

PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH - PRIORITISATION OF COMMON PCs

Contents

QUALITY CUSTOMER RESEARCH	3
PRIORITISATION OF COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS	3
DETAIL OF OUR APPROACH TO UNDERSTANDING CUSTOMERS' PRIORITISATION OF COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS.....	6
The evidence base	6
Collating evidence from customer research	7
Weighting evidence from customer research	9
Our customers' priorities.....	14
PR19, Current, and Future Ambition Levels for Common PCs	14
SOURCE LIST	16
APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF ALL PRIORITISATION EXERCISES	18
APPENDIX 2: WEIGHTING OF ALL SOURCES	38
SCORING AND WEIGHTING OF ALL CUSTOMER RESEARCH SOURCES WHICH INCLUDE A PRIORITY RANKING EXERCISE.....	41
APPENDIX 3: OUR CUSTOMERS AMBITION FOR THE FUTURE - SUMMARY OF RESULTS FROM DEFINING THE FUTURE (2012) AND PEOPLE PANELS #4A AND 4B	52

QUALITY CUSTOMER RESEARCH

Our PR24 research and engagement research comprises a number of individual projects, each designed to respond to specific regulatory or business need.

All members of our strategic research team are members of the Market Research Society. This demonstrates our commitment to research excellence. Our research is always conducted in line with Market Research Society professional standards; the highest ethical, commercial, and methodological practices in research. Both our in-house research team and the agencies we work with abide by these standards. This means that when designing projects and making tactical decisions about aspects such as methodologies or sampling frames we consider the quality of what we will produce first and foremost.

In late 2022, our Customer Engagement Panel was (CEP) established. The panel comprises of three independent experts who bring a wealth of knowledge and experience in research and engagement. The CEP's role is to scrutinise the quality of the customer research we conduct to inform the PR24 business plan. The panel evaluates our research based on assurance criteria provided by Ofwat, CCW and previous work of the Water Forum. We engage the CEP at project stages to enable members to have full oversight of our work and to make sure that they are in a robust place to assure it.

PRIORITISATION OF COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS

A comprehensive understanding of our customers' priorities is an essential input into the decisions and trade-offs our PR24 Plan is built upon. This document sets out how we have drawn on all available **priority ranking exercises**, that have taken place within parts of our ongoing tracking research, and bespoke internal and external PR24 customer research.

In total we identified 23 customer research sources containing priority ranking exercises. The 23 sources contained 54 ranking exercises (as some sources included more than one ranking exercise). These ranking exercises are our **evidence**.

We followed an approach to weighting the evidence adapted from a model set out by the consultancy Sia Partners. Sia's model recommends scoring each source's priority ranking exercises against quality parameters to calculate an overall robustness score. These scores are then used to weight the evidence.

It is important to note:

- **The overall quality of customer research projects was not scored or evaluated as part of this approach.**
- Our focus, for this exercise, was purely on the priority ranking exercises (sources) contained within customer research projects and their relevance to the **levels of priority our customers place on common performance commitments (common PCs)**
- **Not all sources have achieved an equal weighting.** Overall robustness scores range from the lowest score of 1.3 to the highest possible score of 3.0. Common reasons that sources were scored lower include:
 - Older sources have less relevance to understanding today's customers' priorities
 - A limited number of common PCs were considered and ranked within the exercise
 - A new approach for NWG was being trialled, meaning we had no benchmarks to compare against

As a general rule, a score in the region of '3' can be considered the most robust; a score of '2' has good value and represents a range of views; scores of 1 are less valuable, but still feed into the prioritisation model, to help us appreciate and understand the full picture.

The scoring was carried out by the Strategic Customer Research & Engagement Team, with support from Economic Regulation. After collating and weighting the evidence we fed it into our prioritisation model and assigned each line of data to the most appropriate common PC.

The model then generated overall priority levels for all common PCs. We compared our list of customers' priorities to [Ofwat and CCW's ranking research](#).

The Strategic Customer Research & Engagement Team and Economic Regulation Team considered both results and made a judgement on the overall customer prioritisation ranking for each common PC.

All rankings are set-out on the following page, Please note, we have excluded common PCs which have no data.¹

¹ D-MeX and BR-MeX were not included as part of prioritisation exercises in any available research.

Table 1: Customers' Priority levels for Common PCs

Common PCs	Ranking generated by our prioritisation model	Ofwat and CCW's ranking	Triangulated Ranking (judgement based)
Pollutions (serious and all)	High	Medium	High
Internal sewer flooding	High	High	High
Leakage	High	Medium	High
External sewer flooding	High	High	High
CRI	High	High	High
Water quality contacts	Medium	High	High
Discharge compliance	Medium	Medium	Medium
Storm overflows	Medium	Medium	Medium
Biodiversity net gain	Medium	Medium	Medium
Reducing water supply interruptions that last over three hours	Low	High	Medium
Asset health (including mains repair, sewer collapses and unplanned outage)	Low	Medium	Medium
Per Capita Consumption (PCC)	Medium	Low	Low
Business demand	Low	Low	Low
River water quality	Low	Medium	Low
Greenhouse gases	Low	Low	Low
Bathing water quality	Low	Low	Low
C-MeX	Low	-	Low

DETAIL OF OUR APPROACH TO UNDERSTANDING CUSTOMERS' PRIORITISATION OF COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS

The evidence base

We continuously listen to our customers' views to understand their priorities and how they may change over time.

One of the main ways we track our customers' priorities is through our ongoing customer research. This research encompasses all aspects of the services we provide; water quality and reliability, wastewater, the environment, customer services, and affordability. Triangulation of this insight, with bespoke research for PR24, has informed our PR24 decision-making around enhancements, investments and delivering our 'business as usual' services in line with our customers' priorities.

To give us a robust appreciation of our customers' priorities for 2025-30 we began by collating results from all customer research we had conducted or commissioned since the submission of our previous (PR19) business plan, that had included a priority ranking exercise. This was defined as any research activity where participants were asked to consider or rank multiple service areas and state;

- which should be priority areas / focus
- which are most important, matter most, require the most investment or are meaningful to focus on
- which are less important or meaningful to focus on
- their level of agreement with a statement, measure or goal
- The level of priority they would place on a measure (i.e. first, second, third or place or high, medium low)

We also considered if any other sources of data could add value to the triangulation exercise by giving further insight our customers' priorities. These were contacts data, complaints data, performance data and social media sentiment analysis.

Ultimately we decided not to include these in our modelling for the following reasons:

SOURCE

Contacts

These are the contacts we receive from our household customers. We receive these contacts by telephone, post, email, social media, text message and via the self-serve options on our website.

RATIONALE FOR EXCLUSION

The majority of contact we receive relates to billing, which does not directly correspond to any of the common PCs.

The contact we receive relating to water and wastewater services tends to be about an ongoing operational experience. We have concluded that this does not provide insight into our customers' priorities for the future. For example, one of the highest levels of operational contact we receive is from customers reporting no water. We can't infer that this means reducing interruptions to supply is a high future priority. People are often seeking information and reassurance and may be satisfied that the interruption was handled well with only minor inconvenience.

SOURCE	RATIONALE FOR EXCLUSION
<p>Complaints</p> <p><i>This is inbound contact from a customer or customer’s representative that expresses or implies dissatisfaction with the charges, service or functions we provide.</i></p> <p><i>Specifically solicited feedback (such as from Rant & Rave or survey responses is not counted).</i></p>	<p>We monitor and track the number of complaints received and report this data on an annual basis to CCW.</p> <p>The majority of complaints we receive are related to billing, which does not directly correspond to any of the common PCs.</p> <p>Those that relate to water and wastewater services tend to reflect customers’ recent operational experiences, and do not provide insight into our customers’ priorities for the future.</p>
<p>Performance data</p> <p><i>This is information about our services and performance, including how we’ve performed against our commitments. It is published every year in our Annual Performance Report.</i></p>	<p>This data tracks our progress against our PCs. It doesn’t provide insight into our customers’ priorities for the future.</p>
<p>Stakeholder sentiment score</p> <p><i>This is a quarterly report produced on our behalf by Wordnerds.</i></p>	<p>Wordnerd’s model ‘boils’ multiple sources of customer information down to a single score, which we use to track customer satisfaction over time. Several sources contribute to the score including customer tracking research, C-MeX, media monitoring, Rant & Rave and social media.</p> <p>The model is designed to track satisfaction, it’s findings are not transferable to understanding our customers’ priorities for the future.</p>

Collating evidence from customer research

In total we identified 23 customer research sources. This included 18 sources produced by NWG.

- Four annual rounds of [brand values research \(2019-22\)](#),
- [Five quarterly rounds of domestic tracking research \(2022\)](#)
- One round of [wholesale tracking \(2021\)](#)
- Five stand-alone reports - Pre-Acceptability Phase 1 Research (2023), [Retailer and Non-Household Research \(2022\)](#), [People Panels #3: Aims and Measures \(2022\)](#) and [Defining the Future \(2021\)](#).
- Our two [WRMP Options Research reports \(2022\)](#)
- We also included our [Customer Valuations for Service Improvements \(Copperleaf\) \(2022\)](#) research as this was the only project in which participants were asked to consider all water, wastewater, asset health and environmental measures collectively and indicate which they would be willing to pay more for to meet a proposed service level. We have inferred priority levels for these measures by ranking them from highest to lowest valuations.

In support of our Water Resources Management Planning we engaged in two regional customer research projects, which both included priority ranking exercises. One with [Water Resources North](#) and one with [Water](#)

PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH

PRIORITISATION OF COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS

[Resources East.](#)

We also considered priority ranking exercises from three external sources – [CCW and Ofwat’s \(2022\) Customer Spotlight: People’s views and experiences of water](#), [Ofwat and CCW’s \(2022\) Preferences Research](#), and [CCW’s Public Views of the Water Environment \(2021\)](#).

The 22 research sources included 54 ranking exercises (as some sources included more than one ranking exercise). The approach, sample size and details of each prioritisation exercise are summarised in [Appendix 1](#), for full reports please visit our [Research Library](#).

Reporting level

We examined which common PCs were included in each priority ranking exercise sources ([see appendix 2](#)) and considered whether we could present priorities separately for all customers, NW customers and ESW customers. Of the 17 NWG sources 6 reported separate results for NW/ESW household customers:

- Pre-Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)
- [Domestic tracking research](#) (2022-23)
- [People Panels #3 Aims and Measures](#) (2022)
- [Defining the Future](#) (2021)
- [WRMP Options Research \(separate NW and ESW reports\)](#) (2021)

Three of these sources (Pre-Acceptability Phase 1, [People Panels #3 Aims and Measures](#) and [Defining the Future](#)) engaged smaller, qualitative sample sizes. The sources with larger samples ([Domestic tracking research](#) and [WRMP Options Research](#)) covered limited numbers of PCs. On this basis we took the decision to present priorities at NWG level only, as we have greater confidence that this is robust.

Weighting evidence from customer research

We followed an approach to weighting the evidence adapted from the model set out by the consultancy Sia Partners. Sia’s model recommends scoring each source against five quality parameters to calculate an overall robustness score. These scores are then used to weight the evidence.

We discussed Sia’s methodology with our Customer Engagement Panel (CEP) and agreed to include a sixth quality parameter around recency.

The scoring was carried out by the Strategic Customer Research and Engagement Team.

The approach to weighting each source is set out below. [Appendix 4](#) provides our full weighting of sources in regard to how robustly they can inform our understanding of customers’ priorities.

Quality parameter 1: Coverage for topic area (50% of the overall score)

This first parameter accounts for 50% of the overall robustness score. ‘Coverage’ is concerned with ‘*advancing wider knowledge or understanding about the topic.*’ A ‘coverage score’ is given to each insight, from each research report, to evaluate its relevance to a certain topic. To score this area we considered the following questions for each source:

1. How closely linked is the feedback to prioritisation?
2. Is the information valuable for business planning purposes?
3. Does the event cover all outcomes/ measures?

To determine the appropriate score Sia recommended the following scoring system:

Score 1	Covers a minority of outcomes/measures and is less valuable for prioritisation for business planning purposes.
Score 2	Covers some outcomes/measures and has some value for prioritisation for business planning purposes.
Score 3	Covers the majority of outcomes/measures and is valuable for prioritisation for business planning purposes.

Quality parameters 2-6 (50% of the overall score)

The second stage involved scoring four separate quality parameters recommended by Sia, which collectively account for 50% of the overall robustness score. Following consultation with our independent Customer Engagement Panel (CEP) we elected to add a fifth quality parameter to score each source against recency.

PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH

PRIORITISATION OF COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS

The quality parameters, questions and scoring bands we used were:

Quality Parameters	Questions to consider	Scoring bands						
<p>1/5: Methodologically Sound</p> <p><i>Defensible in design by providing a research strategy that can address the evaluation question posed</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Which methods / techniques were used to ensure appropriate depth and breadth of insight across the prioritisation exercise? Was the engagement/research conducted in-line with best practice principles? Are any of the methods applied less well established, new or innovative? If yes, do I need to establish how sound these methods are? Has the methodology been appropriately adapted and refined for the specific purpose for which it has been used? 	<p>Scores are based on the type of engagement methods used e.g. basic surveys are less likely to elicit in-depth insight when compared to customer preference/ willingness to pay research.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="909 411 2027 710"> <tr> <td data-bbox="909 411 1043 486">Score 1</td> <td data-bbox="1043 411 2027 486">Limited or no methodology, unplanned with no aim or objective.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="909 486 1043 598">Score 2</td> <td data-bbox="1043 486 2027 598">Some aims of engagement, but limited discussion of sampling, knowledge levels.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="909 598 1043 710">Score 3</td> <td data-bbox="1043 598 2027 710">Clear aims, sound sampling methodology and consideration of barriers to inclusion.</td> </tr> </table>	Score 1	Limited or no methodology, unplanned with no aim or objective.	Score 2	Some aims of engagement, but limited discussion of sampling, knowledge levels.	Score 3	Clear aims, sound sampling methodology and consideration of barriers to inclusion.
Score 1	Limited or no methodology, unplanned with no aim or objective.							
Score 2	Some aims of engagement, but limited discussion of sampling, knowledge levels.							
Score 3	Clear aims, sound sampling methodology and consideration of barriers to inclusion.							
<p>2/5: Number of customers engaged</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Have a sufficient number of customers been engaged on this topic to capture a broad range of views? Have NW/ESW customers been engaged in this research? 	<p>Scores were based on the number of customers engaged on each sub-topic –those with a high volume of customers are more likely to capture a broad range of views.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="909 1061 2027 1289"> <tr> <td data-bbox="909 1061 1043 1136">Score 1</td> <td data-bbox="1043 1061 2027 1136">Low volume of customers – Limited range of views</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="909 1136 1043 1212">Score 2</td> <td data-bbox="1043 1136 2027 1212">Sufficient volume of customers – Good range of views</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="909 1212 1043 1289">Score 3</td> <td data-bbox="1043 1212 2027 1289">High volume of customers – Broad range of views</td> </tr> </table>	Score 1	Low volume of customers – Limited range of views	Score 2	Sufficient volume of customers – Good range of views	Score 3	High volume of customers – Broad range of views
Score 1	Low volume of customers – Limited range of views							
Score 2	Sufficient volume of customers – Good range of views							
Score 3	High volume of customers – Broad range of views							

PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH

PRIORITISATION OF COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS

Quality Parameters	Questions to consider	Scoring bands						
<p>3/5: Rigorously gathered</p> <p><i>Rigorous in conduct through systematic and transparent collection, analysis and interpretation of qualitative data</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> How was data gathered? Were best practice methods applied for gathering the data? Is the collected data detail rich and in-depth? 	<p>Notes to support scoring: Engagement events were scored highly for being rigorously gathered when a ‘thorough discussion of data collection procedures, a range of perspectives and extensive detail of feedback’* was included.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="907 395 2027 730"> <tr> <td data-bbox="907 395 1041 507">Score 1</td> <td data-bbox="1041 395 2027 507">Limited discussion of data collection technique, who collected the data, or the procedure for recording differing opinions.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="907 507 1041 619">Score 2</td> <td data-bbox="1041 507 2027 619">Some discussion of data collection and the methods. Limited depth of feedback and range of opinions.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="907 619 1041 730">Score 3</td> <td data-bbox="1041 619 2027 730">Thorough discussion of data collection procedures, noted a range of perspectives and extensive detail of feedback.</td> </tr> </table>	Score 1	Limited discussion of data collection technique, who collected the data, or the procedure for recording differing opinions.	Score 2	Some discussion of data collection and the methods. Limited depth of feedback and range of opinions.	Score 3	Thorough discussion of data collection procedures, noted a range of perspectives and extensive detail of feedback.
Score 1	Limited discussion of data collection technique, who collected the data, or the procedure for recording differing opinions.							
Score 2	Some discussion of data collection and the methods. Limited depth of feedback and range of opinions.							
Score 3	Thorough discussion of data collection procedures, noted a range of perspectives and extensive detail of feedback.							
<p>4/5: Credibly interpreted</p> <p><i>Credible in claim through offering well-founded and plausible arguments about significance of the evidence generated</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Were the conclusions drawn based on robust evidence? How does the interpretation ensure the avoidance of bias? Does the evidence provide multiple perspectives and alternative positions? 	<p>Notes to support scoring: Engagement events were scored highly for being credibly interpreted when ‘engagement work is interpreted accurately and fairly with detailed outline of all perspectives and issues discussed’* (e.g. avoid bias or subjective views).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="907 930 2027 1265"> <tr> <td data-bbox="907 930 1041 1042">Score 1</td> <td data-bbox="1041 930 2027 1042">Lack of credible interpretation with potential for bias. Limited or no discussion of feedback points in the conclusion.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="907 1042 1041 1153">Score 2</td> <td data-bbox="1041 1042 2027 1153">Some link and discussion of the engagement details in the event report, including some differing views.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="907 1153 1041 1265">Score 3</td> <td data-bbox="1041 1153 2027 1265">Engagement work interpreted accurately and fairly with detailed outline of all perspectives and issues discussed.</td> </tr> </table> <p>*Follows guidance for assessment of robustness laid out in HM Treasury’s Magenta Book</p>	Score 1	Lack of credible interpretation with potential for bias. Limited or no discussion of feedback points in the conclusion.	Score 2	Some link and discussion of the engagement details in the event report, including some differing views.	Score 3	Engagement work interpreted accurately and fairly with detailed outline of all perspectives and issues discussed.
Score 1	Lack of credible interpretation with potential for bias. Limited or no discussion of feedback points in the conclusion.							
Score 2	Some link and discussion of the engagement details in the event report, including some differing views.							
Score 3	Engagement work interpreted accurately and fairly with detailed outline of all perspectives and issues discussed.							

PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH

PRIORITISATION OF COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS

Quality Parameters	Questions to consider	Scoring bands						
Parameter 5/5: Recency <i>An additional parameter, added by NWG to assess if the age of a source has an impact on its relevancy.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. How recently was the research conducted?2. Are there any reasons that this research should be given a lower weighting because of its age?	<table border="1"><tbody><tr><td>Score 1</td><td>An older source that has become less relevant.</td></tr><tr><td>Score 2</td><td>A source which is 'becoming older', but still has some relevancy.</td></tr><tr><td>Score 3</td><td>A recent source, or an older source that still has relevancy.</td></tr></tbody></table>	Score 1	An older source that has become less relevant.	Score 2	A source which is 'becoming older', but still has some relevancy.	Score 3	A recent source, or an older source that still has relevancy.
Score 1	An older source that has become less relevant.							
Score 2	A source which is 'becoming older', but still has some relevancy.							
Score 3	A recent source, or an older source that still has relevancy.							

Stage 3: Calculating the overall robustness score

The final stage in weighting is to calculate each source's overall robust score. This is derived from averaging the coverage score (50%) and the five quality parameters (50%)

All sources were assessed and weighted as shown in the following table. Detailed methodology on our approach and all scores can be found in [Appendix 4](#).

Table 2: Scoring and weighting of all customer research sources which include a priority ranking exercise

Source	Coverage for topic area (prioritisation)	1/5 Methodologically sound	2/5 Number of customers engaged	3/5 Rigorously gathered	4/5 Credibly interpreted	5/5 Recency	Overall robustness score ²
	1-3 (50%)	1-3 (100%)					
Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022 and Q1 2023)	2	3	3	2	2	3	2.3
Pre-Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)	2	3	2	2	2	3	2.2
Retailer and Non-Household Research (2022)	3	3	2	3	3	3	2.9
Copperleaf Valuations (2022)	3	2	3	3	2	3	2.8
People Panels #3 (2022)	3	3	3	2	2	3	2.8
WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) (2022)	2	3	3	3	3	3	2.5
Defining the future (2021)	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.0
Brand Values (2020-22)	1	2	2	2	2	2	1.5
Wholesale Tracker (2021)	1	2	2	2	2	2	1.5
Brand Values (2019)	2	2	2	2	2	1	1.9
Water Resources North (club project) 2021	3	3	2	3	3	2	2.8
Water Resources East (club project) 2021	2	3	2	3	2	2	2.2
CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)	2	2	1	2	2	3	2.0
CCW and Ofwat Customer Spotlight (2022)	2	2	1	2	2	3	2.0
CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)	1	1	1	2	1	3	1.3

These scores are expressed *relative to the question* of prioritisation. So for example, many of our scores for “credibly interpreted” are 2 – because there is limited scope for discussion in quantitative research. This does not mean that this is low quality research, but is scored this way to give more weight to where topics were discussed deliberately. Similarly, for “methodologically sound” we score 2 because the research was not specifically designed for the purpose of prioritisation (and for example, the CCW research does not explicitly set out to do so). This does not mean that these pieces of research are not good quality: simply that it has less weight in answering this specific question.

² Derived from averaging coverage score (50%) and the five quality parameters (50%)

Our customers' priorities

The two exercises, collating and weighting the evidence, were fed into our prioritisation model. The individual results of each ranking exercise were entered into a separate line in Excel and coded against a common PC or service area. In total, we collected 248 lines of data which represented the views of over 6,800 NWG customers and over 3,100 nationally representative water customers.

Once in our prioritisation model each line of data was normalised, weighted and ranked. This resulted in overall priority levels for all service areas and common PCs as follows. Please note, we have excluded common PCs which have no data.³

Table 3: Customers' Priority levels for Common PCs

Common PCs	Ranking generated by our prioritisation model	Ofwat and CCW's ranking	Triangulated Ranking (judgement based)
Pollutions (serious and all)	High	Medium	High
Internal sewer flooding	High	High	High
Leakage	High	Medium	High
External sewer flooding	High	High	High
CRI	High	High	High
Water quality contacts	Medium	High	High
Discharge compliance	Medium	Medium	Medium
Storm overflows	Medium	Medium	Medium
Biodiversity net gain	Medium	Medium	Medium
Reducing water supply interruptions that last over three hours	Low	High	Medium
Asset health (including mains repair, sewer collapses and unplanned outage)	Low	Medium	Medium
Per Capita Consumption (PCC)	Medium	Low	Low
Business demand	Low	Low	Low
River water quality	Low	Medium	Low
Greenhouse gases	Low	Low	Low
Bathing water quality	Low	Low	Low
C-MeX	Low	-	Low

³ D-MeX and BR-MeX were not included as part of prioritisation exercises in any available research.

PR19, Current, and Future Ambition Levels for Common PCs

We were keen to explore if our customers priorities had changed since PR19, or if we had any evidence that priority levels for 2030 onwards are different to the current picture.

As detailed [earlier in this report](#) our understanding of customers' priorities for PR24 comes from robust collation, weighting and analysis of 15 sources of research.

Understanding PR19 priorities

To compare our customers' current priorities to those held at PR19 we looked back to our [PR19 business plan](#) and [Customer Engagement Summaries](#).

Understanding Priority Levels for 2030 onwards

We have two sources of evidence where customers have been asked to consider our ambitious, long-term goals. Defining the Future (2021) included an exercise in which respondents were provided with explanations of our 'ambitious goals' and asked whether they agreed with them. We have ranked which goals received the highest to lowest percentages of agreement.

As part of People Panels #4a and 4b – Long Term Strategy, Metrics and Ambition panelists were presented with three target levels; reduced, our current commitment and a more ambitious target and asked to state their level of long-term ambition for a number of service areas. Results from both research projects are summarised in [Appendix 5](#).

A summary of customers' views: PR19, PR24 and Future Ambition:

- **Water quality contacts and CRI:** Customers have always expected high quality drinking water and continue to expect this in future.
- **Internal sewer flooding:** A high priority for customers at PR19 which continues to be at PR24. Customers demonstrate an appetite for increased ambition in future.
- **External sewer flooding:** This was a priority for customers at PR19 and continues to be at PR24. We have no evidence of future ambition levels.
- **Storm Overflows:** Reducing pollution was a high priority area at PR19. Reducing the use of storm overflows is a current high priority. In future customers want to see zero pollutions as a result of our assets and operations.
- **Discharge Permit Compliance:** At PR19 going beyond statutory requirements wasn't a high priority to customers. Discharge Permit Compliance continues to be a mid-level priority at PR24.
- **Leakage (NW and ESW):** A mid-level priority at PR19 and PR24 with support demonstrate for more ambition in future.
- **Pollutions (Serious and All):** A high priority area for improvement at PR19. Currently a high priority, with support for more ambition in future.
- **Greenhouse Gases:** Currently a mid-level priority, with support for more ambition in future.
- **Bathing water quality:** A mid-level priority at PR19 and PR24 with no support for increased future ambition.
- **River water quality:** A mid-level priority at PR19 and PR24.
- **C-MeX:** A lower ranking current priority. Customers agree with our ambitious goal to 'Deliver world class customer service.'
- **PCC:** A lower ranking priority at PR19 and PR24 no support for increased future ambition.
- **Biodiversity:** The lowest ranking priority for PR19 with support for more ambition in future.

More detail can be found in the following table.

SOURCE LIST

Source	Year	Code(s)	Method	Sample	No. of participants
Domestic tracking research	2022-23	Q1 2023	Quantitative - telephone interviews	Household customers	2,500
People Panels #3 Aims and Measures	2022	E022	Qualitative – Online focus group	People Panel members	62
Customer Valuations for Service Improvements (Copperleaf)	2022	NA	Quantitative – Hall Tests	Household customers	2,000
Defining the Future	2021	E003	Qualitative – Online workshops and telephone interviews	Household customers Non-household customers Future customers Stakeholders	100
WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW)	2021	E072 and E073	Quantitative – online and face-to-face surveys	Household customers Non-household customers Future customers Customers in vulnerable circumstances	3,271
Brand Values	2019	E077	Quantitative - Telephone interviews	Household customers	750
Brand Values	2020	E002	Quantitative - Telephone interviews	Household customers	700
Brand Values	2021	E001	Quantitative - Telephone interviews	Household customers	700
Brand Values	2022	E076	Quantitative - Telephone interviews	Household customers	500
Retailer and Non-Household Research	2022	E070	Site visits and Microsoft Teams calls with retailers Online community and online focus groups for non-household customers	Retailers Non-Households	34
Water Resources North Customer Engagement (club project)	2021	E056	Qualitative – Reconvened online workshops with pre- and post- surveys (7 with NW customers, 2 with Hartlepool Water customers and 7 with Yorkshire Water customers)	Household customers, future customers, citizens, non-household customers (water and non-water dependent)	5 focus groups (estimated 50 customers)
Water Resources East Customer Engagement (club project)	2021	E055	Qualitative – Reconvened online workshops with pre- and post- surveys (4 with ESW customers, 4 with Cambridge Water customers and 8 with Anglian Water customers). In-depth interviews with non-household customers and stakeholders.	Household customers, non-bill payers, future customers, economically vulnerable customers, non-household customers and stakeholders	4 reconvened focus groups (20 customers)
Wholesale Tracker Results	2021		Quantitative – telephone survey	Non-Households (wholesale customers)	200

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

External sources referenced:	Year	Code(s)	Method	Sample	No. of participants
Ofwat and CCW 2022 Preferences Research	2022	NA	Qualitative – online focus groups and online in-depth interviews	Household customers, non-household customers, future customers, customers in vulnerable circumstances, customers who speak English as a second language	136 (est.)
Customer spotlight: People's views and experiences of water	2022	NA	Quantitative – Online survey, telephone survey	Adults in England and Wales, participants from ethnic minority communities, digitally disenfranchised' respondents	2,951
CCW Public views on the water environment	2021	NA	Online forum Online focus group	Household customers Future customers	62 (4 NW)

APPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF ALL PRIORITISATION EXERCISES

Source, Sample size and approach	Details of prioritisation exercise(s)	Granularity of reporting
<p>Domestic Tracking four rounds (Q1-Q4) 2022</p> <p>2,000 participants</p> <p>Quantitative - telephone interviews</p>	<p>The interviewer tells the participant that they are going to read them some broad themes which “NW/ESW is looking at in their business plan for 2020-2025”. The interviewer then asks the participant to “tell me which of these you think should be priority areas for them and which, if any, you think are less important.” The interviewer tells the participant they will “read the themes out first and that then they will go back and see what you think to them”. The following themes are read out in randomised order:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reducing bills 2. Maintain high standards on clean, clear and good tasting water 3. Reduce emissions and adapt to climate change 4. Improve service (sewer flooding, customer service etc) 5. Ensuring water is always available (i.e. not running out of water and having hose pipe band etc) 6. Repair leaks (more quickly) 7. Better reliability by replacing infrastructure and doing more maintenance 8. Improve flood defences 9. Cleaner rivers 10. Cleaner beaches <p>The participant is then asked “which of these would you say should be priority areas for [Northumbrian Water / Essex & Suffolk Water]?” The list is repeated as necessary and multi-coding is allowed.</p> <p>The report presents the percentages of participants who’ve stated that each theme is an ‘area of the business plan that should be a priority’ and an ‘area of the business plan that is less important’.</p>	<p>The report presents results at NWG level only.</p>

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

Source, Sample size and approach	Details of prioritisation exercise(s)	Granularity of reporting
<p>Brand Values (2019)</p> <p>750</p> <p>Quantitative - telephone interviews</p>	<p>The interviewer tells the participant that they are “going to read out some broad themes that NW/ESW is looking at in their business plan for 2020-2025”. The interviewer then asks the participant to “tell me which of these you think should be priority areas for them and which, if any, you think are less meaningful for them to focus on.” The following themes are read out:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Customers always have access to clean water 2. Improving the environment 3. Affordable bills 4. Doing what they say they will 5. Help when it is needed 6. Spending money locally 7. Being innovative 8. Unrivalled customer experience 9. Giving time and resources to local communities <p>The report presents the percentages of participants who’ve stated that each theme should be an area of ‘focus’ or is ‘less meaningful’</p>	<p>The report presents results at NWG level only.</p>

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

<p>People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)</p> <p>62</p> <p>Qualitative – Online focus group</p>	<p>These people panel sessions were designed to introduce panellists to our business plan areas, themes and measures, and work through several ranking exercises in relation to these.</p> <p><u>Area ranking</u> In this exercise panellists were asked to rank our five areas from most to least important</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Customer 2. Environment 3. People 4. Community 5. Competitiveness <p><u>Theme ranking</u> In this exercise panellists were asked to rank our seven themes from most to least important</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure reliable & resilient services 2. Caring for the long-term essential needs of the environment 3. Caring for the long-term essential needs of communities 4. Consider the sustainability and resilience of the business 5. Providing affordable & inclusive services 6. Delivering unrivalled customer experience 7. Ensure efficiency and prudent investment <p><u>Customer measures</u> In this exercise panellists were asked to rank our seven customer measures from most to least important</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ensure a continuous supply of water to promote customer confidence and trust 2. Promote confidence in our drinking water by delivering high quality water 3. Reduce the 'wastage' of water through a reduction in leakage 4. Eradicate sewer flooding in the home as a result of our assets and operations 5. Ensure water services are supplied to all customers at a reasonable cost 6. Reduce the amount of water used by our customers to improve water resources across our regions 7. Deliver world class customer service <p><u>Environment measures</u></p>	<p>The reports presents results at an overall NWG level and also breakdown results by the five panels; NW, Essex, Suffolk, Young and Employees.</p>
--	---	---

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

In this exercise panellists were asked to rank our four environment measures from most to least important

1. Reduce instances of pollution to protect and preserve our environment
2. Be leading in the sustainable use of natural resources and become carbon neutral
3. Demonstrate leadership and continuous improvement in the management of the environment in and around our assets
4. Have the best rivers and beaches in the country

Community, people, and competitiveness measures

In this exercise panellists were asked to rank our four community, people and competitiveness measures from most to least important

1. Ensure an industry leading level of health & safety in the workplace
2. Create a diverse workplace that ensures the right people with the right skills are proud to work for our company
3. Maximise our spend within our regions to enhance the social benefit that can be realised.
4. Deliver strong and sustainable financial resilience with fair returns

Star vote exercises 1 and 2

In the first star voting exercise panellists were asked to share 25 stars across 15 measures; giving a maximum of three stars to each measure and choosing to place more stars on the measures they considered most important.

In the second exercise, panellists were asked to place their 25 stars across the five measures they considered to be most important; they could add up to 14 stars to each measure.

The measures shared were:

1. Reduce instances of pollution to protect and preserve our environment
2. Promote confidence in our drinking water by delivering high quality water
3. Ensure water services are supplied to all customers at a reasonable cost
4. Ensure a continuous supply of water to promote customer confidence and trust
5. Reduce the wastage of water through a reduction in leakage
6. Be leading in the sustainable use of natural resources and become carbon neutral
7. Demonstrate leadership and continuous improvement to the environment in and around our regions
8. Ensure an industry leading level of health & safety in the workplace
9. Reduce the amount of water used by our customers to improve water resources across our regions

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

Source, Sample size and approach	Details of prioritisation exercise(s)	Granularity of reporting
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Eradicate sewer flooding in the home as a result of our assets and operations 11. Create a diverse workplace that ensures the right people with the right skills are proud to work for our company 12. Maximise our spend within our regions to enhance the social benefit that can be realised 13. Deliver world class customer service 14. Have the best rivers and beaches in the country 15. Deliver strong and sustainable financial resilience with fair returns <p>Note two of the measures included in the exercise have been excluded from our prioritisation triangulation as they are not customer facing (health and safety and diversity)</p>	

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

<p>Retailer and Non-Household Research (2022)</p>	<p>Participants were asked to allocate 100 “investment coins” across three high-level areas (water, wastewater, environment and asset health), to indicate their relative importance. They then ranked individual service attributes within each them.</p> <p>Water</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving the taste, smell and appearance of drinking water Reducing leakage from the water network Repairing visible leaks quicker Water efficiency Reducing water supply interruptions that last over three hours Reducing the number of properties that experience a water interruption that lasts more than 12 hours Reducing the chance of a fault at a water treatment works Reducing water supply interruptions that last between one and three hours <p>Wastewater</p>	
---	---	--

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

	<p>Reducing sewer flooding on the outside of customer properties</p> <p>Reducing sewer flooding inside customer properties</p> <p>Reducing the number of properties that experience sewer flooding more than once</p> <p>Environment</p> <p>Reducing the number of pollution incidents caused by Northumbrian Water / Essex & Suffolk Water</p> <p>Ensuring the treated wastewater that is returned to rivers and seas is sufficiently clean</p> <p>Improving the quality of sea water at beaches</p> <p>Reducing the number of major and significant pollution incidents caused by Northumbrian Water / Essex & Suffolk Water</p> <p>Reducing the number of times Northumbrian Water / Essex & Suffolk Water spill heavily diluted wastewater into rivers and seas during heavy rainfall</p> <p>Managing river water quality</p> <p>Reducing the Northumbrian Water / Essex & Suffolk Water carbon footprint</p> <p>Improving rivers, reservoirs and coastlines that the public can access</p> <p>Using Northumbrian Water / Essex & Suffolk Water sites to improve biodiversity</p> <p>Asset health</p>	
--	---	--

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

Source, Sample size and approach	Details of prioritisation exercise(s)	Granularity of reporting
	<p>Reducing the number of water mains that burst</p> <p>Reducing the number of sewers that collapse</p> <p>Reducing the number of sewer blockages</p>	
<p>Brand values three rounds (2020-22)</p> <p>1,900</p> <p>Quantitative - Telephone interviews</p>	<p>The interviewer tells the participant that “Customers have told [NW/ ESW] that there are four priority areas that matter most to them - value for money, great customer service, top quality water, and being prepared for the future (e.g. having reliable, resilient infrastructure and service)”. The interviewer then asks the participant if they could “rank these four areas in terms of the priority that you would place on each one? Which of them would be your top priority? Which second? Which third?”</p> <p>The report presents the percentages of participants who rated each area as a top priority. Results are presented at NWG level.</p>	<p>The report presents results at NWG level only.</p>

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

Source, Sample size and approach	Details of prioritisation exercise(s)	Granularity of reporting
<p>Pre-Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)</p> <p>120</p> <p>Qualitative - online and face-to-face workshops</p>	<p>Participants were shown areas of investment and asked to vote firstly on which three mattered the most to them and secondly on which three areas required the most investment.</p> <p>The areas shown were:</p> <p><u>Shown to NW and ESW participants</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Metering, encouraging water efficiency and tackling leakage to ensure we have enough water in the future 2. Investment to reduce lead pipes in the network because of the health risk 3. Investment to make sure that Northumbrian Water can supply the highest quality of water to their customers 4. Ensuring that we can continue to treat water in rivers and reservoirs to make this into drinking water 5. Maintaining and replacing equipment to make sure it is in good working order and to avoid service failures (asset health) 6. Investment to reduce carbon emissions and meet net zero 7. Investing in the network to ensure it is resilient to climate change 8. Improvements to rivers, reservoirs and coastlines that the public can access (e.g. footpaths, wildlife, water quality) 9. Meeting new regulations around reservoir safety 10. Introducing new security measures at critical sites to ensure services aren't interrupted <p><u>Shown to NW participants only</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. Tackling storm overflows which release heavily diluted wastewater into rivers and seas 12. Growing wastewater treatment works to respond to population growth 13. Removing nutrients from wastewater to avoid the environment being disrupted 14. Investment to minimise how often customers experience sewer flooding to the outside of their property <p><u>Shown to ESW participants only</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 15. Investment to make sure that Essex & Suffolk Water can supply the highest quality of water to their customers 	<p>Results are reported separately for NW and ESW participants.</p>

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

Source, Sample size and approach	Details of prioritisation exercise(s)	Granularity of reporting		
<p>Defining the future (2021)</p> <p>100</p> <p>Qualitative – Online focus group, pre-task sent to non-household customers.</p>	<p>Respondents were provided with an explanation of NWG’s ‘ambitious goals’ and asked whether or not they agreed with them. There were 14 goals in total spread across the six categories of NWG’s business plan. The purpose of this exercise was to see to what extent customers endorsed the ambitious goals included in NWG’s long-term strategy.</p> <p>The ambitious goals shared were:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="416 432 1803 1120"> <tr> <td data-bbox="416 432 1104 1120"> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deliver world class customer service 2. Give every single customer the opportunity to have a strong voice and engage with them, with at least 2 million customers participating by 2025 3. Eradicate water poverty in their operating areas by 2030 4. Have the lowest levels of leakage in the country in their water stressed ESW operating area 5. Have a per capita consumption (PCC) for water use of 118 litres per person per day by 2040 6. Promote confidence in their drinking water so that nine out of ten of their customers choose tap water over bottled water 7. Eradicate sewer flooding in the home as a result of their assets and operations </td> <td data-bbox="1115 432 1803 1120"> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Be leading in innovation within the water sector and beyond 9. Be leading in the sustainable use of natural resources, through achieving zero avoidable waste by 2025 and being carbon neutral by 2027 10. Demonstrate leadership in catchment management to enhance natural capital and deliver net gain for biodiversity 11. Have the best rivers and beaches in the country 12. Have zero pollutions as a result of their assets and operations 13. Spend at least 60p in every £1 with suppliers in their regions 14. Be the most socially responsible water company </td> </tr> </table>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deliver world class customer service 2. Give every single customer the opportunity to have a strong voice and engage with them, with at least 2 million customers participating by 2025 3. Eradicate water poverty in their operating areas by 2030 4. Have the lowest levels of leakage in the country in their water stressed ESW operating area 5. Have a per capita consumption (PCC) for water use of 118 litres per person per day by 2040 6. Promote confidence in their drinking water so that nine out of ten of their customers choose tap water over bottled water 7. Eradicate sewer flooding in the home as a result of their assets and operations 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Be leading in innovation within the water sector and beyond 9. Be leading in the sustainable use of natural resources, through achieving zero avoidable waste by 2025 and being carbon neutral by 2027 10. Demonstrate leadership in catchment management to enhance natural capital and deliver net gain for biodiversity 11. Have the best rivers and beaches in the country 12. Have zero pollutions as a result of their assets and operations 13. Spend at least 60p in every £1 with suppliers in their regions 14. Be the most socially responsible water company 	<p>Conclusions from the polls are drawn at an overall level for both the NW and ESW operating areas with household, business, and stakeholder customers combined.</p> <p>The graphs show a breakdown of household customers vs. business customers and stakeholder (as a combined sample).</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Deliver world class customer service 2. Give every single customer the opportunity to have a strong voice and engage with them, with at least 2 million customers participating by 2025 3. Eradicate water poverty in their operating areas by 2030 4. Have the lowest levels of leakage in the country in their water stressed ESW operating area 5. Have a per capita consumption (PCC) for water use of 118 litres per person per day by 2040 6. Promote confidence in their drinking water so that nine out of ten of their customers choose tap water over bottled water 7. Eradicate sewer flooding in the home as a result of their assets and operations 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. Be leading in innovation within the water sector and beyond 9. Be leading in the sustainable use of natural resources, through achieving zero avoidable waste by 2025 and being carbon neutral by 2027 10. Demonstrate leadership in catchment management to enhance natural capital and deliver net gain for biodiversity 11. Have the best rivers and beaches in the country 12. Have zero pollutions as a result of their assets and operations 13. Spend at least 60p in every £1 with suppliers in their regions 14. Be the most socially responsible water company 			

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

<p>Copperleaf valuations (2022)</p> <p>2,000</p> <p>Quantitative - Hall tests, Board game</p>	<p>Copperleaf is an investment modelling system within which our PR24 business plan is being optimised. One input required by Copperleaf was customer valuations for service attributes.</p> <p>It was important that our customers were able to consider all measures collectively, making trade-offs and identifying priority measures in terms of ambition, performance and investment. To achieve this we developed a ‘board game’ style approach which representative samples of NW and ESW household customers took part in via hall tests. Participants were provided with a number of plastic coins representing money they would pay over and above their current water/water and wastewater bill and asked to allocate the coins across the measures to demonstrate how much they would be willing to pay to see NWG achieve this service level. The exercise was unconstrained with respondents able to use as few or as many coins as they wished.</p> <p>In our NW region participants were asked to consider 24 measures, in our ESW regions participants were asked to consider 14 measures</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="409 659 1798 1433"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="409 659 1104 699">Shown to NW and ESW participants</th> <th data-bbox="1104 659 1798 699">Shown to NW participants only</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="409 699 1104 1342"> <p>Water</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improving the taste, smell and appearance of drinking water 2. Reducing leakage from the water network 3. Repairing visible leaks quicker 4. Reducing water supply interruptions that last over three hours 5. Reducing water supply interruptions that last between one and three hours 6. Reducing the number of properties that experience a water interruption that lasts more than 12 hours 7. Reducing the chance of a fault at a water treatment works 8. Water efficiency in homes 9. Water efficiency in businesses </td> <td data-bbox="1104 699 1798 1342"> <p>Asset Health</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 15.Reducing the number of sewers that collapse 16.Reducing the number of blockages that are found in the sewer <p>Wastewater</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 17.Reducing sewer flooding inside customer properties 18.Reducing sewer flooding on the outside of customer properties 19.Reducing the number of properties that experience sewer flooding more than once <p>Environment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 20.Improving the quality of sea water at beaches 21.Reducing the number of pollution incidents caused by NW 22.Ensuring the treated wastewater that is returned to rivers and seas is sufficiently clean </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="409 1342 1104 1433"> <p>Asset Health</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10.Reducing the number of water mains that burst </td> <td data-bbox="1104 1342 1798 1433"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Shown to NW and ESW participants	Shown to NW participants only	<p>Water</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improving the taste, smell and appearance of drinking water 2. Reducing leakage from the water network 3. Repairing visible leaks quicker 4. Reducing water supply interruptions that last over three hours 5. Reducing water supply interruptions that last between one and three hours 6. Reducing the number of properties that experience a water interruption that lasts more than 12 hours 7. Reducing the chance of a fault at a water treatment works 8. Water efficiency in homes 9. Water efficiency in businesses 	<p>Asset Health</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 15.Reducing the number of sewers that collapse 16.Reducing the number of blockages that are found in the sewer <p>Wastewater</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 17.Reducing sewer flooding inside customer properties 18.Reducing sewer flooding on the outside of customer properties 19.Reducing the number of properties that experience sewer flooding more than once <p>Environment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 20.Improving the quality of sea water at beaches 21.Reducing the number of pollution incidents caused by NW 22.Ensuring the treated wastewater that is returned to rivers and seas is sufficiently clean 	<p>Asset Health</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10.Reducing the number of water mains that burst 		<p>Results at NWG level have informed our prioritisation ranking.</p>
Shown to NW and ESW participants	Shown to NW participants only							
<p>Water</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improving the taste, smell and appearance of drinking water 2. Reducing leakage from the water network 3. Repairing visible leaks quicker 4. Reducing water supply interruptions that last over three hours 5. Reducing water supply interruptions that last between one and three hours 6. Reducing the number of properties that experience a water interruption that lasts more than 12 hours 7. Reducing the chance of a fault at a water treatment works 8. Water efficiency in homes 9. Water efficiency in businesses 	<p>Asset Health</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 15.Reducing the number of sewers that collapse 16.Reducing the number of blockages that are found in the sewer <p>Wastewater</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 17.Reducing sewer flooding inside customer properties 18.Reducing sewer flooding on the outside of customer properties 19.Reducing the number of properties that experience sewer flooding more than once <p>Environment</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 20.Improving the quality of sea water at beaches 21.Reducing the number of pollution incidents caused by NW 22.Ensuring the treated wastewater that is returned to rivers and seas is sufficiently clean 							
<p>Asset Health</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10.Reducing the number of water mains that burst 								

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

Source, Sample size and approach	Details of prioritisation exercise(s)		Granularity of reporting
	<p>Environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 11.Improving rivers, reservoirs and coastlines that the public can access 12.Reducing the NW/ESW carbon footprint 13.Using NW/ESW sites to improve biodiversity 14.Reducing the number of major and significant pollution incidents caused by ESW/NW 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 23.Reducing the number of times NW spill heavily diluted wastewater into rivers and seas during heavy rainfall 24.Managing river water quality 	
<p>We have inferred prioritisation from the results by ranking measures in terms of the highest to lowest overall valuation.</p>			

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

<p>Water Resources North Customer Engagement (2021)</p>	<p><u>Pre-workshop Homework Task (HR)</u></p> <p>Participants were asked to think about water and the environment and to state which of the following they thought should be the key areas of focus for their water company</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Educating customers on their water use to help them save water and for customers who have a meter to help them save money. 2. Reducing leaks from the water network. 3. Managing the impact of climate change on water supply (e.g. more severe and / or frequent droughts / flooding 4. Protecting reservoir stocks. 5. Working in partnership with other sectors who also take water from the environment to minimise the impact on the water environment overall. 6. Continuing to maintain and protect rivers and ecosystems i.e. keeping them as they are today. 7. Improving rivers and ecosystems i.e. enhancing the water environment. 8. Working more closely with the agriculture industry to promote more sustainable farming practices (e.g. reducing fertiliser and pesticide use which impact the water in rivers and ultimately the water collected by water companies). 9. Becoming carbon neutral (achieving net zero carbon emissions 10. Working with partners to restore bog habitats. 11. Minimising the impact of water abstraction on chalk streams. <p><u>Post-workshop (PW) questionnaire</u></p> <p><u>PW Ranking exercise 1</u></p> <p>As part of a post workshop questionnaire participants were asked to think again about the WRMP Metrics they had seen in their workshop and to “allocate points to them to show how important they are to you. You have a total of 100 points to give to the 12 Metrics, you can give as many points as you would like to each of the Metrics, you can give some to all of them or only choose to share the points out to a selection, it all depends on what you think is important (the more points given the more important it is) however the total must add up to 100.’</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Public Water Supply (PWS) drought resilience 2. Biodiversity net gain 3. Natural capital 4. Leakage 5. Per Capita Consumption 	<p>Results are reported separately for NW customers. These have been pulled through into our overall prioritisation ranking.</p>
---	---	--

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

- 6. Non-drought resilience
- 7. Carbon
- 8. Customer preferred option type
- 9. Stakeholder preferred option type
- 10. Human and social wellbeing
- 11. Financial cost
- 12. Option deliverability

PW Ranking exercise 2

Participants were then asked to read a number of options available as part of a WRMP that can either reduce demand or increase supply, at an overall level and to indicate which area of water resource management is most important to them overall?

Water Demand Management	
Meter optants	Customers who have a metered supply are generally more water efficient as they are more water aware. Through increased promotion of metering we can encourage a greater number of customers to opt for a water meter
Metering on change of occupancy	The WReN supply areas cannot universally meter all customers as this is only permitted in areas the Environment Agency classify as water stressed. However, we can increase the number of metered customers by installing a meter into every property which is sold
Supply pipe renewal	Customers are responsible for their supply pipe from the property boundary to the point of supply. Water is wasted through leaks from these pipes. Increased investment would allow identification and replacement of leaking supply pipe
Water efficiency (providing water saving products)	Both commercial and domestic customers can benefit from water audits and installation of water saving products, such as shower regulators and low flush cistern devices
Consumption data	By providing customers with information on how much they use vs. how much other consumers use it raises awareness of how they compare and encourages them to take action to reduce use. This can be through an online portal or app

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

Commercial water efficiency	Audits and / or internal leakage detection/fixin
Distribution management	
Leakage	All water companies have an annual leakage target they must meet. By investing in increased leakage detection activity, leakage can be reduced beyond current targets
Mains replacement	Replacing aging mains pipes to reduce the number of bursts. Old pipes generally result in more bursts, replacing those mains that lose the most water through bursts will reduce the volume of water put into supply
Resources management	
Extension of existing water treatment works	Increasing the capacity of existing works can increase the volume of water treated and available for supply
Reservoir (dam or embankment raising	Increasing reservoir capacity provides additional storage of water and increases the volume available for supply
Reservoir desilting	Over time silt accumulates at the bottom of reservoirs taking up capacity. Removal of this silt increases storage and therefore the volume of water available
Desalination	Increased water supply could be provided by constructing a desalination plant. This would treat sea water and increase the water available for supply
Increased abstraction	Supply can be increased by applying for licenses to abstract from new river / groundwater sources or apply for an increase to an existing river / groundwater sources. This may require additional investment in increased treatment work capacity
Water transfers	Transfer water between water companies in our region or between neighbouring regions. This will require investment in new infrastructure

PW Ranking exercise 3

Participants were then asked to consider all of the options and to rank them in order of how you would prefer WReN (Water Resources North) to approach the water supply demand balance where a ranking of 1 is your most preferred option for meeting the water supply demand balance and a ranking of 14 is your least preferred option

1. Meter optants
2. Metering on change of occupancy
3. Supply pipe renewal
4. Water efficiency (providing water saving products)
5. Consumption data
6. Commercial water efficiency
7. Leakage
8. Mains replacement
9. Extension of existing water treatment works
10. Reservoir (dam or embankment raising)
11. Reservoir desilting
12. Desalination
13. Increased abstraction
14. Water transfer

Ranking exercise 4

Participants were then told that companies also need to consider a Drainage Water Management Plan (DWMP) and that these plans look to improve drainage and, through doing so, environmental water quality. They were told that when wastewater (sewage) escapes from the sewer or other drainage networks, it can have a number of consequences (listed below). Participants were asked to state which consequences they thought water companies should work hardest to prevent

The options shared were:

1. Flooding of Infrastructure (like major roads, hospitals)
2. Indoor Flooding
3. Pollution Leading to Dead Fish in Rivers
4. Potential to make People and Animals who go in River and Sea Water Poorly
5. Outdoor Flooding
6. Algae Choking Plant and Wildlife
7. Litter in Rivers and the Sea

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

Source, Sample size and approach	Details of prioritisation exercise(s)	Granularity of reporting
	<p>8. Water Company Fines for Pollution or Poor River and Bathing Water Quality 9. Bad Smells due to Blocked Drains 10. Slow Drainage due to Blocked Drains 11. Temporary Loss of Use of Rivers and the Sea for Activities like Swimming, Surfing and Paddling</p> <p><u>Ranking exercise 5</u></p> <p>Participants were asked to rank the options included in exercise 4 again, this time in order of the most important drainage issue to prevent to the least where a ranking of 1 was their most preferred option for improving drainage and environmental water quality and a ranking of 11 was their least preferred option.</p> <p><u>PW Ranking exercise 6</u></p> <p>Participants were then presented with their 6 most preferred options from the WRMP (Water Resources Management Plan) and the 6 most preferred options to prevent from the DWMP (Drainage Water Management Plan) and asked to rank them together based on where they believed companies should be focussing their efforts where 1 is the most preferred and 12 is the least preferred.</p>	

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

Source, Sample size and approach	Details of prioritisation exercise(s)	Granularity of reporting
Water Resources East Customer Engagement (2021)	<p><u>Exercise 1: Supply and Demand side options</u></p> <p>Participants were asked which the 3 supply and demand options they would most like to see included in the plan. The options presented were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Leakage detection and reduction 2. Using grey water or rainwater collection and use 3. More reservoirs to store water 4. Higher water efficiency using incentives and awareness campaigns 5. Universal metering 6. Taking water from the sea (desalination) 7. Recycling treated wastewater and returning to the water supply 8. Storing water underground 9. Transferring water around and beyond the region 10. Sea tankering water from other countries <p><u>Exercise 2: Best value plan objectives</u></p> <p>Participants were asked which 4 Best value plan objectives they would most like to see included in the plan</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Affordable water bills over the long term 2. The most from what we have (reducing leakage, encouraging customers to use less) 3. A plan that that is adaptable in case of new/emerging conditions 4. Ambitious targets to reduce carbon emissions and use renewable energy 5. Better natural habitats: supporting wildlife & biodiversity 6. A reduction in flood risk to communities 7. Higher levels of resilience to drought (reducing the risk of emergency measures) 8. Creating attractive water environments for recreation and wellbeing 9. What regional organisations, businesses and consumers say they want 10. Job creation and benefits to the local and regional economy 	<p>Report at WRE regional level (Cambridge Water, ESW and Anglian Water)</p>

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

Source, Sample size and approach	Details of prioritisation exercise(s)	Granularity of reporting		
<p>CCW and Ofwat Customer spotlight: People's views and experiences of water (2022)</p> <p>2,951</p> <p>Quantitative – Online survey, telephone survey</p>	<p>Participants were asked to think about “your water company and their focus over the next 10-20 years” and to rate 10 areas of focus on “a scale from 1 to 10 according to how important they are for you, with 10 being extremely important and 1 being not at all important”.</p> <p>The focus areas tested were:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="416 483 1776 802"> <tr> <td data-bbox="416 483 1093 722"> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide clean, safe drinking water 2. Prevent sewage entering people's homes 3. Prevent sewage entering rivers, streams, and the sea 4. Fix leaks 5. Make sure there are no water shortages </td> <td data-bbox="1099 483 1776 802"> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Provide good customer service 7. Ensuring services can meet the needs of future generations 8. Reducing the amount of water taken from environmentally... 9. Keep bills low 10. Reduce their carbon footprint </td> </tr> </table>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide clean, safe drinking water 2. Prevent sewage entering people's homes 3. Prevent sewage entering rivers, streams, and the sea 4. Fix leaks 5. Make sure there are no water shortages 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Provide good customer service 7. Ensuring services can meet the needs of future generations 8. Reducing the amount of water taken from environmentally... 9. Keep bills low 10. Reduce their carbon footprint 	<p>Reported at a national level, no company breakdown.</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide clean, safe drinking water 2. Prevent sewage entering people's homes 3. Prevent sewage entering rivers, streams, and the sea 4. Fix leaks 5. Make sure there are no water shortages 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Provide good customer service 7. Ensuring services can meet the needs of future generations 8. Reducing the amount of water taken from environmentally... 9. Keep bills low 10. Reduce their carbon footprint 			
<p>OFWAT CCW Preferences Research (2022)</p> <p>136</p> <p>Qualitative – online focus groups and online in-depth interviews</p>	<p>Ofwat’s draft common PCs (20 service areas) were explored via stimulus. These were:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="416 882 1776 1257"> <tr> <td data-bbox="416 882 1093 1257"> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water supply interruption 2. The appearance, taste and smell of tap water 3. Boil water notice 4. Do not drink notice 5. Hose pipe bans 6. Severe drought 7. Sewer flooding: outside your property 8. Sewer flooding: inside your property 9. Leaks 10. Bathing water quality </td> <td data-bbox="1099 882 1776 1257"> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. River water quality 12. Pollution incidents 13. Storm overflows 14. Non-essential use ban (businesses only) 15. Water pressure 16. The presence of lead in pipes 17. Biodiversity 18. Carbon 19. Helping people and businesses use less water 20. Customer satisfaction & customer service </td> </tr> </table> <p>The analysis ranks each service aspect as high importance / impact, some importance / impact or lower importance / impact</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water supply interruption 2. The appearance, taste and smell of tap water 3. Boil water notice 4. Do not drink notice 5. Hose pipe bans 6. Severe drought 7. Sewer flooding: outside your property 8. Sewer flooding: inside your property 9. Leaks 10. Bathing water quality 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. River water quality 12. Pollution incidents 13. Storm overflows 14. Non-essential use ban (businesses only) 15. Water pressure 16. The presence of lead in pipes 17. Biodiversity 18. Carbon 19. Helping people and businesses use less water 20. Customer satisfaction & customer service 	<p>Reported at a national level, no company breakdown.</p> <p>Some demographic differences (e.g. age and SEG are reported. Although not consistently for each measure).</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Water supply interruption 2. The appearance, taste and smell of tap water 3. Boil water notice 4. Do not drink notice 5. Hose pipe bans 6. Severe drought 7. Sewer flooding: outside your property 8. Sewer flooding: inside your property 9. Leaks 10. Bathing water quality 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. River water quality 12. Pollution incidents 13. Storm overflows 14. Non-essential use ban (businesses only) 15. Water pressure 16. The presence of lead in pipes 17. Biodiversity 18. Carbon 19. Helping people and businesses use less water 20. Customer satisfaction & customer service 			

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

Source, Sample size and approach	Details of prioritisation exercise(s)	Granularity of reporting
<p>CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)</p> <p>62</p> <p>Online forum</p> <p>Online focus groups</p>	<p>Participants were asked to prioritise a list responsibilities that water companies have to balance (alongside the environmental priorities they had been talking about). The responsibilities presented were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Providing schemes to lower water bills to help people on low incomes 2. Keeping bills as low as possible. 3. Managing the environmental impact of what they do 4. Helping customers access support in ways to suit them e.g. not online / language needs 5. Providing clean and reliable drinking water to peoples' taps 6. Removing & treating water that has been used before sending it back to rivers 7. Helping customers access support in ways to suit them e.g. not online / language needs 8. Planning & investing to keep services reliable, despite climate change/ population growth 	<p>Reported at a national level, no company breakdown.</p>

APPENDIX 2: INCLUSION OF PCS IN PRIORITY RANKING EXERCISES AND COPPERLEAF VALUATION RESEARCH

COMMON PCS	Sources with results reported separately for NW / ESW household customers					Sources which did not report results separately for NW / ESW household customers			Sources which engaged non-household customers	
	Pre-Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)	Domestic tracking research (2022-23)	People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)	Defining the Future (2021)	WRMP Options Research (separate NW and ESW reports) (2021)	Brand values research (2019)	Brand values research (2020-22)	Customer Valuations for Service Improvements (Copperleaf) (2022) ⁴	Retailer and Non-Household Research (2022)	Wholesale tracking (2021)
Mains repair	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Customer contacts about water quality	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Compliance risk index (CRI)	✓							✓	✓	✓
Leakage (NW)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	
Leakage (ESW)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	
Per capita consumption (PCC)			✓	✓	✓			✓		
Unplanned outage at a water treatment works	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓
Interruptions to supply over three hours								✓	✓	
Business demand								✓	✓	
Internal sewer flooding			✓	✓				✓	✓	
External sewer flooding	✓							✓	✓	
Discharge permit compliance	✓				✓			✓	✓	
Sewer collapses	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓	✓
Pollutions (serious and all)			✓	✓				✓	✓	
Storm overflows	✓							✓	✓	
Greenhouse gases	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	
Bathing water quality		✓						✓	✓	✓

⁴ Note: Our [Customer Valuations for Service Improvements \(Copperleaf\) \(2022\)](#) research did not include a priority ranking exercise. We have included Copperleaf as it is our only project in which participants were asked to consider all water, wastewater, asset health and environmental measures collectively and indicate which they would be willing to pay more for to meet a proposed service level. We have inferred priority levels for these measures by ranking them from highest to lowest valuations.

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

COMMON PCS	Sources with results reported separately for NW / ESW household customers					Sources which <u>did not</u> report results separately for NW / ESW household customers			Sources which engaged non-household customers	
	Pre-Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)	Domestic tracking research (2022-23)	People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)	Defining the Future (2021)	WRMP Options Research (separate NW and ESW reports) (2021)	Brand values research (2019)	Brand values research (2020-22)	Customer Valuations for Service Improvements (Copperleaf) (2022)⁴	Retailer and Non-Household Research (2022)	Wholesale tracking (2021)
River water quality		✓	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓
Biodiversity net gain	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
C-MeX			✓	✓		✓	✓			
D-MeX										
BR-MeX										

APPENDIX 3: SAMPLE BREAKDOWN OF PRIORITISATION EXERCISES

Source	Reporting levels			
	NWG household customers (overall)	NW household customers	ESW household customers	Other
Pre-Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)	-	32	53	NW Young (6) ... ESW Young (4) Essex households (25) Suffolk households (24)
Domestic tracking research (2022-23)	2,500	1,583	917	-
People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)	62	15	29	Young (13) Employees (5)
Customer Valuations for Service Improvements (Copperleaf) (2022)	2,000	-	-	-
Defining the Future (2021)	100	49	51	27 stakeholders 13 non-households
WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) (2021)	2,835	1,740	1,095	NW Non-household (99) NW Future customers (100) NW Customers in vulnerable circumstances (428) ESW Non-household (102) ESW Future customers (117) ESW Customers in vulnerable circumstances (271)
Brand Values (2019)	750	-	-	-
Brand Values (2020-22)	1,900	-	-	-
Retailer and Non-Household Research (2022)	-	-	-	Non-household customers (31)
Water Resources North Customer Engagement (club project) (2021)	-	5 focus groups (estimated 50 customers)	-	
Water Resources East Customer Engagement (club project) (2021)	-	-	4 reconvened focus groups (20 customers)	
Wholesale Tracker Results (2021)	-	-	-	Non-household customers (2000)

APPENDIX 4: WEIGHTING OF ALL SOURCES

SCORING AND WEIGHTING OF ALL CUSTOMER RESEARCH SOURCES WHICH INCLUDE A PRIORITY RANKING EXERCISE

STAGE 1: COVERAGE SCORE

Parameter 1/1: Coverage Score (50% of the overall robustness score)																																						
Was each topic area covered across a sufficient number of events / methods to obtain a range of views from customer groups?																																						
Step 1: Questions to consider	Step 2: Scoring	Step 3: Scores for all Events (prioritisation)																																				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> How closely linked is the feedback to prioritisation? Is the information valuable for business planning purposes? Does the event cover all outcomes/ measures? 	<p>Notes from Sia to support scoring: Topics which are discussed extensively across a range of events score highly. Those which are limited to water community events score lower due, typically, to a lack of breadth of engagement.</p> <p>Consider if each topic area was covered across a sufficient number of events / methods to obtain a range of views from customer groups.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Score 1</td> <td>Covers a minority of outcomes/measures and is less valuable for prioritisation for business planning purposes.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Score 2</td> <td>Covers some outcomes/measures and has some value for prioritisation for business planning purposes.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Score 3</td> <td>Covers the majority of outcomes/measures and is valuable for prioritisation for business planning purposes.</td> </tr> </table>	Score 1	Covers a minority of outcomes/measures and is less valuable for prioritisation for business planning purposes.	Score 2	Covers some outcomes/measures and has some value for prioritisation for business planning purposes.	Score 3	Covers the majority of outcomes/measures and is valuable for prioritisation for business planning purposes.	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022 and Q1 2023)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Copperleaf Valuations (2022)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Retailer and Non-Household Research (2022)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Defining the future (2021)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WRMP Options Research (NW and ESWP (2022)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pre -Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brand Values (2020-22)</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brand Values (2019)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wholesale Tracker (2021)</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CCW and Ofwat 2022 Customer Spotlight - People's views and experiences of water</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table>	Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022 and Q1 2023)	2	Copperleaf Valuations (2022)	3	Retailer and Non-Household Research (2022)	3	Defining the future (2021)	3	People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)	3	WRMP Options Research (NW and ESWP (2022)	2	Pre -Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)	2	Brand Values (2020-22)	1	Brand Values (2019)	2	Wholesale Tracker (2021)	1	Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)	3	Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)	2	CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)	2	CCW and Ofwat 2022 Customer Spotlight - People's views and experiences of water	2	CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)	1
Score 1	Covers a minority of outcomes/measures and is less valuable for prioritisation for business planning purposes.																																					
Score 2	Covers some outcomes/measures and has some value for prioritisation for business planning purposes.																																					
Score 3	Covers the majority of outcomes/measures and is valuable for prioritisation for business planning purposes.																																					
Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022 and Q1 2023)	2																																					
Copperleaf Valuations (2022)	3																																					
Retailer and Non-Household Research (2022)	3																																					
Defining the future (2021)	3																																					
People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)	3																																					
WRMP Options Research (NW and ESWP (2022)	2																																					
Pre -Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)	2																																					
Brand Values (2020-22)	1																																					
Brand Values (2019)	2																																					
Wholesale Tracker (2021)	1																																					
Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)	3																																					
Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)	2																																					
CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)	2																																					
CCW and Ofwat 2022 Customer Spotlight - People's views and experiences of water	2																																					
CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)	1																																					

PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS

Coverage Score Q&A	Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022)	Copperleaf Valuations (2022)	Retailer and Non Household Research (2022)	Defining the future (2021)	WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) 2022	People Panels #3 (2022)	Pre - Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)	Brand Values (2020-22)	Wholesale Tracker (2021)	Brand Values (2019)	Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)	Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)	CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)	CCW and Ofwat Customer Spotlight (2022)	CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)
1. How closely linked is the feedback to prioritisation?	<i>Includes an 'Areas of the business plan that respondents think should be a priority' exercise⁵</i>	<i>Valuations of performance measures and customers' desire for improvement</i>	<i>Prioritisation of components within four service areas (water, wastewater, environment and asset health).</i>	<i>Prioritisation of the importance of outcomes</i>	<i>Covered WRMP Options only.</i>	<i>Ranked 5 areas; 7 themes; and measures within themes. Constrained and unconstrained ranking exercises.</i>	<i>Main focus on potential PR24 plans. Includes prioritisation exercises on what matters most and areas requiring the most investment.</i>	<i>Four previously identified Customer priority areas⁶ ranked.</i>	<i>Limited number of service areas included.</i>	<i>Participants ranked nine broad business plan themes⁷ as one exercise within wider objectives.</i>	<i>Includes many (seven) priority ranking exercises.</i>	<i>Two prioritisation exercises. The first focuses on WRMP, the second brings in a wider range of factors.</i>	<i>All Ofwat's draft common PCs for PR24 categorised as high, some, or lower importance.</i>	<i>Priorities for the future was one objective. This research also explored satisfaction, engagement, financial circumstances and behaviours.</i>	<i>General priorities was one objective. This research was mostly concerned with behaviours and views in relation to water environments</i>
2. Is the information valuable for business planning purposes?	Yes	<i>Input into Copperleaf</i>	<i>Yes – especially for the views of NHHS (note retailers did not participate in this activity).</i>	<i>It shaped the programme of work for PR24</i>	<i>Yes, but mainly for WRMP.</i>	<i>Supports Defining the Future. Features in most of the line of sight reviews.</i>	<i>Very – shaped the next iteration of plan to be tested with customers.</i>	<i>Limited as only four areas ranked</i>	<i>Limited as only seven areas ranked</i>	<i>Supporting evidence. Features in many of the line of sight reviews.</i>	<i>Yes – but mainly for WReN.</i>	<i>Yes – but mainly for WRE.</i>	<i>It provides a national view to compare our customers' views against – which can be valuable.</i>	<i>It provides a national view to compare our customers' views against – which can be valuable.</i>	<i>It provides a national view to compare our customers' views against – which can be valuable.</i>
3. Does the event cover all outcomes/ measures	<i>No, covers a limited number and some are combined</i>	<i>Covers the majority of measures (not customer experience): 24 in NW area 14 in ESW area</i>	<i>Excludes customer experience – but includes the majority of other service measures.</i>	<i>Includes all outcomes</i>	<i>WRMP only.</i>	<i>It did as they stood at the point in time of the engagement</i>	<i>No - it was focused on areas for investment (statutory or enhancements)</i>	No	No	<i>Broadly linked to outcomes at PR19</i>	<i>Mostly WRMP and DWMP options, with some other affordability and environmental factors.</i>	<i>Mostly WRMP options, with some other affordability, wastewater and environmental factors.</i>	<i>No, it covers Ofwat's early thinking on common PCs.</i>	<i>Ten areas covered across water, wastewater, customer service, environment and resilience.</i>	<i>Seven areas covered across water, wastewater, environment, affordability and support services.</i>

⁵ Maintain high standards on clean, clear and good tasting water, Ensuring water is always available, Repair leaks (more quickly), Reduce emissions and adapt to climate change, Cleaner rivers Reducing bills, Better reliability by replacing infrastructure and doing more maintenance, Improve flood defences, Cleaner beaches, Improve service (sewer flooding, customer service etc.)

⁶ Top quality water, Value for Money, great customer service, prepared for the future

⁷ Access to clean water, improving the environment, affordable bills, doing what they say they will, help when it is needed, spending money locally, being innovative, unrivalled customer experience, giving time and resources to local communities

**STAGE 2: SOURCE ROBUSTNESS SCORING
(5 PARAMETERS WHICH MAKE UP 50% OF THE OVERALL ROBUSTNESS SCORE)**

Parameter 1/5: Methodologically Sound																																						
<i>Defensible in design by providing a research strategy that can address the evaluation question posed</i>																																						
Step 1: Questions to consider	Step 2: Scoring	Step 3: Scores for all Events (prioritisation)																																				
<p>4. Which methods / techniques were used to ensure appropriate depth and breadth of insight across the prioritisation exercise?</p> <p>5. Was the engagement/research conducted in-line with best practice principles?</p> <p>6. Are any of the methods applied less well established, new or innovative? If yes, do I need to establish how sound these methods are?</p> <p>7. Has the methodology been appropriately adapted and refined for the specific purpose for which it has been used?</p>	<p>Notes to support scoring: Scores are based on the type of engagement methods used e.g. basic surveys are less likely to elicit in-depth insight when compared to customer preference/ willingness to pay research.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Score 1</td> <td>Limited or no methodology, unplanned with no aim or objective.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Score 2</td> <td>Some aims of engagement, but limited discussion of sampling, knowledge levels and stakeholder backgrounds.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Score 3</td> <td>Clear aims, sound sampling methodology and consideration of barriers to inclusion.</td> </tr> </table>	Score 1	Limited or no methodology, unplanned with no aim or objective.	Score 2	Some aims of engagement, but limited discussion of sampling, knowledge levels and stakeholder backgrounds.	Score 3	Clear aims, sound sampling methodology and consideration of barriers to inclusion.	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Copperleaf Valuations (2022)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Retailer and Non-Household (2022)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Defining the future (2021)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) (2021)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pre -Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brand Values (2020-22)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wholesale Tracker (2021)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brand Values (2019)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CCW and Ofwat 2022 Customer Spotlight - People's views and experiences of water</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> </table>	Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022)	2	Copperleaf Valuations (2022)	3	Retailer and Non-Household (2022)	3	Defining the future (2021)	3	WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) (2021)	3	People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)	2	Pre -Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)	2	Brand Values (2020-22)	2	Wholesale Tracker (2021)	2	Brand Values (2019)	2	Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)	3	Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)	3	CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)	2	CCW and Ofwat 2022 Customer Spotlight - People's views and experiences of water	2	CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)	2
Score 1	Limited or no methodology, unplanned with no aim or objective.																																					
Score 2	Some aims of engagement, but limited discussion of sampling, knowledge levels and stakeholder backgrounds.																																					
Score 3	Clear aims, sound sampling methodology and consideration of barriers to inclusion.																																					
Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022)	2																																					
Copperleaf Valuations (2022)	3																																					
Retailer and Non-Household (2022)	3																																					
Defining the future (2021)	3																																					
WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) (2021)	3																																					
People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)	2																																					
Pre -Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)	2																																					
Brand Values (2020-22)	2																																					
Wholesale Tracker (2021)	2																																					
Brand Values (2019)	2																																					
Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)	3																																					
Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)	3																																					
CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)	2																																					
CCW and Ofwat 2022 Customer Spotlight - People's views and experiences of water	2																																					
CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)	2																																					

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

Methodologically Sound Score Q&A	Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022)	Copperleaf Valuations (2022)	Retailer and Non-Household (2022)	Defining the future (2021)	WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) (2022)	People Panels #3 (2022)	Pre - Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)	Brand Values (2020-22)	Wholesale Tracker (2021)	Brand Values (2019)	Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)	Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)	CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)	CCW and Ofwat Customer Spotlight (2022)	CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)
1. Which methods / techniques were used to ensure appropriate depth and breadth of insight across the prioritisation exercise?	<i>Telephone interviews with household customers.</i>	<i>Hall tests with household customers using a board game approach.</i>	<i>Online community.</i>	<i>Online workshops with households In-depth telephone interviews with stakeholders and NHHs.</i>	<i>Online surveys, panel surveys, online focus groups and face-to-face surveys for digitally disengaged customers.</i>	<i>Online deliberative panel sessions – household customers.</i>	<i>Online deliberative workshops with poll voting – household customers, future customers and stakeholders.</i>	<i>Telephone survey - household customers.</i>	<i>Telephone survey</i>	<i>Telephone survey - household customers.</i>	<i>Workshops</i>	<i>Workshops and depth-interviews</i>	<i>Online focus groups and online depth-interviews. Households (groups). NHH, futures, 75+ and ESL (interviews).</i>	<i>Online survey plus a telephone survey with 100 'digitally disenfranchise d' respondents.</i>	<i>Online forum (2 ½ weeks) and online focus groups.</i>
2. Was the engagement/research conducted in-line with best practice principles?	<i>Yes, but recordings suggest the ranking exercise is challenging over the phone.</i>	<i>Yes.</i>	<i>Yes.</i>	<i>Yes.</i>	<i>Yes.</i>	<i>Yes.</i>	<i>Yes.</i>	<i>Yes.</i>	<i>Yes.</i>	<i>Yes.</i>	<i>Yes.</i>	<i>Yes.</i>	<i>No evidence against.</i>	<i>No evidence against.</i>	<i>No evidence against.</i>
3. Are any of the methods applied less well established, new or innovative? If yes, do I need to establish how sound these methods are?	<i>No.</i>	<i>Designed, tried and tested at PR19.</i>	<i>This was new for NWG at PR24.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>This was new for NWG at PR24.</i>	<i>Where possible we were following Ofwat/CCW's draft A&A guidance.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>No.</i>	<i>No – common market research methods.</i>	<i>No – common market research methods.</i>	<i>No – common market research methods.</i>
4. Has the methodology been appropriately adapted and refined for the specific purpose for which it has been used?	<i>No, it would be cognitively stronger if participants could see a list of the areas for improvement.</i>	<i>Yes, was adapted to include more measures than were tested at PR19.</i>	<i>Yes.</i>	<i>Designed to understand what participants want to talk to NW/ESW about; when we should work with others and what NW/ESW should just deal with.</i>	<i>Yes.</i>	<i>This will be an area we reflect on at the end of PR24 when determining our 'tool kit' for PR29.</i>	<i>On reflection, it is better to host customer sessions separate to people panels. This has been adopted for future projects.</i>	<i>Yes.</i>	<i>Yes.</i>	<i>Yes.</i>	<i>Yes.</i>	<i>Yes.</i>	<i>No evidence against.</i>	<i>No evidence against.</i>	<i>No evidence against.</i>

Parameter 2/5: Number of customers engaged																																						
<i>Have a sufficient number of customers been engaged on this topic to capture a broad range of views?</i>																																						
Step 1: Questions to consider	Step 2: Scoring	Step 3: Scores for all Events (prioritisation)																																				
<p>1. Have a sufficient number of customers been engaged on this topic to capture a broad range of views?</p> <p>2. Have NW/ESW customers been engaged in this research?</p>	<p>Notes to support scoring: Scores were based on the number of customers engaged on each sub-topic –those with a high volume of customers are more likely to capture a broad range of views.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Score 1</td> <td>Low volume of customers – Limited range of views</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Score 2</td> <td>Sufficient volume of customers – Good range of views</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Score 3</td> <td>High volume of customers – Broad range of views</td> </tr> </table>	Score 1	Low volume of customers – Limited range of views	Score 2	Sufficient volume of customers – Good range of views	Score 3	High volume of customers – Broad range of views	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Copperleaf Valuations (2022)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Retailer and Non-Household Research</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Defining the future (2021)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) (2021)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pre -Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brand Values (2020-22)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wholesale Tracker (2021)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brand Values (2019)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CCW and Ofwat 2022 Customer Spotlight - People’s views and experiences of water</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table>	Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022)	3	Copperleaf Valuations (2022)	3	Retailer and Non-Household Research	2	Defining the future (2021)	3	WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) (2021)	3	People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)	3	Pre -Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)	2	Brand Values (2020-22)	2	Wholesale Tracker (2021)	2	Brand Values (2019)	2	Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)	2	Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)	2	CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)	1	CCW and Ofwat 2022 Customer Spotlight - People’s views and experiences of water	1	CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)	1
Score 1	Low volume of customers – Limited range of views																																					
Score 2	Sufficient volume of customers – Good range of views																																					
Score 3	High volume of customers – Broad range of views																																					
Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022)	3																																					
Copperleaf Valuations (2022)	3																																					
Retailer and Non-Household Research	2																																					
Defining the future (2021)	3																																					
WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) (2021)	3																																					
People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)	3																																					
Pre -Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)	2																																					
Brand Values (2020-22)	2																																					
Wholesale Tracker (2021)	2																																					
Brand Values (2019)	2																																					
Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)	2																																					
Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)	2																																					
CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)	1																																					
CCW and Ofwat 2022 Customer Spotlight - People’s views and experiences of water	1																																					
CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)	1																																					

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

Quality/ robustness Score Q&A	Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022)	Copperleaf Valuations (2022)	Retailer and Non-Household Research (2022)	Defining the future (2021)	WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) (2022)	People Panels #3 (2022)	Pre - Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)	Brand Values (2020-22)	Wholesale Tracker (2021)	Brand Values (2019)	Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)	Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)	CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)	CCW and Ofwat Customer Spotlight (2022)	CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)
1. Have a sufficient number of customers been engaged on this topic to capture a broad range of views?	2,000 household customers in total Four rounds with 500 customers each. Statistically representative sample overall	2,000 household customers Even split NW / ESW Quotas were set for participant demographics 25% of participants were vulnerable in relation to health or finances	31 NHH customers engaged (note retailers did not participate in this activity).	100 household customers 27 Stakeholders 13 businesses Even split NW / ESW Wide range of views sought and analysed – different demographics were recruited	3,271 Household customers Non-household customers Future customers Customers in vulnerable circumstances Including a sample of customers from Berwick (specific options related to their community).	62 household and future customers.	112 household customers, including 49 people panelists. 8 stakeholders	1,900 household customers in total (3 annual rounds) Quotas on age only Some views gathered at a 'theme' level	200 (110 NW and 90 ESW). Considering that this is NHH this represents a good sample size. Includes a range of NHH sizes.	750 household customers Quotas on age only Some views gathered at a 'theme' level	160 (approx.) 16 Reconvened online workshops Household customers, future customers, citizens, non-household customers (water and non-water dependent)	16 reconvened focus groups, 4 of which were with ESW customers. A range of SEGs. 14 depth interviews in total (NHHS) 3 with ESW NHHs. Stakeholders also included.	136 (est.) households, businesses, specific household segments – 75+ years, future bill payers and ESL. No participants from NWG areas.	2,951 respondents. 2,116 (England), 507 (Wales) weighted to be nationally representative. Additional booster of 328 participants from ethnic minority communities. Unclear how many NWG were included.	62 (4 NWG).
2. Have NW/ESW customers been engaged in this research?	Yes.	Yes.	Yes – but some gaps in business sizes across regions.	Yes.	Yes	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	Yes.	NW only	ESW only	No.	Report includes views from the North-East and South-East. Not possible to conclude exact numbers.	Limited.

Parameter 3/5: Rigorously gathered																																						
<i>Rigorous in conduct through systematic and transparent collection, analysis and interpretation of qualitative data</i>																																						
Step 1: Questions to consider	Step 2: Scoring	Step 3: Scores for all Events (prioritisation)																																				
1. How was data gathered? 2. Were best practice methods applied for gathering the data? 3. Is the collected data detail rich and in-depth?	<p>Notes to support scoring: Engagement events were scored highly for being rigorously gathered when a 'thorough discussion of data collection procedures, a range of perspectives and extensive detail of feedback'* was included.</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Score 1</td> <td>Limited discussion of data collection technique, who collected the data, or the procedure for recording differing opinions.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Score 2</td> <td>Some discussion of data collection and the methods. Limited depth of feedback and range of opinions.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Score 3</td> <td>Thorough discussion of data collection procedures, noted a range of perspectives and extensive detail of feedback.</td> </tr> </table>	Score 1	Limited discussion of data collection technique, who collected the data, or the procedure for recording differing opinions.	Score 2	Some discussion of data collection and the methods. Limited depth of feedback and range of opinions.	Score 3	Thorough discussion of data collection procedures, noted a range of perspectives and extensive detail of feedback.	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Copperleaf Valuations (2022)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Retailer and Non-Household (2022)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Defining the future (2021)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) (2021)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pre -Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brand Values (2020-22)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wholesale Tracker (2021)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brand Values (2019)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CCW and Ofwat 2022 Customer Spotlight - People's views and experiences of water</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table>	Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022)	2	Copperleaf Valuations (2022)	2	Retailer and Non-Household (2022)	3	Defining the future (2021)	3	WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) (2021)	3	People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)	3	Pre -Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)	3	Brand Values (2020-22)	2	Wholesale Tracker (2021)	2	Brand Values (2019)	2	Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)	3	Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)	3	CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)	2	CCW and Ofwat 2022 Customer Spotlight - People's views and experiences of water	2	CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)	1
Score 1	Limited discussion of data collection technique, who collected the data, or the procedure for recording differing opinions.																																					
Score 2	Some discussion of data collection and the methods. Limited depth of feedback and range of opinions.																																					
Score 3	Thorough discussion of data collection procedures, noted a range of perspectives and extensive detail of feedback.																																					
Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022)	2																																					
Copperleaf Valuations (2022)	2																																					
Retailer and Non-Household (2022)	3																																					
Defining the future (2021)	3																																					
WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) (2021)	3																																					
People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)	3																																					
Pre -Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)	3																																					
Brand Values (2020-22)	2																																					
Wholesale Tracker (2021)	2																																					
Brand Values (2019)	2																																					
Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)	3																																					
Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)	3																																					
CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)	2																																					
CCW and Ofwat 2022 Customer Spotlight - People's views and experiences of water	2																																					
CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)	1																																					

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

Rigorously gathered Score Q&A	Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022)	Copperleaf Valuations (2022)	Retailer and Non-Household (2022)	Defining the future (2021)	WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) (2022)	People Panels #3 (2022)	Pre - Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)	Brand Values (2020-22)	Wholesale Tracker (2021)	Brand Values (2019)	Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)	Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)	CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)	CCW and Ofwat Customer Spotlight (2022)	CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)
1. How was data gathered?	<i>Via independent research agency</i>	<i>Data collection sheets were recorded by an independent research agency</i>	<i>Via an online community, hosted on a temporary basis y Yonder specifically for the project.</i>	<i>Through analysis of poll results, and recorded conversations by independent research agency</i>	<i>Online survey, online focus groups and face-to-face with audiences who were digitally disengaged. Panel survey with NHHs and future customers.</i>	<i>Through analysis of poll results, and recorded conversations by independent research agency</i>	<i>Through analysis of poll results, and recorded conversations by independent research agency</i>	<i>Through analysis of poll results, and recorded conversations by independent research agency</i>	<i>Telephone survey.</i>	<i>Through analysis of poll results, and recorded conversations by independent research agency</i>	<i>Through analysis of poll results, and recorded conversations by independent research agency</i>	<i>Through analysis of poll results, and recorded conversations by independent research agency</i>	<i>Gathered by independent research agency – no access to further detail.</i>	<i>Gathered by independent research agency – no access to further detail.</i>	<i>Gathered by independent research agency – no access to further detail.</i>
2. Were best practice methods applied for gathering the data?	Yes	Yes	Yes.	Yes	Yes.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No evidence against.	No evidence against.	No evidence against.
3. Is the collected data detail rich and in-depth?	<i>Data is analysed consistently so results can be compared over time</i>	<i>No reasons for decisions were recorded. Numerical results only.</i>	<i>Yes – quantitative scoring backed up by discussion.</i>	<i>Data was analysed in many different ways.</i>	<i>Data was analysed in many different ways.</i>	<i>Data was analysed in many different ways.</i>	<i>Data was analysed in many different ways.</i>	<i>Data is analysed consistently so results can be compared over time</i>	<i>Limited. Quantitative scores only, no narrative and only partial regional breakdown.</i>	<i>Data is analysed</i>	<i>Data was analysed in many different ways.</i>	<i>Data was analysed in many different ways.</i>	<i>Broad range of views pulled out in analysis – evidence of granular analysis.</i>	<i>Some evidence of granular analysis.</i>	<i>Limited evidence of analysis by sub-group.</i>

Parameter 4/5: Credibly interpreted																																						
<i>Credible in claim through offering well-founded and plausible arguments about significance of the evidence generated</i>																																						
Step 1: Questions to consider	Step 2: Scoring	Step 3: Scores for all Events (prioritisation)																																				
<p>4. Were the conclusions drawn based on robust evidence?</p> <p>5. How does the interpretation ensure the avoidance of bias?</p> <p>6. Does the evidence provide multiple perspectives and alternative positions?</p>	<p>Notes to support scoring: Engagement events were scored highly for being credibly interpreted when ‘engagement work is interpreted accurately and fairly with detailed outline of all perspectives and issues discussed’* (e.g. avoid bias or subjective views).</p> <table border="1"> <tr> <td>Score 1</td> <td>Lack of credible interpretation with potential for bias. Limited or no discussion of feedback points in the conclusion.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Score 2</td> <td>Some link and discussion of the engagement details in the event report, including some differing views.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Score 3</td> <td>Engagement work interpreted accurately and fairly with detailed outline of all perspectives and issues discussed.</td> </tr> </table> <p>*Follows guidance for assessment of robustness laid out in HM Treasury’s Magenta Book</p>	Score 1	Lack of credible interpretation with potential for bias. Limited or no discussion of feedback points in the conclusion.	Score 2	Some link and discussion of the engagement details in the event report, including some differing views.	Score 3	Engagement work interpreted accurately and fairly with detailed outline of all perspectives and issues discussed.	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Copperleaf Valuations (2022)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Retailer and Non-Household</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Defining the future (2021)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) (2022)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pre -Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brand Values (2020-22)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wholesale Tracker (2021)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brand Values (2019)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CCW and Ofwat 2022 Customer Spotlight - People’s views and experiences of water</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)</td> <td>1</td> </tr> </table>	Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022)	2	Copperleaf Valuations (2022)	2	Retailer and Non-Household	3	Defining the future (2021)	3	WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) (2022)	3	People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)	2	Pre -Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)	2	Brand Values (2020-22)	2	Wholesale Tracker (2021)	2	Brand Values (2019)	2	Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)	3	Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)	2	CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)	2	CCW and Ofwat 2022 Customer Spotlight - People’s views and experiences of water	2	CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)	1
Score 1	Lack of credible interpretation with potential for bias. Limited or no discussion of feedback points in the conclusion.																																					
Score 2	Some link and discussion of the engagement details in the event report, including some differing views.																																					
Score 3	Engagement work interpreted accurately and fairly with detailed outline of all perspectives and issues discussed.																																					
Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022)	2																																					
Copperleaf Valuations (2022)	2																																					
Retailer and Non-Household	3																																					
Defining the future (2021)	3																																					
WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) (2022)	3																																					
People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)	2																																					
Pre -Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)	2																																					
Brand Values (2020-22)	2																																					
Wholesale Tracker (2021)	2																																					
Brand Values (2019)	2																																					
Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)	3																																					
Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)	2																																					
CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)	2																																					
CCW and Ofwat 2022 Customer Spotlight - People’s views and experiences of water	2																																					
CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)	1																																					

**PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF
COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS**

Credibly interpreted Score Q&A	Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022)	Copperleaf Valuations (2022)	Retailer and Non-Household (2022)	Defining the future (2021)	WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) (2022)	People Panels #3 (2022)	Pre - Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)	Brand Values (2020-22)	Wholesale Tracker (2021)	Brand Values (2019)	Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)	Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)	CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)	CCW and Ofwat Customer Spotlight (2022)	CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)
1. Were the conclusions drawn based on robust evidence?	Yes	?	Yes	Yes	Yes	<i>Small sample size for polls but supported by rich deliberative conversation analysed.</i>	<i>Yes, but not supported by rich deliberative conversation.</i>	<i>Yes, but not supported by rich deliberative conversation.</i>	<i>Yes, but not supported by rich deliberative conversation.</i>	<i>Yes, but not supported by rich deliberative conversation.</i>	<i>Yes, and supported by rich deliberative conversation – clearly broken down at company level.</i>	<i>Yes, and supported by rich deliberative conversation – possible to get a sense of the views of customers from different companies.</i>	<i>No evidence otherwise – completed by an independent, MRS Company Partner.</i>	<i>No evidence otherwise – completed by an independent, MRS Company Partner.</i>	<i>No evidence otherwise – completed by an independent, MRS Company Partner.</i>
2. How does the interpretation ensure the avoidance of bias?	<i>Independent factual reporting only.</i>	?	<i>Independent factual reporting only.</i>	<i>Independent factual reporting only.</i>	<i>Independent factual reporting only.</i>	<i>Independent factual reporting only.</i>	<i>Independent factual reporting only.</i>	<i>Independent factual reporting only.</i>	<i>Independent factual reporting only.</i>	<i>Independent factual reporting only.</i>	<i>Independent factual reporting only.</i>	<i>Independent factual reporting only.</i>	<i>See above.</i>	<i>See above.</i>	<i>See above.</i>
3. Does the evidence provide multiple perspectives and alternative positions?	<i>Yes differences are highlighted NW / ESW.</i>	?	<i>Yes, differences are highlighted and examples given of reasons for choices.</i>	<i>Yes, differences are highlighted and examples given of reasons for choices.</i>	<i>Yes, differences are highlighted and examples given of reasons for choices.</i>	<i>Yes, differences are highlighted and examples given of reasons for choices.</i>	<i>Yes, differences are highlighted but limited examples given of reasons for choices.</i>	<i>Analysis at company level with significant area differences highlighted in narrative</i>	<i>Analysis at company level only.</i>	<i>Analysis at company level only.</i>	<i>Analysis at company level and regional level.</i>	<i>Analysis at regional level only.</i>	<i>Broad range of views pulled out in analysis – evidence of granular analysis.</i>	<i>Some evidence of granular analysis.</i>	<i>Limited evidence of analysis by sub-group.</i>

Parameter 5/5: Recency																																						
How recently was the research conducted?																																						
Step 1: Questions to consider	Step 2: Scoring	Step 3: Scores for all Events (prioritisation)																																				
1. How recently was the research conducted?	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Score 1</td> <td>An older source that has become less relevant (2019 or earlier)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Score 2</td> <td>A source which is 'becoming older', but still has some relevancy (2020- June 2021)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Score 3</td> <td>A recent source, or an older source that still has relevancy (July 2021 onwards)</td> </tr> </table> <p>Note: A score of '3' is given to sources produced from July 2021 onwards, because this when we started our PR24 customer research.</p>	Score 1	An older source that has become less relevant (2019 or earlier)	Score 2	A source which is 'becoming older', but still has some relevancy (2020- June 2021)	Score 3	A recent source, or an older source that still has relevancy (July 2021 onwards)	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022 and Q1 2023)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Copperleaf Valuations (2022)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Retailer and Non-Household Research</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Defining the future (2021)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) (2022)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Pre -Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brand Values (2020-22)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Wholesale Tracker (2021)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Brand Values (2019)</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CCW and Ofwat 2022 Customer Spotlight - People's views and experiences of water</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </table>	Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022 and Q1 2023)	3	Copperleaf Valuations (2022)	3	Retailer and Non-Household Research	3	Defining the future (2021)	3	WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) (2022)	3	People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)	3	Pre -Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)	3	Brand Values (2020-22)	2	Wholesale Tracker (2021)	2	Brand Values (2019)	1	Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)	2	Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)	2	CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)	3	CCW and Ofwat 2022 Customer Spotlight - People's views and experiences of water	3	CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)	3
Score 1	An older source that has become less relevant (2019 or earlier)																																					
Score 2	A source which is 'becoming older', but still has some relevancy (2020- June 2021)																																					
Score 3	A recent source, or an older source that still has relevancy (July 2021 onwards)																																					
Domestic Tracking (Q1-Q4 2022 and Q1 2023)	3																																					
Copperleaf Valuations (2022)	3																																					
Retailer and Non-Household Research	3																																					
Defining the future (2021)	3																																					
WRMP Options Research (NW and ESW) (2022)	3																																					
People Panels #3 Aims and Measures (2022)	3																																					
Pre -Acceptability Phase 1 (2023)	3																																					
Brand Values (2020-22)	2																																					
Wholesale Tracker (2021)	2																																					
Brand Values (2019)	1																																					
Water Resources North (WReN) Club Project (2021)	2																																					
Water Resources East (WRE) Club Project (2021)	2																																					
CCW and Ofwat Preferences Research (2022)	3																																					
CCW and Ofwat 2022 Customer Spotlight - People's views and experiences of water	3																																					
CCW Public Views of the Water Environment (2021)	3																																					

APPENDIX 5: OUR CUSTOMERS AMBITION FOR THE FUTURE - SUMMARY OF RESULTS FROM DEFINING THE FUTURE (2012) AND PEOPLE PANELS #4A AND 4B

People Panels #3 – Aims and Measures (2022)

Participants were asked to allocate 25 stars over 15 measures, placing more on the measures they felt were most important to consider in NW/ESW’s long-term plan.

People Panels #4a and 4b – Long Term Strategy, Metrics and Ambition (2022)

Three targets for 2050 with increasing levels of ambition present, participants voted on their preferred level.

COMMON PCS

Defining the conversation (2021)

Ambitious goal tested and % Agreement Score

COMMON PCS	Defining the conversation (2021)	People Panels #3 – Aims and Measures (2022)	People Panels #4a and 4b – Long Term Strategy, Metrics and Ambition (2022)
Water quality contacts	<i>Promote confidence in their drinking water so that nine out of ten of their customers choose tap water over bottled water</i> 91% agreement	Promote confidence in our drinking water by delivering high quality water received the second highest number of stars	No levels of ambition shared.
CRI	No ambitious goal shared.		
Internal sewer flooding	<i>Eradicate sewer flooding in the home as a result of their assets and operations</i> 92% agreement	Eradicate sewer flooding in the home as a result of our assets and operations received the sixth lowest number of stars	The majority of panelists (61%) wanted to see a more ambitious target which was: Zero flooding incidents in home by 2035, maintained to 2050.
External sewer flooding	No ambitious goal shared.		No levels of ambition shared.
Storm Overflows	No ambitious goal shared.		No levels of ambition shared.
Discharge Permit Compliance	No ambitious goal shared.		No levels of ambition shared.

PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS

People Panels #3 – Aims and Measures (2022)

Participants were asked to allocate 25 stars over 15 measures, placing more on the measures they felt were most important to consider in NW/ESW’s long-term plan.

People Panels #4a and 4b – Long Term Strategy, Metrics and Ambition (2022)

Three targets for 2050 with increasing levels of ambition present, participants voted on their preferred level.

COMMON PCS

Defining the conversation (2021)

Ambitious goal tested and % Agreement Score

Leakage (NW)	No ambitious goal shared.		
Leakage (ESW)	<i>Have the lowest levels of leakage in the country in their water-stressed ESW operating area</i> 77% agreement	<i>Reduce the wastage of water through a reduction in leakage received the fifth highest number of stars.</i>	The majority of panelists (50%) wanted to see a more ambitious target which was: 50% reduction in leakage in NW/ESW regions by 2050
Pollutions (Serious and All)	<i>Have zero pollutions as a result of their assets and operations</i> 88% agreement	Reduce instances of pollution to protect and preserve our environment received the most stars	The majority of panelists (58%) wanted to see a more ambitious target which was: Zero pollution incidents by 2035, maintained to 2050.
Greenhouse Gases	<i>Be leading in the sustainable use of natural resources, through achieving zero avoidable waste by 2025 and being carbon neutral by 2027</i> 88% agreement	Be leading in the sustainable use of natural resources and become carbon neutral received the sixth highest number of stars.	The majority of panelists (53%) wanted to see a more ambitious target which was: Net zero in our operations by 2027, “Embodied” net zero by 2045.
Bathing water quality	<i>Have the best rivers and beaches in the country</i> 86% agreement	Have the best rivers and beaches in the country received the lowest number of stars.	The majority of panelists (45%) wanted to see a target in line with our current commitment which was 100% bathing waters meeting ‘Excellent’ by 2040, maintained to 2050.

PR24 CUSTOMER RESEARCH SUMMARIES AND PRIORITISATION OF COMMON PERFORMANCE COMMITMENTS

People Panels #3 – Aims and Measures (2022)

Participants were asked to allocate 25 stars over 15 measures, placing more on the measures they felt were most important to consider in NW/ESW’s long-term plan.

People Panels #4a and 4b – Long Term Strategy, Metrics and Ambition (2022)

Three targets for 2050 with increasing levels of ambition present, participants voted on their preferred level.

River water quality		
C-MeX	Deliver world class customer service (75%) agreement	Deliver world class customer service received the third lowest number of stars.
PCC	Have a per capita consumption (PCC) for water use of 118 litres per person per day by 2040 65% agreement	Reduce the amount of water used by our customers to improve water resources across our regions received the ninth highest number of stars.
Biodiversity	Demonstrate leadership in catchment management to enhance natural capital and deliver net gain for biodiversity 91% agreement	
Reducing water interruptions that last longer than three hours		

COMMON PCS

Defining the conversation (2021)

Ambitious goal tested and % Agreement Score

River water quality	
C-MeX	Deliver world class customer service (75%) agreement
PCC	Have a per capita consumption (PCC) for water use of 118 litres per person per day by 2040 65% agreement
Biodiversity	Demonstrate leadership in catchment management to enhance natural capital and deliver net gain for biodiversity 91% agreement
Reducing water interruptions that last longer than three hours	

No levels of ambition shared.

No levels of ambition shared.

The majority of panelists (51%) wanted to see a target in line with our current commitment which was

Customers use 110 litres per person per day by 2050.

No levels of ambition shared.

The majority of panelists (69%) wanted to see a target in line with our current commitment which was

Average number of minutes lost per property - 2 minutes by 2050.