ‘call out’ response by a maintenance team.</div>	<div>Suggested alternatives:</div> <div>Increased use of metering and/or smart metering.</div>	<div>Some felt that the transfer to move across the responsibility of such pipes removes the burden from property owners.</div> <div>The potential transfer of ownership/responsibility was well received and acceptance of the arrangement compared to the status quo increased significantly across all audiences (56% of householders, 60% of businesses and 68% of other affected parties felt the proposed change would be acceptable).</div> <div>A third of businesses (33%) and 43% of other affected parties preferred the current situation.</div> <div>Respondents cited various reasons why this is not a suitable long term approach, including lack of consumer awareness about their responsibilities, the importance of addressing water quality and a view that the current approach does not prioritise addressing leakage and manage it in a systematic way or address the growing pressure on water resources.</div> <div>They felt that it would be better to focus on installation of water meters to enable leaks to be detected and dealt with quicker, and to look at addressing leakage from internal taps and toilets.</div>	<div>On average householders &amp; private landlords were accepting of a similar charge per year on top of their bills (9.39 and £11.34 per year on average). Businesses on average would pay an additional 4.3% per year on top of their bills.</div> <div>What was also important to consider is that not just the average amount each audience was prepared to pay but the proportion who found the price acceptable. Only 50% of households would accept an increase of £9 per year or more. A more acceptable charge would be £4 per year.</div>	<div>Most felt the transfer would mean property owners have no control over water companies digging up on their property.</div>	<div>Awareness about who was currently responsible for the supply pipe was mixed, particularly among householders and business. If there is a transfer of ownership/responsibility it will be news to many and so this would need to be handled sensitively in any communication.</div> <div>Communication was expected via a multi-channel campaign to ensure that everyone has the opportunity to hear about it.</div>		<div>Householders felt it was unfair that the policy was different between regions for the current situation of offering a supply pipe repair.</div>
<div>ICS Acceptance Testing</div> <div><div>What we did:</div><div>This report presents the findings of customer acceptability testing of Portsmouth Water’s (PW) PR19 Business Plan for the 2020-2025 period.</div><div>The findings are based on an online quantitative survey of over 500 household customers served by PW. The survey was developed in consultation with PW and the</div></div>		<div>Customers are supportive of the Havant Thicket Storage reservoir proposal.</div>		<div>84.3% acceptability of the PW plan - service commitments and bills (before the effects of inflation). Acceptability is highest for the AB group (90.6%) and is 84.9% for the lowest DE group.</div> <div>80.4% acceptability of the PW plan - service commitments and bills (with the effects of inflation). Acceptability with inflation remains highest for the AB group (84.7%) and was 80.1% for the DE group.</div>				<div>Acceptability of the PW plan after respondents were informed about sewerage bill changes remained high, but did demonstrate larger sensitivity to any potential increase in Southern Water’s sewerage bills.</div>



<p>company’s Customer Challenge Group (CCG).</p> <p>The survey fieldwork was conducted over the period 9<sup>th</sup> August 2018 to 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2018 &amp; the survey responses are weighted by age, gender, and SEG.</p> <p>(Appendix 2.28)</p>				<p>84.3% acceptability of the proposed Incentives (rewards/penalty) package.</p> <p>A majority of customers prefer a flat bill profile for 2020-25 and are also very supportive of stable flat bills to 2030.</p> <p>Customers are very supportive of paying a company specific premium in recognition of Portsmouth Water’s higher borrowing costs as a small water only company.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--