

October 2019

Trust in water

Variation of Icosa Water Services Limited's appointment to include Ospringe Parcel B, near Faversham, Kent

www.ofwat.gov.uk

ofwat

1. About this document

Variation of Icosa Water Services Limited's appointment to include Ospringe Parcel B, near Faversham, Kent

On 27 August 2019, Ofwat began a [consultation on a proposal](#) to vary Icosa Water Services Limited's ("**Icosa Water**") appointment to become the water and sewerage services provider for a development in South East Water Limited ("**South East Water**") water supply area and Southern Water Services Limited ("**Southern Water**") sewerage services area called Ospringe Parcel B, near Faversham, Kent ("**the Site**").

The consultation ended on 24 September 2019. During the consultation period, we received representations from one organisation, which we considered in making our decision. On 10 October 2019, we granted Icosa Water a variation to its existing appointment to enable it to supply water and sewerage services to the Site.

This notice gives our reasons for making this variation.

Contents

1. About this document	2
2. Introduction	4
3. The application	6
4. Responses received to the consultation	8
5. Conclusion	9
Appendix 1: Site Map	10

2. Introduction

The new appointment and variation mechanism, specified by Parliament and set out in primary legislation, allows one company to replace the current company as the provider of water and/or sewerage services for a specific area. This mechanism can be used by new companies to enter the market and by existing companies to expand into areas where they are not the appointed company. In this case, Icosa Water applied to replace South East Water and Southern Water to become the appointed water and sewerage company for the Site.

A company may apply for a new appointment (or a variation of its existing appointment to serve an additional site) if any of the following three criteria are met:

- None of the premises in the proposed area of appointment is served by the existing appointed company at the time the appointment is made (the **“unserved criterion”**);
- Each premises is likely to be supplied with at least 50 mega litres per year (in England) or at least 250 mega litres per year (in Wales) and the customer in relation to each premises consents (**“the large user criterion”**);
- The existing water and sewerage supplier in the area consents to the appointment (**“the consent criterion”**).

When considering applications for new appointments and variations, Ofwat operates within the statutory framework set out by Parliament, including our duty to protect consumers, wherever appropriate by promoting effective competition. In particular, in relation to unserved sites, we seek to ensure that the future customers on the site – who do not have a choice of supplier – are adequately protected. When assessing applications for new appointments and variations, the two key policy principles we apply are:

1. Customers, or future customers, should be no worse off than if they had been supplied by the existing appointee; and
2. We must be satisfied that an applicant will be able to finance the proper carrying out of its functions as a water and/or sewerage company.

Entry and expansion (and even the threat of such by potential competitors) can lead to benefits for different customers (such as household and business customers and developers of new housing sites). Benefits can include price discounts, better

services, environmental improvements and innovation in the way services are delivered.

Benefits can also accrue to customers who remain with the existing appointee, because when the existing appointee faces a challenge to its business, that challenge can act as a spur for it to improve its services. We believe the wider benefits of competition through the new appointments and variations mechanism can offset any potential disbenefits for existing customers that might arise. We consider these potential disbenefits in more detail below.

3. The application

Icosa Water applied to be the water and sewerage services appointee for the site under the unserved criterion set out in section 7(4)(b) of the Water Industry Act 1991 (“**WIA91**”). Icosa Water will serve the Site by way of bulk supply and discharge agreements with South East Water and Southern Water, respectively.

3.1 Unserved status of the Site

To qualify under the unserved criterion, an applicant must show that at the time the appointment is made, none of the premises in the proposed area of appointment is served by the existing appointee.

We have an independent report stating that the Site is unserved, and letters from South East Water and Southern Water confirming that they are content for Icosa Water to take over the Site.

While a brownfield site, Southern Water has confirmed it has no records of wastewater assets at the Site, and South East Water has confirmed it has no active connections at the Site. The only two buildings not demolished are heritage features, not requiring any connection.

Having reviewed the facts of this Site and taking into account the independent report and the information from the incumbents, we consider the Site to be unserved.

3.2 Financial viability of the proposal

We will only make an appointment if we are satisfied that the proposal poses a low risk of being financially non-viable. We assess the risk of financial viability on a site-by-site basis and also consider the financial position of the company as a whole.

Based on the information available to us, we concluded the site demonstrates sufficient financial viability, and Icosa Water has satisfied us that it can finance its functions and that it is able to properly carry them out.

3.3 Assessment of ‘no worse off’

Icosa Water will match the charges of the incumbent suppliers at the Site.

With regard to service levels, we have reviewed Icosa Water's Codes of Practice and its proposed service levels and compared these to the Codes of Practice and the

performance commitments of South East Water and Southern Water. Based on this review, we are satisfied that customers will be offered an appropriate level of service by Icosa Water and that overall customers will be 'no worse off' being served by Icosa Water instead of by South East Water and Southern Water.

3.4 Effect of appointment on South East Water and Southern Water's customers

In considering whether customers will be no worse off, we also looked at the potential effects of this variation on the price that South East Water and Southern Water's existing customer base may face.

The calculation necessarily depends on a range of assumptions, and there are clearly difficulties involved in quantifying the effect on customers of South East Water and Southern Water. It is therefore necessary to use a simplified set of figures. We have expressed the effect in 'per bill' terms to try and quantify the possible effect in an easily understandable way. Broadly, we have assessed the potential magnitude of this impact by comparing how much South East Water and Southern Water might have expected to receive in revenue from serving the Site directly, were they to serve the Site, with the revenues they might expect from the proposed arrangement with Icosa Water.

In this case, we have calculated that if we grant the Site to Icosa Water, there may be a negligible impact (if any) on the bills of South East Water and Southern Water's existing customers.

This impact does not take into account the potential spillover benefits to customers arising from dynamic efficiencies achieved as a result of the competitive process to win new sites.

3.5 Developer choice

Where relevant, we take into consideration the choices of the site developer. In this case, the developer said that it wanted Icosa Water to be the water and sewerage company for the Site.

4. Responses received to the consultation

We received one response to our consultation; from the Consumer Council for Water (“**CCWater**”). We considered this response before making the decision to vary Icosa Water's appointment. The points raised in the response are set out below.

4.1 CCWater response

Overall, CCWater agrees with Ofwat's assessment that customers will be no worse off if served by Icosa Water instead of Southern Water and South East Water. CCWater accepts that given Icosa Water's relatively small size and the disparate nature of its customer base, it may be appropriate for Icosa Water to tailor some of the services that it provides. Until it can provide a social tariff, CCWater stated that it would expect Icosa Water to offer appropriate, flexible support to any individual customers in financial difficulty that would otherwise benefit from a social tariff. CCWater expects that this should not be at the expense of Icosa Water's other customers.

Our response

One of the key policy principles Ofwat considers when assessing NAV applications is that customers should be 'no worse off' if a NAV is granted. In other words, an applicant must ensure that its new customers are made no worse off in terms of price and service than if they had been served by the previous incumbent(s). This requirement has been met by Icosa Water in its proposal to improve the levels of service and match the pricing set by Southern Water and South East Water. We do not require applicants to offer a better service and price than the previous incumbent.

5. Conclusion

Having assessed Icosa Water's application, and having taken account of the responses we received to our consultation, we decided to grant a variation to Icosa Water's area of appointment to allow it to serve the Site for water and sewerage services. This appointment became effective on 11 October 2019.

Appendix 1: Site Maps





E:\18015 Ospringe B\Drawings\DS Drawings\Drawn_18-015-SSA-01.dwg David Harrison 12/03/2019 09:37:44