

# OUR PURPOSE CUSTOMER RESEARCH REPORT

# CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	3
OBJECTIVES.....	3
APPROACH.....	3
SAMPLE .....	4
FINDINGS.....	4
<i>How important do you believe these measures are?</i> .....	4
<i>Have we explained this well?</i> .....	5
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	32

## INTRODUCTION

Our purpose is caring for the essential needs of our communities and environment, now and for generations to come. We do this by providing reliable and affordable water and wastewater services for our customers. We make a positive difference by operating efficiently and investing prudently, to maintain a sustainable and resilient business.

Information we publish should be engaging, relevant, and accurate. It should also be easily understood. In June 2022 we invited a sample of customers to participate in an online survey, designed to give the Partnerships team insight to make sure the measures included in the report Our Purpose 2022/23 are explained in clear and understandable language, and that they align with what our customers think the report should include.

This report sets out the findings from our research.

## OBJECTIVES

The research had two objectives:

- To explore how well we have explained each measure and to gain feedback to help improve the explanations of individual measures; and
- To explore which measures customers think should be used to measure our performance against Our Purpose, with a view to decreasing the number reported on

## APPROACH

This research was designed and completed by the Customer Strategy & Experience team, working closely with the Partnerships Manager.

An online survey was created and hosted in Netigate.

The possible measures to be included in the Our Purpose report are grouped under six themes, each with its own set of measures:

- Caring for the long-term essential needs of the environment;
- Sustainability and resilience;
- Efficiency and prudent investment;
- Affordability of services;
- Caring for the long-term essential needs of communities; and
- Reliability of services.

It was identified that the survey would take too long to complete if we asked all participants to comment on all the themes and measures. Therefore, we divided the themes into three separate surveys, each covering two themes.

The survey was 'live' between 27 May to 3 June 2022. To encourage participation in the survey we offered an optional entry into a prize draw for the chance to win £250 of shopping vouchers.

## SAMPLE

We engaged Northumbrian Water (NW) and Essex & Suffolk Water (ESW) household customers in this research. Equal number of customers from each of the three operating regions were sent each of the surveys, which were:

- Survey 1 – This survey included questions for the themes of ‘Caring for the long-term needs of the environment’ and ‘Sustainability and resilience’. 6,545 were asked, of this number, 251 responded;
- Survey 2 – This survey included questions for the themes of ‘Efficiency and prudent investment’ and ‘Affordability of services’. 6,563 were asked, of this number 284 responded; and
- Survey 3 – This survey included questions for the themes of ‘Caring for the long-term essential needs of communities’ and ‘Reliability of services’. 6,499 were asked, of this number 292 responded.

## FINDINGS

This section sets out findings from the surveys.

*Please note that some of the figures presented in this section may not add up to 100% i.e., 99%/101%. This is due to rounding.*

### *How important do you believe these measures are?*

Participants were asked to rate how important it was that each measure was included in the Our Purpose report as evidence that we are delivering against Our Purpose. Participants were asked to rate each measure on a scale of 0-10 where ‘0 is Not Important’ and ‘10 is Very Important’.

The objective was to explore which measures customers think should be used to measure our performance against Our Purpose, with a view to decreasing the number reported on. To establish whether a measure should be included in Our Purpose or not we set a threshold of 75% of ratings being between 7-10.

Based on this threshold, 20 out of 30 of the measures score highly enough to be included in Our Purpose. The following table sets out all scores and indicates which measures fell below the threshold of 75%.

Theme	Measure	Percentage of scores of between 7 and 10
Caring for the long-term essential needs of the environment	Percentage of bathing waters categorised as good or excellent	84%
	Water Environment Improvements	85%
	EPA star rating	82%
	Net GHG Emissions	79%
	Pollution incidents per 10,000km sewers	85%
	Corporate natural capital account	71%
Sustainability and resilience	Apprenticeship levels	69%
	GPTW Trust Index	64%
	Employee turnover rate	68%
	Lost time accidents	72%
	Resilience framework	75%
Efficiency and prudent investment	Unplanned outages	84%
	Mains repairs	86%
	Credit rating	74%
	Sewer collapses	87%
	Expenditure versus allowance	75%
Affordability of services	Customer perception of value for money	72%
	Satisfaction of customers who receive additional financial support	77%
	Percentage of households in water poverty	80%
Caring for the long-term needs of communities	C-MEX – CES and NPS Elements	71%
	Local Procurement	75%
Reliability of Services	Per capita consumption (PCC)	74%
	Interruption to supply greater than three hours	82%
	C-MEX – CSS element	73%
	Risk of severe restrictions in a drought	83%
	Sewer blockages	85%
	Compliance risk index (CRI)	84%
	Leakage	80%
	Risk of sewer flooding in a storm	85%
Internal sewer flooding	86%	

### Have we explained this well?

Participants were asked to share their opinions on how well we had described of each measure. This question did not relate to the wording of the measure itself, but the description we had drafted for each, which was intended to be a customer-friendly guide to the meaning of the measure.

Response options of ‘Yes, we have explained this well’, ‘No, we have not explained this well’, ‘Don’t know’, and ‘Prefer not to say’ were offered.

We take pride in our ability to present complex, technical information in customer friendly language. We aim for our communications to be clear and concise to help the reader understand the information more easily. On this basis we felt it appropriate to set a threshold of 80% of participants stating ‘Yes, we have explained

this well', for determining whether a measure's description can be considered 'well explained.' This threshold effectively means at least 4/5 participants agree the measure's description is explained well.

We acknowledge that this still leaves a significant minority of 1/5 (20%) of customers stating either that the measure's description is not explained well, or that they 'don't know' or 'would prefer not to say'.

The 80% threshold means that we consider just two descriptions to be 'well explained':

- Percentage of bathing waters categorised as good or excellent  
*The Environment Agency, one of our regulators, monitors how clean sea water is. Every year they give the water at each beach, that is designated as being safe to swim in, a rating of excellent, good, sufficient or poor.*

and


- C-MEX – CES and NPS Elements  
*Customers take part in a Customer Experience Survey (CES) asking how satisfied they are within the services they receive. They also provide a Net Promoter Score (NPS) which is about how likely they would be to recommend us to others. The economic regulator uses this information, along with other satisfaction survey information, to rank all water companies in England and Wales from best to worst for customer service.*

The majority of descriptions (25/30) were rated as explained well by 70-79% of participants. In other research projects scores in this range might be considered 'good' or 'acceptable'. However, in this case we feel that we should hold ourselves to a higher threshold and feel that 70-79% (i.e. around three quarters of customers) does not represent a high enough level of customer understanding.

Three descriptions scored lower than 70%. These were:

- Resilience framework  
*This is our approach to understanding the challenges facing, or potentially facing, our business and putting in place plans to overcome them. (69%)*
- Expenditure versus allowance  
*Our regulator sets and allowance for how much we can spend on delivering services to customers. This is a measure of whether we stay within our allowance. (65%)*
- Corporate natural capital account  
*Natural capital accounting is the process of calculating the value of natural resources and services on our land. (63%)*

In all but two instances scores for " 'Don't Know/Unsure' were higher than 'no, we have not explained this well'. 'Don't know/Unsure' as a response option is open to interpretation and could mean that the participant isn't certain what the measure means, isn't ready to commit to a response, doesn't have the motivation to form a response or doesn't have an opinion.

The following tables set out the scores achieved by all measures and descriptions, ordered from the most to the least well explained within each theme. We have included all measures and descriptions, regardless of whether or not we have recommended they are included in Our Purpose (see previous section). Measures which are recommended for inclusion in Our Purpose are delimited with a yellow star symbol. 

All participants were invited to provide comment on the ratings they gave. Some participants took this opportunity to pose questions that would they felt, if answered, would improve the measures' descriptions. Some participants also suggested specific edits to descriptions. Tables of this verbatim feedback follow each theme's table.

We have excluded comments which were illegible or not relevant to the question being asked (e.g. a general complaint about the water industry or the services we provide or our performance).

## 'Caring for the long-term essential needs of the environment'

Measure	Description	'Yes, we have explained this well'	'No, we have not explained this well'	'Don't Know/ Unsure'	'Prefer not to say'
★ Percentage of bathing waters categorised as good or excellent	<i>The Environment Agency, one of our regulators, monitors how clean sea water is. Every year they give the water at each beach, that is designated as being safe to swim in, a rating of excellent, good, sufficient or poor.</i>	✓ 80%	8%	11%	1%
★ Water Environment Improvements	<i>The amount of improvements made to water environments such as rivers, reservoirs and coastlines that the public can access. Improvements could be made to facilities and recreation, wildlife and biodiversity and the quality of water.</i>	✗ 76%	9%	14%	1%
★ EPA star rating	<i>The Environment Agency, one of our regulators, collects data on how well water companies have protected the environment in a number of different ways. They use the data to form a scorecard and give an overall assessment out of four stars.</i>	✗ 72%	11%	16%	2%
★ Net GHG Emissions	<i>Net zero is about balancing the amount of harmful greenhouse gases being put into the atmosphere with those being taken out.</i>	✗ 72%	13%	14%	2%
★ Pollution incidents per 10,000km sewers	<i>The number of times pollution is caused by contaminated substances being released from our sewers into a watercourse or onto land, per 10,000km of sewer.</i>	✗ 71%	15%	13%	2%
Corporate natural capital account	<i>Natural capital accounting is the process of calculating the value of natural resources and services on our land.</i>	✗ 63%	15%	21%	1%



**Percentage of bathing waters categorised as good or excellent**

**(80% of participants agreed this measure’s description had been explained well)**

The Environment Agency, one of our regulators, monitors how clean sea water is. Every year they give the water at each beach, that is designated as being safe to swim in, a rating of excellent, good, sufficient or poor.

Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (18)	<p><i>“Yes you have explained this well”</i></p> <p><i>“Agreed”</i></p>
Questions for clarification and suggested edits (6)	<p><i>“Does this mean one water test a year? One a week would seem more useful.”</i></p> <p><i>“How/where does effluent discharge frequency and volume get measured / accounted for?”</i></p> <p><i>“Need to specify time-line to collect data.”</i></p> <p><i>“Needs information on the improvements being made, and actually on that being done.”</i></p> <p><i>“What action is taking if water quality is poor?”</i></p> <p><i>“Bathing water indicates water we use at home...”</i></p>

**Water Environment Improvements**

**(76% of participants agreed this measure’s description had been explained well, 23 comments made)**

The amount of improvements made to water environments such as rivers, reservoirs and coastlines that the public can access. Improvements could be made to facilities and recreation, wildlife and biodiversity and the quality of water.

Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (18)	<p><i>“Excellent. Very clear”</i></p> <p><i>“Explanation on what this is is clear just had never seen or heard anything on this before this survey”</i></p>
Questions for clarification and suggested edits (5)	<p><i>“Amount or number? what is measured? No scale”</i></p> <p><i>“Need to specify time-line to collect data.”</i></p> <p><i>“Needs information on the action being taken.”</i></p> <p><i>“Could start, 'Improvements made to water environments that the public can access like Coastlines, rivers and reservoirs....'”</i></p> <p><i>“Minor grammatical thing, if you can count the number of improvements, it should read "The number of improvements made to water environments...." not amount”</i></p>

### EPA star rating

**(72% of participants agreed this measure’s description had been explained well)**

The Environment Agency, one of our regulators, collects data on how well water companies have protected the environment in a number of different ways. They use the data to form a scorecard and give an overall assessment out of four stars.

<p>Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (17)</p>	<p><i>“Explanation on what this is is clear just had never seen or heard anything on this before this survey”</i></p> <p><i>“Makes sense now after a fourth read!”</i></p> <p><i>“Well presented and easy to understand”</i></p>
<p>Questions for clarification and suggested edits (10)</p>	<p><i>“Is 4 stars the highest or lowest category?”</i></p> <p><i>“Itemise the ‘different ways’”</i></p> <p><i>“Need to specify time-line to collect data”</i></p> <p><i>“What happens to the results from the scorecard? What action occurs if any and at what score level is action taken?”</i></p> <p><i>“You can add what EPA abbreviation stands for”</i></p> <p><i>“You don’t explain what EPA stands for. Perhaps I should already know... but I don’t”</i></p> <p><i>“‘in a number of different ways.’ Is not necessary, the previous part of the sentence makes this obvious.”</i></p> <p><i>“It may be useful to provide an example of the different ways in which the environment could be protected, so that it is easier for people understand as they would have additional context”</i></p> <p><i>“It might clarify things to give an example (“...have protected the environment in a number of different ways, for example... They use the data”. I’m presuming it means protected the environment in terms of your business operations NOT generally protected the environment”</i></p>
<p>Comments expressing unfamiliarity with the subject matter (4)</p>	<p><i>“Have never heard of or seen anything about this before”</i></p> <p><i>“Haven’t a clue what you’re talking about.”</i></p>

### Net GHG Emissions

**(72% of participants agreed this measure’s description had been explained well)**

Net zero is about balancing the amount of harmful greenhouse gases being put into the atmosphere with those being taken out.

<p>Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (16)</p>	<p><i>“Clear and direct”</i></p> <p><i>“Good definition”</i></p>
--	--

<p>Questions for clarification and suggested edits (11)</p>	<p><i>“No time-frame?”</i></p> <p><i>“What does GHG stand for?”</i></p> <p><i>“What is the water company doing to help achieve Net zero?”</i></p> <p><i>“Need to specify time-line to collect data.”</i></p> <p><i>“[change] ‘With those being taken out’ to ‘with those we have worked to decrease the greenhouse output’”</i></p> <p><i>“I would say the first part would make more sense by the following... ‘ Net zero is reporting on how we balance...’”</i></p> <p><i>“Stick with net zero, it’s common and understood.”</i></p> <p><i>“I’d never seen the abbreviation GHG before but now I know. It’s common to add the abbreviation of anything after the full version for clarity.”</i></p> <p><i>“I’d spell out what GHG means explicitly (like no 10 and GpTW) you do in the text but harder to spot.”</i></p> <p><i>“How about defining the abbreviation before using it.”</i></p> <p><i>“Terminology used is not good for non-technical people”</i></p>
<p>Comments expressing unfamiliarity with the subject matter (4)</p>	<p><i>“Not at all sure what this has to do with our water.”</i></p>

**Pollution incidents per 10,000km sewers**

***(71% of participants agreed this measure’s description had been explained well)***

*The number of times pollution is caused by contaminated substances being released from our sewers into a watercourse or onto land, per 10,000km of sewer.*

<p>Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (14)</p>	<p><i>“Explained well, but from what I've heard in the News, far too much untreated matter is going into rivers/sea.”</i></p>
--	---

<p>Questions for clarification and suggested edits (12)</p>	<p><i>"10,000km of sewer does not explain the area of watercourse or land contaminated"</i></p> <p><i>"It's the 10,000km that's confusing and complex - why not just no. of incidents."</i></p> <p><i>"10,000km of sewer is confusing. I do not know how many km of sewers in a city, so the number of pollution incidents per 10,000km does not mean much. It might be good to explain this more."</i></p> <p><i>"Why is 10000km chosen as the comparison figure?"</i></p> <p><i>"Why this measure? (10000km)"</i></p> <p><i>"The words are fine, but there's no context - how much contamination should we expect? What's good/bad?"</i></p> <p><i>"No quantification of an "incident""</i></p> <p><i>"This begs a question; how significant is pollution before it becomes an "incident"?"</i></p> <p><i>"Need to specify time-line to collect data."</i></p> <p><i>"Could do with more definition."</i></p> <p><i>"What about the sea?"</i></p> <p><i>"Could be adjusted to smaller ratio to highlight problem."</i></p> <p><i>"Perhaps give in miles rather than km?"</i></p>
<p>Comments expressing unfamiliarity with the subject matter (3)</p>	<p><i>"Not at all sure what this has to do with our water."</i></p>

**Corporate natural capital account**


***(63% of participants agreed this measure's description had been explained well)***

*Natural capital accounting is the process of calculating the value of natural resources and services on our land.*

<p>Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (12)</p>	<p><i>"Straightforward explanation"</i></p> <p><i>"Good"</i></p>
--	--

<p>Questions for clarification and suggested edits (10)</p>	<p><i>"I feel like this one could have gone into more detail as I don't quite understand what it means"</i></p> <p><i>"What kind of natural resources and services? Can you give some examples?"</i></p> <p><i>"The words are fine, but unsure what this means in practical terms. On what basis do you calculate value of natural resources?"</i></p> <p><i>"Monetary value or other value?"</i></p> <p><i>"More detail would be good. What is meant by "services"?"</i></p> <p><i>"More on "the process""</i></p> <p><i>"Need to specify time-line to collect data."</i></p> <p><i>"What does this really mean?"</i></p> <p><i>But to whose benefit !?"</i></p> <p><i>"How is 'value' presented?"</i></p>
<p>Negative comments about the how well the measure was explained (14)</p>	<p><i>"Bit of a 'blah' there using the words 'Natural Capital' Bit too accountancy for me"</i></p> <p><i>"This is very wordy and sounds confusing"</i></p> <p><i>"A bit confusing."</i></p> <p><i>"I have no recollection of such an account"</i></p>

**‘Sustainability and resilience’**

Measure	Description	‘Yes, we have explained this well’	‘No, we have not explained this well’	‘Don't Know/ Unsure’	‘Prefer not to say’
Apprenticeship levels	<i>The number of apprentices currently being trained and employed in our business.</i>	✗ 77%	10%	13%	0%
GPTW Trust Index	<i>The Great Place To Work (GPTW) trust index is calculated through an annual survey which asks our employees to rate what it is like to work for our company.</i>	✗ 75%	11%	14%	1%
Employee turnover rate	<i>The number of employees who leave the company.</i>	✗ 74%	10%	16%	1%
Lost time accidents	<i>The number of accidents which happened at work, resulting in an employee needing time off.</i>	✗ 74%	11%	15%	1%
 Resilience framework	<i>This is our approach to understanding the challenges facing, or potentially facing, our business and putting in place plans to overcome them.</i>	✗ 69%	12%	17%	1%

### Apprenticeship levels

**(77% of participants agreed this measure's description had been explained well)**

*The number of apprentices currently being trained and employed in our business.*

Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (13)	<i>"Straightforward definition"</i>
Questions for clarification and suggested edits (8)	<p><i>"...and the success/dropout rate is?"</i></p> <p><i>"'Levels' seems to indicate different levels within the apprenticeship scheme?"</i></p> <p><i>"And how many is this?"</i></p> <p><i>"Does it show how many are needed? Is there a shortfall for example?"</i></p> <p><i>"No indication of type or level of apprenticeships"</i></p> <p><i>"[Express the number] As a percentage of total workforce"</i></p> <p><i>"[Express as the number] currently employed and being trained in our business."</i></p> <p><i>"Use a table to show if the level of apprenticeships is growing or decreasing."</i></p>

### GPTW Trust Index

**(75% of participants agreed this measure's description had been explained well)**

*The Great Place To Work (GPTW) trust index is calculated through an annual survey which asks our employees to rate what it is like to work for our company.*

Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (16)	<p><i>"No comments, well explained"</i></p> <p><i>"Seems appropriate"</i></p>
Questions for clarification and suggested edits (10)	<p><i>"Hope the survey questions aren't loaded or biased towards the company (rather than the employee)"</i></p> <p><i>"How many employees respond? Is it anonymised?"</i></p> <p><i>"Might be hard for them to be completely honest - is it anonymous?"</i></p> <p><i>"Not sure what this has to do with individual customers."</i></p> <p><i>"Slightly unclear"</i></p> <p><i>"I had no idea of the meaning of this initialism up till now. Best avoid confusing initialisms unless they are in common usage."</i></p> <p><i>"This is an example where you used the full phrase and then the abbreviation in brackets. If you did this throughout it would be much clearer to me."</i></p> <p><i>"Use of table to show if the level of GPTW is growing."</i></p> <p><i>"We have an annual survey which.....our company and the GPTW trust index is calculated from the answers given."</i></p>

**Employee turnover rate****(74% of participants agreed this measure’s description had been explained well)***The number of employees who leave the company.*

Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (10)	<i>“Explained Well”</i>
Questions for clarification and suggested edits (9)	<i>“Relative to the number in employment...?”</i> <i>“And show number re-employed?”</i> <i>“I am not sure the "turnover" word is the right word. It might be useful to think of using something like 'Leave'”</i> <i>“Turnover indicates in and out, churn is more appropriate”</i> <i>“It would be helpful to know how long these employees had worked for the company and the reason for leaving”</i> <i>“Not sure what this has to do with individual customers?”</i> <i>“and the reason they leave?”</i> <i>“Through retirement or resignation?”</i> <i>“Use of table to show if the level of employee is growing or decreasing and reasons why.”</i>

**Lost time accidents****(74% of participants agreed this measure’s description had been explained well)***The number of accidents which happened at work, resulting in an employee needing time off.*

Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (12)	<i>“Clear definition”</i>
Questions for clarification and suggested edits (5)	<i>“I am not aware of viewing info on this, I would hope the inspections address any issues corporate responsibility”</i> <i>“[The description contains] no quantification of the relative length of lost time”</i> <i>“Not sure what this has to do with individual customers?”</i> <i>“Sounds like a horrible corporate metric. Accidents in the workplace is more appropriate.”</i> <i>“Use of table to show if the accidents are growing or decreasing.”</i>



Comments expressing unfamiliarity with the subject matter (2)	<p><i>"Do not know any data on this"</i></p> <p><i>"Meaningless"</i></p>
---	--

**Resilience framework**

***(69% of participants agreed this measure's description had been explained well)***

*This is our approach to understanding the challenges facing, or potentially facing, our business and putting in place plans to overcome them.*

Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (6)	
Questions for clarification and suggested edits (8)	<p><i>"It's not obvious from this how you measure or explain the challenges facing you or how you would overcome them"</i></p> <p><i>"Need to specify time line to collect data."</i></p> <p><i>"Not to keen on the title 'Resilience framework' but the explanation is clear enough."</i></p> <p><i>"[edit suggestion] 'Putting plans in place, to overcome them.'"</i></p> <p><i>"Resilience framework of itself means nothing until explained. It is jargon"</i></p> <p><i>"Vague. Bit fluffy. Also, I feel this measures forecast liquidity rather than genuine resilience."</i></p> <p><i>"What are the challenges?"</i></p> <p><i>"Waffle"</i></p>
Comments expressing unfamiliarity with the subject matter (2)	<p><i>"Haven't a clue what you're talking about."</i></p> <p><i>"Not sure why we need to know this?"</i></p>

## 'Efficiency and prudent investment'

Measure	Description	'Yes, we have explained this well'	'No, we have not explained this well''	'Don't Know/ Unsure'	'Prefer not to say'	
★	Unplanned outages	<i>When we are unexpectedly unable to produce water from one of our water treatment works because of a fault.</i>	✗ 77%	9%	13%	1%
★	Mains repairs	<i>The number of repairs we carry out to burst water mains every year.</i>	✗ 76%	11%	12%	1%
	Credit rating	<i>An external assessment of whether a business is believed to be capable of meeting their financial commitments, including paying for day to day operations, investing for the future and repaying debt.</i>	✗ 73%	10%	15%	2%
★	Sewer collapses	<i>The number of sewers which have collapsed and are releasing sewage into the environment or causing disruption for our customers.</i>	✗ 70%	12%	17%	1%
★	Expenditure versus allowance	<i>Our regulator sets and allowance for how much we can spend on delivering services to customers. This is a measure of whether we stay within our allowance.</i>	✗ 65%	14%	21%	1%

### Unplanned outages

**(77% of participants agreed this measure's description had been explained well)**

*When we are unexpectedly unable to produce water from one of our water treatment works because of a fault.*

Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (23)	<p><i>"Explained well and informed well"</i></p> <p><i>"Very understandable"</i></p>
Questions for clarification and suggested edits (7)"	<p><i>"If 'fault' is self-explanatory, so is 'outage' - this definition is pointless."</i></p> <p><i>"Make wording as simple to understand as possible."</i></p> <p><i>"Not just number to be logged but also why. Is it a result of poor investment in old equipment or an act of nature?"</i></p> <p><i>"Odd phrasing 'produce water'. Also with out warning might be better than 'unexpectedly'. Some of the language used people might not understand. Needs to be written so an 8 yr old could understand so it's accessible to all your clients."</i></p> <p><i>"Outage - how does this affect the customer? Low water pressure, no water supply? this is unclear language. Outage to me means no supply."</i></p> <p><i>"Think this feels a bit broad, a burst main would be an outage to someone in a house as well, regardless of if it's the treatment or the main pipes - central outage or something like that would make more sense to use end users I think."</i></p> <p><i>"Unplanned is too narrow, what could have led to an outage if not fixed in a timely manner."</i></p>

### Mains repair

**(76% of participants agreed this measure's description had been explained well)**

*The number of repairs we carry out to burst water mains every year*

Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (23)	<p><i>"Very understandable"</i></p> <p><i>"Well described"</i></p>
---	--

<p>Questions for clarification and suggested edits (10)</p>	<p><i>“Don't know how many repairs are carried out year on year, what is your measure for improvement?”</i></p> <p><i>“It does not reflect how many burst mains there are per year. Many main breaks indicate poor or old infrastructure”</i></p> <p><i>“[I'd] like to know how many miles of pipes we are talking about?”</i></p> <p><i>“Make wording as simple to understand as possible.”</i></p> <p><i>“More info how many were carried out the previous year.”</i></p> <p><i>“Number of repairs seems a weak measure - in fact an almost irrelevant measure. It does not distinguish between a small leakage, a large leakage, the time taken to repair the leakage, and in any case is it good to have many mains repairs or few?”</i></p> <p><i>“Pretty irrelevant, how is an average person expected to understand what is high or low? A high figure could mean that you react quickly to problems, or that you are not doing much to maintain them. And vice versa.”</i></p> <p><i>“Reactive measure, what were avoidable vs. unavoidable?”</i></p> <p><i>“Some mains pipes are replaced due to age, not due to damage.”</i></p>
---	--

**Credit rating**

**(73% of participants agreed this measure's description had been explained well)**

*An external assessment of whether a business is believed to be capable of meeting their financial commitments, including paying for day to day operations, investing for the future and repaying debt.*

<p>Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (23)</p>	<p><i>“I understand this”</i></p> <p><i>“Clear explanation”</i></p> <p><i>“This is explained well”</i></p>
<p>Questions for clarification and suggested edits (5)</p>	<p><i>“Make wording as simple to understand as possible.”</i></p> <p><i>“Please rephrase in normal terms not water jargon”</i></p> <p><i>“The word 'belief' suggests not based on observable facts - suggest remove 'believed to be' or could use 'considered to be'”</i></p> <p><i>“Too long”</i></p> <p><i>“What about pensions and dividends?”</i></p>
<p>Comments expressing unfamiliarity with the subject matter (9)</p>	<p><i>“As an individual I have no interest in your dealings with business”</i></p> <p><i>“Unaware of this procedure. Don't know”</i></p> <p><i>“If you say so... Not really sure what you want my opinion on”</i></p> <p><i>“No one has contacted me to give any information on this subject”</i></p>

**Sewer collapses**

**(70% of participants agreed this measure's description had been explained well)**

*The number of sewers which have collapsed and are releasing sewage into the environment or causing disruption for our customers.*

<p>Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (21)</p>	<p><i>"This is explained well"</i>  <i>"Understandable"</i>  <i>"Clear explanation"</i></p>
<p>Questions for clarification and suggested edits (5)</p>	<p><i>"Number of collapses seems a weak measure. It does not distinguish between a small collapse, a large collapse, the time taken to repair the collapse."</i>  <i>"Are these caused by lack of maintenance? How is this figure per mile of sewer for example?"</i>  <i>"Is it an indication of how quick you respond to a problem or that you are not keeping the system in good working order?"</i>  <i>"Make wording as simple to understand as possible."</i>  <i>"Why do they collapse?"</i></p>

**Expenditure vs. allowance**

***(65% of participants agreed this measure's description had been explained well)***

*Our regulator sets and allowance for how much we can spend on delivering services to customers. This is a measure of whether we stay within our allowance.*

<p>Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (25)</p>	<p><i>"Makes sense although I was previously unaware of it"</i>  <i>"I Understand what this means"</i>  <i>"Is good language I understand very well"</i></p>
--	--

<p>Questions for clarification and suggested edits (20)</p>	<p><i>"A little bit of a mouth full"</i></p> <p><i>"But to what point? How is the allowance set and what is it set at a level?"</i></p> <p><i>"[need] more info regarding the amounts."</i></p> <p><i>"Grammar doesn't sound right"</i></p> <p><i>"I don't understand the definition of "an allowance", and what does "can spend" really mean. For example, why can't you spend more than the allowance."</i></p> <p><i>"I have no idea what your limits are so you may exceed them, but you never say how much you spend"</i></p> <p><i>"I think for some people the language could be a little bit sophisticated"</i></p> <p><i>"I'm not sure about how your allowance is arrived at by the regulator?"</i></p> <p><i>"Make wording as simple to understand as possible."</i></p> <p><i>"No one has told me how much you spend or how much you are allowed to spend"</i></p> <p><i>"Overly complicated and passing ownership around. Just describe staying within budget"</i></p> <p><i>"Spending may be a more user friendly word than expenditure"</i></p> <p><i>"The actual measure described is 'Allowance Minus Expenditure', not 'Expenditure versus allowance'."</i></p> <p><i>"The phrase 'compared to' could be used. Our expenditure compared to the allowance we are set by....etc"</i></p> <p><i>"This is confusing. Are you saying you would willingly spend more but the regulator says no - frankly not credible. I would believe they set a minimum you must reinvest"</i></p> <p><i>"Unclear and too wordy"</i></p> <p><i>"Using the word allowance to explain what an allowance is doesn't help people understand what it means"</i></p> <p><i>"What is the allowance?"</i></p> <p><i>"You have not explained what the allowance is. Perhaps limit may be a better word."</i></p> <p><i>"You might like to consider starting this sentence with, "Following negotiation...""</i></p>
---	--

## 'Affordability of services'

Measure	Description	'Yes, we have explained this well'	'No, we have not explained this well''	'Don't Know/ Unsure'	'Prefer not to say'
Customer perception of value for money	<i>We survey customers to ask them if they think their water bill represents value for money.</i>	✗ 78%	9%	12%	1%
★ Satisfaction of customers who receive additional financial support	<i>Some of our customers are on a reduced bill because they are struggling financially. We survey these customers to ask them how satisfied they are.</i>	✗ 77%	9%	12%	2%
★ Percentage of households in water poverty	<i>The percentage of households who spend more than 3% of their income, after housing costs, on their water and sewerage bill.</i>	✗ 75%	10%	15%	1%

### Customer perception of value for money

**(78% of participants agreed this measure's description had been explained well)**

We survey customers to ask them if they think their water bill represents value for money.

Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (23)	<i>"Very understandable"</i> <i>"Clear explanation"</i>
Questions for clarification and suggested edits (3)	<i>"Make wording as simple to understand as possible."</i> <i>"Smoke and mirrors, perception is not an objective measure"</i> <i>[suggested edit] "We ask our customers if they think..."</i>

### Satisfaction of customers who receive additional financial support

**(77% of participants agreed this measure's description had been explained well)**

We survey customers to ask them if they think their water bill represents value for money.

Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (22)	<i>"All explained well"</i> <i>"This is explained well"</i>
Questions for clarification and suggested edits (6)	<i>"additional financial support - I think, 'water benefit' or something like that makes more sense, you get 'housing benefit, disability benefits etc"</i> <i>"If they are struggling financially they may not have the facility to respond to online surveys "</i> <i>"[ask] If they can afford to pay their bill"</i> <i>"Make wording as simple to understand as possible".</i> <i>"This sounds like turkey's voting for Christmas, the higher they rate you the better outcome you will get from OFWAT, so the customers most in need will pay more in the long term perverse regulation."</i> <i>"We ask these customers - how often? - to let us know how satisfied they are. Rather than we survey them, odd word choice as can be misconstrued"</i>

### Percentage of households in water poverty

**(75% of participants agreed this measure's description had been explained well)**


The percentage of households who spend more than 3% of their income, after housing costs, on their water and sewerage bill.

Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (21)	<i>"Understood"</i> <i>"Well described"</i>
---	--



<p>Questions for clarification and suggested edits (7)</p>	<p><i>“Does this include energy, not fit for purpose in the current economic climate”</i></p> <p><i>“Explain more in laments terms not water jargon”</i></p> <p><i>“How do you know what a household's income is?”</i></p> <p><i>“Is it 3% of Net income or Gross Income?”</i></p> <p><i>“It's more like 10% if your claiming Universal credit”.</i></p> <p><i>“Make wording as simple to understand as possible”.</i></p> <p><i>“Not sure how you know.”</i></p>
--	---

**‘Caring for the long-term essential needs of communities’**

Measure	Description	‘Yes, we have explained this well’	‘No, we have not explained this well’	‘Don't Know/ Unsure’	‘Prefer not to say’
C-MEX – CES and NPS Elements	<i>Customers take part in a Customer Experience Survey (CES) asking how satisfied they are within the services they receive. They also provide a Net Promoter Score (NPS) which is about how likely they would be to recommend us to others. The economic regulator uses this information, along with other satisfaction survey information, to rank all water companies in England and Wales from best to worst for customer service.</i>	✓ 81%	7%	11%	2%
 Local Procurement	<i>We aim to spend at least 60p in every £1 with local suppliers in our regions.</i>	✗ 77%	10%	12%	1%

## C-MEX – CES and NPS Elements

**(81% of participants agreed this measure's description had been explained well)**

Customers take part in a Customer Experience Survey (CES) asking how satisfied they are within the services they receive. They also provide a Net Promoter Score (NPS) which is about how likely they would be to recommend us to others. The economic regulator uses this information, along with other satisfaction survey information, to rank all water companies in England and Wales from best to worst for customer service.

Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (25)	<p><i>"Happy with language used."</i></p> <p><i>"Its very well explained"</i></p>
Questions for clarification and suggested edits (7)	<p><i>"All the 'cs' in 'c- mex' [it] is over the top"</i></p> <p><i>"Customer Experience Survey does sound very similar to Customer Satisfaction Survey, although there appears to be a subtle distinction between the two. Perhaps using different words for one of them would help."</i></p> <p><i>"I don't know what good a ranking is when one must use whatever water company is given them."</i></p> <p><i>"Reliability of services would lead me to believe that the service was working without fault or interruption."</i></p> <p><i>"Still jargon"</i></p> <p><i>"What's economic regulator?"</i></p> <p><i>"Where can I see this?."</i></p>

## Local Procurement

















**(81% of participants agreed this measure's description had been explained well)**

*We aim to spend at least 60p in every £1 with local suppliers in our regions.*

Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (43)	<p><i>"It is pretty obvious what you mean."</i></p> <p><i>"Straight to the point"</i></p>
---	---

<p>Questions for clarification and suggested edits (14)</p>	<p><i>“Don't ‘aim’, Do”.</i></p> <p><i>“E&amp;S water comes from Abberton, Colchester and Hanningfield, nr. Rettendon. Is this what you mean by "local"?”</i></p> <p><i>“What is the money? Profit? Outlay? Where is the money being spent? and explain why can't more be spent locally”</i></p> <p><i>“How do I know this is true?”</i></p> <p><i>“I don't know what procurement means or what the pence and pound amounts are about.”</i></p> <p><i>“I have no idea if this is good or bad and what you get from non-local suppliers. I know there are no pipe manufacturers in my area so that would be impossible but what isn't? Also, you say "aim" - that means nothing. The true test is what you actually do. I assume Lewis Hamilton always "aims" to win but doesn't always achieve it”</i></p> <p><i>“[edit to wording] Investment in suppliers”</i></p> <p><i>“Local suppliers of what? Too ambiguous a statement.”</i></p> <p><i>“Maybe explain what for?”</i></p> <p><i>“What sort of suppliers?”</i></p> <p><i>“what type of suppliers?”</i></p> <p><i>“Give type of suppliers this could be”</i></p> <p><i>“Where is this spent?”</i></p> <p><i>“Why only 60p?”</i></p>
---	--

## 'Reliability of services'

Measure	Description	'Yes, we have explained this well'	'No, we have not explained this well''	'Don't Know/ Unsure'	'Prefer not to say'
	Per capita consumption (PCC)	 79%	10%	10%	1%
	Interruption to supply greater than three hours	 77%	11%	12%	0%
	C-MEX – CSS element	 76%	11%	12%	1%
	Risk of severe restrictions in a drought	 75%	15%	9%	1%
	Sewer blockages	 74%	12%	14%	1%
	Compliance risk index (CRI)	 74%	12%	13%	1%
	Leakage	 73%	13%	14%	0%
	Risk of sewer flooding in a storm	 72%	13%	14%	1%
	Internal sewer flooding	 71%	12%	16%	1%

**Per capita consumption (PCC)****(79% of participants agreed this measure's description had been explained well)***The amount of water each person uses, on average, each day.*

Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (15)	<i>"Understood."</i> <i>"Clear"</i>
Questions for clarification and suggested edits (5)	<i>"an average daily water usage per person?"</i> <i>"Could be lower "</i> <i>"Do not know the figures."</i> <i>"I use as much as I need; no less, no more. Why do I want to know how much other people use?"</i> <i>"What is this measurement likely to be ?"</i>

**Interruption to supply greater than three hours****(77% of participants agreed this measure's description had been explained well)***The number of times a customer's water is unavailable for three hours or more.*

Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (15)	<i>"Easy to read and understand"</i> <i>"Happy with language."</i>
Questions for clarification and suggested edits (15)	<i>"Am I still having to pay for the water I don't get? Three hours is an awfully long time as well."</i>

**C-MEX – CSS element****(76% of participants agreed this measure's description had been explained well)***A Customer Satisfaction Survey (CSS) of customers who have recently contacted us. The economic regulator uses this information, along with other satisfaction survey information, to rank all water companies in England and Wales from best to worst for customer service.*

Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (24)	<i>"Its very well explained"</i> <i>"Understood perfectly."</i>
---	--

<p>Questions for clarification and suggested edits (6)</p>	<p><i>“All the ‘cs’ in ‘c- mex’ [it] is over the top”</i></p> <p><i>“Customer Experience Survey does sound very similar to Customer Satisfaction Survey, although there appears to be a subtle distinction between the two. Perhaps using different words for one of them would help?”</i></p> <p><i>“Reliability of services would lead me to believe that the service was working without fault or interruption.”</i></p> <p><i>“Still jargon”</i></p> <p><i>“What’s economic regulator?”</i></p> <p><i>“Where can I see this?”</i></p>
--	---

**Risk of severe restrictions in a drought**

***(75% of participants agreed this measure’s description had been explained well)***

*The risk that we would have to restrict the amount of water customers can use during a drought.*

<p>Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (17)</p>	<p><i>“Easy to understand”</i></p> <p><i>“Happy with language.”</i></p>
<p>Questions for clarification and suggested edits (4)</p>	<p><i>“Could do with more simple language”</i></p> <p><i>“Done properly risk is a slightly technical subject - so this risk for instance has a least a couple of dimensions - how often and how bad?”</i></p> <p><i>“This is obviously important. Is the customer made aware of remedies that might be planned in the future and how cost effective they might be?”</i></p> <p><i>“We assume that some warning will be given prior to restriction?”</i></p>

**Sewer blockages**

***(74% of participants agreed this measure’s description had been explained well)***

*The number of sewers which become partially or fully blocked, meaning that sewage cannot pass through them.*

<p>Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (14)</p>	<p><i>“Good simple language”</i></p> <p><i>“Understood.”</i></p>
<p>Questions for clarification and suggested edits (2)</p>	<p><i>“Are the street drains being check regular?”</i></p> <p><i>“should be simpler”</i></p>

**Compliance risk index (CRI)**

***(74% of participants agreed this measure’s description had been explained well)***

A measure of how well we are managing risks and investing to keep drinking water clean and safe to drink.

Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (15)	<p><i>"It's well explained"</i></p> <p><i>"Happy"</i></p>
Questions for clarification and suggested edits (2)	<p><i>"I assume that as a water company, you're doing that. I don't need statistics which I wouldn't understand anyway."</i></p> <p><i>"What type of risks?"</i></p>

### **Leakage**

**(73% of participants agreed this measure's description had been explained well)**

The amount of water which leaks from pipes between our water treatment works and customers' homes and businesses.

Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (14)	<p><i>"Nice and clear language"</i></p> <p><i>"Understood"</i></p>
---	--

### **Risk of sewer flooding in a storm**

**(72% of participants agreed this measure's description had been explained well)**

The percentage of homes that may be at risk of flooding due to a sewer overflowing during a storm.

Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (16)	<p><i>"It' well explained"</i></p> <p><i>"Clear"</i></p>
Questions for clarification and suggested edits (2)	<p><i>"Could use simpler language"</i></p>

### **Internal sewer flooding**

**(71% of participants agreed this measure's description had been explained well)**

The number of buildings and homes which are flooded by sewage entering them.

Positive comments about the how well the measure was explained (15)	<p><i>"Perfectly understood"</i></p> <p><i>"Understood"</i></p>
---	---

## **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The following table sets out which measures are recommended for inclusion in Our Purpose and the key considerations to make when finalising them.



Theme	Measure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Key recommendations to improve how we explain this measure to customers</li> </ul>
<p>Caring for the long-term essential needs of the environment</p>	<p><b>Percentage of bathing waters categorised as good or excellent</b>  <i>The Environment Agency, one of our regulators, monitors how clean sea water is. Every year they give the water at each beach, that is designated as being safe to swim in, a rating of excellent, good, sufficient or poor.</i></p>	<p>No recommendations</p>
	<p><b>Water Environment Improvements</b>  <i>The amount of improvements made to water environments such as rivers, reservoirs and coastlines that the public can access. Improvements could be made to facilities and recreation, wildlife and biodiversity and the quality of water.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify how often we will test</li> <li>Clarify what action will be taken in a test returns poor results</li> <li>Revise use of the term ‘bathing water’ – as this can suggest water in the bath</li> </ul>
	<p><b>EPA star rating</b>  <i>The Environment Agency, one of our regulators, collects data on how well water companies have protected the environment in a number of different ways. They use the data to form a scorecard and give an overall assessment out of four stars.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explain the abbreviation</li> <li>Clarify what is meant by ‘4 stars’</li> <li>Specify how frequently the data is collected</li> <li>Detail the action we will take on the basis of the assessment</li> <li>Provide examples of the different ways in which the environment could be protected</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Net GHG Emissions</b>  <i>Net zero is about balancing the amount of harmful greenhouse gases being put into the atmosphere with those being taken out.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explain the abbreviation</li> <li>Clarify what we are doing to help achieve Net zero?</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Pollution incidents per 10,000km sewers</b>  <i>The number of times pollution is caused by contaminated substances being released from our sewers into a watercourse or onto land, per 10,000km of sewer.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10,000km was not an accessible measure to participants. Alternatives suggestions included to frame this in terms of the areas of water or land contaminated, report on number instances, consider a smaller ratio, using miles rather than km</li> <li>Provide some context on what ‘good’ and ‘bad’ look like</li> <li>Quantify ‘incident’</li> </ul>

Sustainability and resilience	<p><b>Resilience framework</b>  <i>This is our approach to understanding the challenges facing, or potentially facing, our business and putting in place plans to overcome them.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify the types of challenges this refers to</li> <li>• Try to reduce jargon/corporate language</li> </ul>
Efficiency and prudent investment	<p><b>Unplanned outages</b>  <i>When we are unexpectedly unable to produce water from one of our water treatment works because of a fault.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Define what 'outage' is</li> <li>• Give examples of what a 'fault' could be and why one may occur</li> <li>• Consider 'without warning' rather than 'unexpectedly'.</li> <li>• Clarify the impact on of an 'Outage' on the customer</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Mains repairs</b>  <i>The number of repairs we carry out to burst water mains every year.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Set this in context – by including how many repairs are carried out year on year</li> <li>• Explain the causes of burst mains – i.e. under-investment, damage or aging infrastructure</li> <li>• Consider proving alternative measures within the description, such as length of mains repaired, the size of the repair and/or the time taken to repair</li> <li>• Be clear about how the number should be interpreted – i.e. <i>is it good to have many mains repairs or few?</i> A high figure could mean we react quickly, a small number could mean that aren't doing enough maintain</li> <li>• Clarify the difference between 'avoidable' and 'unavoidable' repairs</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Sewer collapses</b>  <i>The number of sewers which have collapsed and are releasing sewage into the environment or causing disruption for our customers.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Consider proving alternative measures within the description, such as; total length of collapsed sewers, the size of the collapses, their impact and/or the time taken to repair</li> <li>• Clarify the cause(s) of sewer collapses</li> <li>• Provide guidance on how the number should be interpreted - Is it</li> </ul>

		<p>an indication of how well we maintain and invest in the network</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include information on how quickly we respond to a collapsed sewer</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Expenditure versus allowance</b>  <i>Our regulator sets an allowance for how much we can spend on delivering services to customers. This is a measure of whether we stay within our allowance.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Describe how the regulator sets the allowance is set and what our allowance typically is</li> <li>• Define "an allowance", what it is and why we can't spend more it</li> <li>• Consider using alternative, simpler terms like 'budget', 'spending'</li> <li>• Be clear what our motivation is – i.e. do we want to spend more than the regulator sets?</li> </ul>
Affordability of services	<p><b>Satisfaction of customers who receive additional financial support</b>  <i>We survey customers to ask them if they think their water bill represents value for money.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Specify how often we conduct this survey</li> <li>• Clarify the difference between affordability and value for money</li> <li>• Explain the consequence of this survey – what happens on the basis of the results?</li> <li>• Consider changing 'We survey...' to "We ask these customers"</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Percentage of households in water poverty</b>  <i>The percentage of households who spend more than 3% of their income, after housing costs, on their water and sewerage bill.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Be clear what services this includes – i.e. it does not include the energy used to heat water.</li> <li>• Be clear how we calculate this - i.e. how do we know what a household's income is? Is the 3% net or gross income?"</li> </ul>
Caring for the long-term needs of communities	<p><b>Local Procurement</b>  <i>We aim to spend at least 60p in every £1 with local suppliers in our regions.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Define 'local'</li> <li>• Be more explicit about the types of suppliers we spend with and what we purchase from them</li> <li>• Provide some assurance that we will spend 60p in each £1 locally</li> <li>• Consider using a different word to 'procurement'</li> <li>• Set the 60p in context – is this good, average or poor compared to other companies?</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove the word 'aim' – or explain why it has to be an aim, rather than something we always achieve.</li> </ul>
Reliability of Services	<p><b>Interruption to supply greater than three hours</b>  <i>The number of times a customer's water is unavailable for three hours or more.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Be clear on the compensation (if anyone) customers may receive.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Risk of severe restrictions in a drought</b>  <i>The risk that we would have to restrict the amount of water customers can use during a drought.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explain what we mean by the term 'risk' - how often are we at risk or a drought and would the implications be</li> <li>Detail how we plan for the future and what measures/communications we would put in place before and during a drought</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Sewer blockages</b>  <i>The number of sewers which become partially or fully blocked, meaning that sewage cannot pass through them.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include information on how often sewers are inspected</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Compliance risk index (CRI)</b>  <i>A measure of how well we are managing risks and investing to keep drinking water clean and safe to drink.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explain what we mean by 'risks' with examples of what these could be</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Leakage</b>  <i>The amount of water which leaks from pipes between our water treatment works and customers' homes and businesses.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No recommendations</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Risk of sewer flooding in a storm</b>  <i>The percentage of homes that may be at risk of flooding due to a sewer overflowing during a storm.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use simpler language</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Internal sewer flooding</b>  <i>The number of buildings and homes which are flooded by sewage entering them.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No recommendations</li> </ul>