



ANGLIAN WATER INDEPENDENT CHALLENGE GROUP

MINUTES

Date: 17 March 2023
Time: 13:30 to 17:30
Location: Via Teams

- Present:**
- Craig Bennett – Chair (M)
 - Gill Holmes – CCW (M)
 - Peter Holt – Chief Executive, Uttlesford District Council
 - Joanne Lancaster – MD, Huntingdonshire District Council/Independent (M)
 - Paul Metcalfe – MD, PJM Economics (M)
 - Sarah Powell – Environment Agency (M)
 - Nathan Richardson – Waterwise/Blueprint for Water (M)
 - Sarah Thomas – CCW (M)
 - John Vinson – CCW (O)

 - Peter Simpson – Chief Executive, Anglian Water
 - Peter Holland – Director of Customer and Wholesale Services, Anglian Water
 - Amanda Markwardt – Director of Economics and Engagement, ICS Consulting (for agenda item 3)
 - Arun Pontin – Regulatory Policy Manager (for agenda item 3)
 - Darren Rice – Regulation Director, Anglian Water
 - Allan Simpson – Strategic Growth Manager, Anglian Water (for agenda item 2)
 - Emily Timmins – Director of Water Recycling (for agenda item 5)
 - Rachel Walters – PR24 Customer Engagement Lead, Anglian Water

 - Vicky Anning – Secretariat (O)

- Apologies:**
- Claire Higgins – Cross Keys Homes (M)
 - Justin Tilley – Natural England (M)
 - Richard Tunnicliffe – CBI (M)

Summary of actions

Action	Status
<i>Closed</i>	
RW to re-circulate customer segmentation information	Done
AW to circulate slides for Your Water Your Say	Done
RW to circulate additional slides from March meeting not shared in pre-reading	Complete
RW to add hyperlinks to Synthesis Report	Completed in March edition
<i>Open (new)</i>	
AP to circulate detailed wording from bespoke performance commitments	Pending
AW to share company performance dashboard	Pending
SP to share link to monitoring report on gov.uk (published 30 March)	Pending
JV to share outcomes of CCW workshop on environmental transparency	Pending
AW to provide regular update on pollution incident plan and <i>Get River Positive</i> , including information from recent parliamentary presentation	Ongoing/pending
ET to return to ICG in September with more detailed glide path	Pending
Hartlepool to be added as future agenda item for ICG	Pending
Site visit in relation to customer information around blockages TBC	Pending
ICG only meeting called for 17 May	Pending
<i>Open (carried over from previous meetings)</i>	
AW to share further information on smart meters and analysis on customer behaviour and water use this summer compared to other regions	Carried over; more details to follow
DR to follow up with JV about adaptive planning process	Pending
DR to follow up with Nathan regarding delay to draft WRMP and provide letter from Defra	Pending
PH/PS to follow up with Nathan around reducing NHH water use	Ongoing
ICG members to consider assurance role, build in sufficient time for assurance and consider role of external auditors	Ongoing
ICG members to consider what information they would like to see around DWMP and CSOs and how they would like it presented	Pending
CB/VA to discuss workplan/outputs	Ongoing

Meeting minutes

Item	Action
<p>1. <u>Welcome from Independent Challenge Group (ICG) Chair</u></p> <p>ICG Chair Craig Bennett introduced the virtual meeting, thanking Anglian Water (AW) colleagues for providing useful pre-reading materials.</p> <p>He started by welcoming Peter Holt as the newest ICG member. Peter introduced himself as Chief Executive of Uttlesford District Council in Essex.</p> <p>Peter will represent local government going forward as Joanne Lancaster has stood down from her role as Managing Director of Huntingdonshire District Council. She will remain on the ICG in an independent capacity.</p>	

Item		Action
	<p>Minutes from the 20 January ICG meeting were approved and adopted.</p> <p>Central Oversight Group (COG) update Craig reflected on the report recently published by CCW – Review of Independent Challenge Groups. He would be picking up on some of the points raised in the report, including suggestions relating to presentation of the challenge log. He was planning to draw on some of the lessons learned from the review at the ICG only session and hoped for a fuller discussion at a future meeting.</p> <p>In summary, he felt that AW’s ICG was comfortably within the zone of all the approaches and models outlined in the review. However, there were lots of interesting points raised that cast light on how the ICG might want to evolve the group and sharpen its focus, which would be good to discuss in more detail at a future date.</p> <p>Craig couldn’t attend the next COG meeting on 19 April and asked for volunteers. Paul Metcalfe offered to attend on CB’s behalf.</p> <p>Paul also offered to attend the CCW Triangulation meeting with Ofwat on 26 April, which was open to all ICG members.</p>	
2.	<p><u>Long-Term Delivery Strategy (LTDS)</u></p> <p>Allan Simpson – AW’s Long-Term Strategy Delivery Manager – gave an overview of developments regarding the Long-Term Delivery Strategy (LTDS).</p> <p>As a new requirement for this price review, the 25-year LTDS added a new level of complexity to the business planning and he was happy to meet members of the ICG to talk them through specific details.</p> <div data-bbox="352 1328 1206 1805" data-label="Diagram"> <p>Overview of our iterative approach to the Long-Term Delivery Strategy</p> <p>PR24 – Consultation Plan</p> <p>WRMP/DWMP – Consultation insight</p> <p>Phase A: What we have</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> LTDS consultation gaps Consultation of existing customer insights Ambition <p>Phase B: Development of adaptive plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gamification (April – May) Customer board Follow up focus groups Future customer focus groups Affordability focus groups <p>Key Considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordability vs Ambition Ambition Phasing and prioritisation Fairness Future customer principles Affordability <p>LTDS Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scenario interpretation Consolidate draft strategic plans & existing data to develop the “Emerging Core Pathway” Mapping stakeholder ambition Mapping existing AWS commitments <p>Process Flow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Draft vision statement & forecast outcomes Final vision statement & forecast outcomes 2050 Enhancement Pathway: Iteration 1.1 Test against future scenarios 2050 Enhancement Pathway: Iteration 2 2050 Enhancement Pathway: Iteration 3 Create adaptive pathways 2050 Enhancement Pathway: Final Monitoring framework <p>LTDS submission (Oct)</p> </div> <p>Allan gave an overview of the iterative approach to developing the LTDS (see slide above, which was additional to pre-reading):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AW started by looking at the nuts and bolts of Ofwat guidance 	

Item	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Next they embarked on Phase A: to understand the current position and build on any gaps; drawing on work being done with customer views for the Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) and the Drainage and Wastewater Management Plan (DWMP). AW are now starting to map stakeholder ambition and have been talking to the online community (without looking at numbers). - They are now in Phase B of developing the adaptive plan and are currently testing against future scenarios (e.g. climate change); 4 of these scenarios are set by Ofwat and one or two are specific to customers and regions. One of the things AW are looking at is water used for energy. - This work will help AW to refine their core pathway before the LTDS is submitted to Ofwat in October. <p>Allan added that it was an important part of the LTDS requirement to set out the company's vision, which would build on the company's 25-year Strategic Direction Statement, published in 2017.</p> <p>Customer engagement was going to be really important but really challenging. AW was launching some gamification approaches in April and May, which would give customers the chance to look at major investments. AW was also planning to follow up with focus groups, which would include future customers.</p> <p>Questions: Paul thanked Allan for a useful summary. He reflected on the gamification element of the customer engagement and whether this was the best way to measure trade offs. There needed to be a balance of approaches, as he believes asking customers about the future has its weaknesses (e.g. people find it difficult to look a long time into the future and the population changes over that time).</p> <p>Darren Rice responded that AW was not planning a one-size fits all approach. Customer preferences would be triangulated in the context of other qualitative engagement to gather a blend of views.</p> <p>Rachel Walters added that the gamification supplier, Emotional Logic, were recruited because they took a behavioural approach, which was key to AW's thinking for this strand. The company would provide customers with context and narrative behind the gamification.</p> <p>Allan said it would be good to follow up this discussion.</p> <p>Nathan Richardson recognised that the LTDS was drawing on customer engagement for the WRMP and DWMP – but he was concerned there was not much scope to loop back to the AW Business Plan.</p> <p>Allan responded that AW wanted to make sure they weren't just lifting and shifting but were also circling back. With cross-cutting themes (e.g. partnerships, technology, innovation), they were looking at whether AW could challenge themselves by doing things a bit differently.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Questions/ challenges</p>

Item	Action
<p>Jo Lancaster reflected that 25 years is a long time horizon for customers to grapple with. She felt it would be helpful to give customers more information about the type of challenges faced by the company and set some boundaries to help get a better quality of responses.</p> <p>She also asked about customer segmentation and encouraged AW to look at different customer groups/segments.</p> <p>Rachel reminded ICG members that AW had set up a customer segmentation strategy that is reflected across AW’s customer engagement that hopefully capture Jo’s points.</p> <p>Action: Jo asked Rachel to re-circulate the customer segmentation information.</p> <p>Sarah Thomas pointed out that getting customers to answer questions about technical issues in a short time scale may be challenging. Customers expect their water companies to be thinking about technicalities, so it’s more important to get customers to build in blue sky thinking.</p> <p>Darren responded that customer engagement, when done well, can cut through those risks. Customers are given context rather than being led straight to choices. The breadth of activity and understanding is important. Stakeholder views/perspectives were also being gathered for WRMP and DWMP, which would be useful to factor in.</p> <p>Craig thanked Allan for a useful discussion and reiterated that there had been a welcome shift during this price review to a longer term view. It was welcome to see Ofwat and the company conducting customer engagement about longer term investments and this would help put shorter term investments into context.</p>	<p>Action RW</p>
<p>3. <u>Performance Commitments (slides 3-22)</u></p> <p>Arun Pontin, AW’s Regulatory Policy Manager and Amanda Markwardt, Director of Economics and Engagement for ICS Consulting, gave an overview of Performance Commitments (PCs) and Outcome Delivery Incentives (ODIs).</p> <p>AW had provided reading materials in advance and the focus of the discussion was bespoke PCs that were due to be submitted to Ofwat in April.</p> <p>Common PCs</p> <p>During this price review, there had been a lot more centralisation of PCs (23 common measures), drawing on centralised customer research. Targets will also be more centralised. But there has been company-level customer engagement and some of the views will be shaped by current affordability and acceptability testing.</p> <p>AW wouldn’t have a clear view of all Ofwat’s thinking on performance commitment levels (i.e. targets) until next spring/summer.</p>	

Item	Action
<p>Questions:</p> <p>Paul asked how the company was planning to use the information provided by customers through the societal valuation refresh to inform their plans.</p> <p>Arun acknowledged that it wasn't clear yet how to respond if there was a big difference between centralised Ofwat research and views provided by AW customers.</p> <p>There was then a general discussion about the timelines and the fact that companies would be informed quite late in the day about issues that were central to their business planning.</p> <p>Darren suggested that AW were sceptical about whether centralised research was the correct approach and he wouldn't be surprised if there was a change in stance from Ofwat. AW was planning prudently.</p> <p>Paul was aware there may be some delays in the centralised research, as it was proving to be more time-consuming than Ofwat had anticipated.</p> <p>Bespoke Performance commitments</p> <p>Ofwat are recommending 2/3 bespoke PCs, although this isn't a hard cap. AW has sought to identify bespoke PCs that align with their particular purpose & regional challenges, including LTDS priorities.</p> <p>178 potential options considered through 50 workshops (with 30 staff contributing). Customers have informed decision making throughout the process. AW was considering a PC on effluent reuse but have moved away from this. They have been testing descriptions with the online community to make sure language is as understandable as possible. Members of the Task and Finish Group have seen and commented on some of these materials.</p> <p>Two phases of engagement with online community in January/February 2023:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 153 participants • Measures on reliable supply with direct impact on customer's daily life came out as high priorities • Customers generally supported measures that are the quickest and cheapest to implement <p>AW is now doing research with ICS Consulting to find out what customers are most supportive of and to try and ascertain customer valuations.</p> <p>AW was working up 8 candidate measures through drafting definitions. The final decision on which to submit would be made in early April, drawing on results of Trinity McQueen research. Submission date to Ofwat was 14 April.</p> <p>Candidates were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Climate resilient networks - Carbon emissions from construction - Working in partnership - Customers unable to use their toilet 	

Item	Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Controlling nutrient run off from developments (nutrient neutrality) - Managing surface water to increase sewer capacity - Supporting customers in vulnerable circumstances - Improving river ecology and amenity <p>Questions/challenges</p> <p>Paul was pleased to see the customer-led approach AW had taken. He asked whether support from customers and stakeholders for the proposed bespoke PCs had been gathered? He felt there was a lot of overlap with common PCs and questioned whether working in partnership was a customer facing issue.</p> <p>Arun responded that there was a customer benefit for all bespoke PCs. AW was also looking at whether these measures were relevant to their purpose and whether they benefit the environment.</p> <p>Gill Holmes also highlighted wording in slide 14 of the pre-reading deck: that a bespoke PC needed to show “significant additional benefits for customers that are unlikely to be realised without it”. She felt she hadn’t seen that yet in AW’s bespoke PCs. For her as a customer, the 8 areas outlined are things she’d expect AW to be doing anyway.</p> <p>Arun said that AW would share write ups as the cases were developed. Materials were still relatively high level and the were expecting flash feedback from Ofwat in May/June.</p> <p>Sarah Powell agreed with Paul and Gill. She felt that improving river and ecology was something AW should be doing through WINEP so the Environment Agency wouldn’t be able to support that as a bespoke PC.</p> <p>Nathan said it was a shame that the proposed bespoke PC on nutrient neutrality didn’t include water demand neutrality. It could be something that’s over and above that AW could work with local authorities on. He also asked if there was anything about biodiversity net gain, which was a PC in last AMP?</p> <p>Arun said there would be a common PC on biodiversity.</p> <p>Craig felt that a bespoke PC should have a wow factor that’s going to lead to something different. Everyone would benefit from working in partnership, but isn’t that something that should be part of business as usual rather than being a goal?</p> <p>John Vinson said he hadn’t seen outlined clearly enough the specificity to the AW region and how these PCs are going to help customers.</p> <p>Sarah Thomas said it was difficult for the ICG to comment without knowing more detail about the measures.</p> <p>Peter Simpson agreed. Level of ambition was there but the company didn’t have the level of detail yet. He described the innovative work that was going into the nutrient neutrality PC, working with developers and North Norfolk County Council.</p>	<p>Challenge</p> <p>Challenge</p> <p>Challenge</p> <p>Challenge</p> <p>Challenge</p> <p>Challenge</p> <p>Challenge</p> <p>Challenge</p>

Item		Action
	<p>Arun would take on board the ICG comments, get feedback from Ofwat and bring the bespoke PCs back to the ICG in future. Action: Arun to share wording of bespoke PCs with ICG.</p> <p>Arun acknowledged that there were gaps in the common PCS (e.g. river quality, gap on phosphorous). He also mentioned that, where was overlap with WINEP, AW would be rewarded for doing more than WINEP. AW was not proposing to be rewarded for carrying out statutory commitments.</p> <p>Sarah P pointed out that WINEP covers all water bodies so questioned how realistic this idea was.</p> <p>Peter S suggested this was something to come back to in future.</p> <p>AW colleagues pointed out that the challenges from ICG members had been robust and really useful. Arun said bespoke PCs were a work in progress, but hopefully they would get to a point that everyone was happy with.</p> <p>Craig encouraged the company to go for the wow factor, as an opportunity to make AW shine in customers’ eyes. This was a chance to really make people think AW was doing something different and separating itself from the pack.</p> <p>He felt that the bespoke PCs had been written by committee, with too much staff input. AW should aim for PCs that were clear, sharp and really exciting and easily understandable by customers. He didn’t feel the proposed PCs were quite at that point yet.</p>	<p>Action AP</p> <p>Challenge</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p><u>PR24 Customer Engagement Deep Dive (slides 24-36)</u></p> <p>Rachel Walters – PR24 Customer Engagement Lead – wanted to give a collective view about what customers have been telling AW so far and how that insight is informing the wider programme of activity.</p>	

Item	Action
<p>Rachel shared a spider diagram from synthesis report (above) in addition to the pre-reading to explain what customers are saying under the themes of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposeful Business • Delighted Customers • Safe, Clean and Reliable Water • and Flourishing Environment <p>She picked out some key areas under each theme:</p> <p>Purposeful business – clear messages coming through from customers about fair and affordable bills. Customers were happy to support vulnerable customers, but there’s an overall concern about how supporting vulnerable customers is managed in short and long term. Customers sometimes struggle to balance shorter and longer term priorities but overall customer satisfaction remains similar over time.</p> <p>Delighted customers – feedback and insights are that bills remain clear, more could be done to help people to save money. Customers are keen to improve and upgrade AW infrastructure to maintain the level of service they receive to date.</p> <p>Safe, clean and reliable water – in all of the research to date, this is a fundamental expectation and customers want to see AW safeguard supply and reduce risks. But there’s also a key message about AW getting their house in order first before they go about additional enhancements.</p> <p>Flourishing environment – key messages are that customers support environmental ambition but their ambitions are restricted by costs. There’s a line to be drawn. They want to see catchment approach and improvements across a wider environment.</p> <p>Customer principles give a wider insight to bring all of this information together to give information about key themes going forward, which will also inform the Your Water Your Say session.</p> <p>Action: Rachel to circulate additional slides not included in pre-reading.</p> <p>Jo thanked Rachel for the useful slides and agreed with comments from Pete Holland that this does need to be nuanced for AW customers. One thing that jarred was “delighted customer”. She believes AW should also be looking at “informed customers” – giving the customers the information they need to make informed decisions.</p> <p>Rachel would look to draw that out in future.</p> <p>Sarah P said there’s a risk of leading customers down a certain path on catchment-based solutions – there are certain things companies have to do in certain places that are statutory requirements.</p> <p>Rachel said these findings help to shape thought processes. It’s just to get general sentiment about what’s front of mind for customers’ views.</p>	<p>Action RW</p> <p>Action RW</p>

Item	Action
<p>She then went on to outline the work in progress and work that had been shared with the Task and Finish Group to date:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviewed material for asset health and risks activity with online community • Reviewed survey for customer investment priorities phase 3 • Meeting with Accent to introduce and shape Affordability & Acceptability testing • Reviewed material for bespoke performance commitments activity with online community • Logged into online community platform to view activities taking place live • Reviewed survey for Customer Valuations to inform bespoke performance commitments <p>AW was now keen to demonstrate how customer insight is being used to feed into development of the Business Plan.</p> <p>John said that the materials had been excellent and timely for the Task and Finish Group and thanked Rachel for that. For the gamification slides, he asked how six options had been settled on and had a query about Options A and B.</p> <p>Rachel clarified that Options A & B would be presented in a random order as part of the gamification process so as not to lead customers down a particular route. It would be presented as a board game.</p> <p>Darren explained that the six options were determined as the areas where customers can have biggest impact. The game was designed to be similar to Be the Boss Plan used in PR19.</p> <p>Your Water Your Say session planning The online session was confirmed for 30 March – AW was reaching out to vulnerable customers and inviting them to 4 AW offices to make sure they have all areas covered. Reaching out to communities through the online community to encourage a wide variety of customers attend, including stakeholders and individual customers. Rachel thanked ICG members for supporting the session.</p> <p>AW was first of companies to run these sessions. There would be a 15 minute presentation and 75 minutes of Q&A. Some questions were being sent in advance via CCW but would not be seen by the company until the day. In response to a question from the ICG, RW acknowledged that it wasn't yet 100% clear how evidence from the session would help to inform AW's Business Plan.</p> <p>John asked if there would be a separate session for Hartlepool.</p> <p>Rachel responded that guidance was clear that only one session was needed per company and Hartlepool customers were invited to attend an in-person session.</p> <p>Peter said it would be made clear in the slide deck early on that Hartlepool was included.</p> <p>Action: AW colleagues to circulate slide deck to ICG members in advance of the session.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Question/ challenge</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Action AW</p>

Item	Action
<p>Task and Finish Group</p> <p>Gill thanked Rachel for sending out information each Monday. Materials were spot on and members were able to feed back in one central place. Between members of the T&F Group, she felt that they were able to give input on technical issues and language. Rachel responds to questions and provides any information requested.</p> <p>Paul agreed with Gill and thanked Rachel for the clear weekly emails with signposting where we can contribute.</p> <p>Craig thanked members of the Task and Finish Group for their work.</p>	
<p>6. <u>Company performance update (agenda order flipped)</u></p> <p>Peter Simpson wanted to address concerns around potential drought forecast for this year. The main issues had been river water refill, which have had very high nitrate levels. AW has had to stop abstraction on a number of occasions. That seems to be result of dry period last summer with record soil moisture deficits, which may potentially have opened up new pathways.</p> <p>In Norfolk, AW is seeing the lowest groundwater levels on the hydrograph for many years. In February, the region saw only 26% of average rainfall. Usually the winter months are key for recharging water supplies.</p> <p>Most of the AW region is reasonably OK but Norfolk is an area of focus for the Drought Management Team. AW may introduce a temporary use ban there and they were gearing up to do that, depending on levels of rainfall in the interim.</p> <p>AW was also looking at River Trent, which had also been quite low.</p> <p>AW was also looking at demand side with customers. They are at the lowest levels of leakage ever in Norfolk.</p> <p>Pete Holland added that AW is working with customers to reduce consumption, drawing on smart meters – and they are also looking at bill impact. More information would be shared with ICG members in future.</p> <p>There was a general discussion around the importance of behavioural change, with ICG members again emphasising how customers needed to be informed about using water responsibly.</p> <p>Craig asked whether it was possible to see a summary slide of the company performance, as was the case during PR19, to keep an eye on company performance. That was a key role of the ICG and there hadn't been an update for some time.</p> <p>Darren responded that he had understood the ICG wanted a more targeted deep dive into certain areas of company performance rather than a generic dashboard.</p>	

Item		Action
	<p>Craig said it would be useful for the ICG to have both. Deep dives are useful but not having the dashboard means the ICG doesn't have sight of some issues for a long time.</p> <p>Action: AW to share company performance dashboard</p> <p>Craig asked for feedback on CSOs in the light of recent media coverage.</p> <p>Peter S reported that there had been a reduction in average spills per CSO. The work of Emily Timmins was paying dividends. Even in wet months of the year, AW had seen good performance. AW had agreed to speed up a programme for monitoring CSOs over 5 years and were already at 84%.</p> <p>In response to coverage in Southend, performance was generally pretty good but there had been a catastrophic sewer collapse. Peter was doing an event in Southend at the end of the month.</p> <p>Through River Positive campaign, AW was look at reducing the number of CSOs to 20 per year. AW was making a presentation to Parliament on this campaign shortly to show their action plan to tackle these issues.</p> <p>Action: materials from the Parliamentary event to be circulated.</p> <p>Sarah P mentioned that data from last year's event duration monitoring for all water companies would be published on gov.uk on 30 March.</p> <p>Action: SP to share link</p>	<p>Action AW</p> <p>Action AW</p> <p>Action SP</p>
<p>5.</p>	<p><u>Verbal update on pollution plan (agenda order flipped)</u></p> <p>Emily Timmins – AW Director of Water Recycling – gave a verbal update on AW's pollution plan.</p> <p>In 2022, AW saw some improvement in terms of pollution incidents and they were looking to repeat that improvement year on year for 2023.</p> <p>It had been a challenging start to the year but analytics showed that things were heading in the right direction, with a zero pollution mindset.</p> <p>Looking at Year 4 in the plan and AW's Board and owners supported doing more than planned in this area, in particular by reducing blockages (80% of which are avoidable). This is being done through a mixture of behaviour change and Artificial Intelligence innovations to monitor pipes.</p> <p>Nathan said that 2021 was a bad year for Cat 1-3 pollution incidents; what happened for 2022?</p> <p>Emily responded there was a minor improvement but not the step change they wanted to see. The pollution plan and measures in place would help to address this.</p>	

Item	Action
<p>Sarah P said EA supported actions outlined in the pollution reduction plan and hoped to see improvements this year. She would like to see, as a measure of success, that the weather isn't blamed for problems going forward. All measures need to be resilient to all kinds of weather.</p> <p>Emily agreed it's important to have a resilient asset base but said it wouldn't be perfect for this year as there was a lot of catching up to do.</p> <p>Jo reiterated the importance of informed customers to avoid blockages and wanted to explore more ways to join up awareness raising work with the customer engagement work.</p> <p>Sarah T agreed that research had shown that messages about unflushables need to be reinforced regularly to take root in customers' minds.</p> <p>Emily invited ICG members to attend a future customer visit to an area where there was a high incidence of blockages due to fats/oils/grease/unflushables.</p> <p>Craig – would be keen for ICG to have a site visit on this issue in future.</p> <p>John V said that CCW was doing workshop later in March looking at environmental transparency. He would share outcomes from that with ICG members. Action: JV to share outcomes</p> <p>Craig said it was great to hear an update from Emily but wanted to know more about the glide path towards zero pollution incidents. Was there a graph customers could see?</p> <p>Emily said that was the goal and she would bring that back to the ICG in six months. Action: ET to bring glide path to ICG in September 2023.</p>	<p>Action</p> <p>Action JV</p> <p>Question/ challenge</p> <p>Action ET</p>
<p>7. <u>General discussion</u></p> <p>Craig thanked colleagues for helpful presentations and hoped that the challenges had been constructive, in particular around the performance commitments.</p> <p>Peter Holt thanked ICG members for helping him to get up to speed.</p> <p>There was discussion around forward topics for future agendas, the challenge log and ICG reports.</p> <p>Craig referred to page 20 of the CCW review of ICGs and felt that the challenge log would help to shape future agenda items. It was important that the ICG satisfied the AW Board that they had provided effective challenge to the whole process. The challenge log and ICG report produced would help to do that.</p>	

Item	Action
<p>8. <u>ICG only session</u></p> <p>ICG members felt the meeting was useful and the reflection on performance was important. However, there was a feeling that the ICG had lost track of some of the knowledge that would help them to make effective challenges.</p> <p>They felt they needed to pull some of the strands together and decide where the ICG could make an informed input/challenge around company plans.</p> <p>In particular, they were concerned that the bespoke performance commitments were not at the level they should be yet. These were nowhere near specific enough for the AW region. They were concerned that staff input seemed to have been a key starting point for these measures. Some of the issues highlighted had also been flagged by members of the Task and Finish Group when looking at the materials for the online community.</p> <p>Members felt that the ICG input on these could help to shape more ambitious measures. However, it was acknowledged that timing was tight ahead of the 14 April submission date.</p> <p>Members wanted to see more detailed wording of the bespoke performance commitments as soon as possible.</p> <p>Members were also concerned that, just 4-5 months ahead of the BP submission, they didn't feel close to knowing what customer support there was for different trade offs or the bill impact of those trade offs. Timings were going to be challenging.</p> <p>There was also concern that Hartlepool hadn't been given enough consideration.</p> <p>Craig said it was key to look at the challenge logs together and highlight where the ICG hasn't got the answers needed.</p> <p>Action: Craig to look at challenge log and work out next steps.</p> <p>Actions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members were keen to see the company performance dashboard going forward. • Members were keen to see bespoke performance measures as soon as possible. • Members were keen to see Hartlepool as a specific agenda item in future. • ICG members would hold a half day ICG meeting in May • This was agreed for Wednesday 17 May am (teams invitation to follow) <p><u>Upcoming meetings</u></p> <p>Wednesday, 17 May morning time TBC (virtual) ICG only session Friday, 16 June 2023 10:00-16:00 (in person) Tuesday, 25 July 2023 10:00-13:00 (virtual) Friday, 15 September 2023 10:00-13:00 (virtual) Friday, 10 November 2023 – 10:00-16:00 (face to face) Friday, 8 December 2023 – 10:00-13:00 (virtual)</p>	<p>Action CB</p> <p>Action AW</p> <p>Action AW</p> <p>Action</p> <p>Action ICG</p>