Board leadership, transparency and governance – Report on companies’ preparations for meeting the 2019 principles
About this document

This document sets out our assessment of the position which water companies are in to meet the 2019 board leadership, transparency and governance principles. It highlights good practice and areas for improvement in order to drive and support further progress in the sector.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Background

The new Board leadership, transparency and governance principles (‘the 2019 principles’) have been in place since 1 April 2019. We consulted on these principles in July 2018 and published the outcomes of that consultation in Board leadership, transparency and governance, conclusions on revising the principles (‘the conclusions document’) in January 2019. Since 1 August 2019 the 17 largest regulated water companies (appointees) in England and Wales and the only licensed infrastructure provider (Bazalgette Tunnel Limited, known as Tideway) – collectively ‘the companies’ – have had a licence requirement to meet the objectives of the principles and to clearly explain how they are doing so.

The purpose of this document is to report on the position that companies are in to meet the objectives of the 2019 principles. This document is our assessment based on companies’ 2018-19 annual reporting, which included explanations of how they were meeting the previous board leadership, transparency and governance principles (‘the 2014 principles’) and the steps they are taking to meet the objectives of the 2019 principles. It sets out our key findings on the quality of the arrangements that companies are putting in place and their explanations for those arrangements, highlighting good practice and areas for improvement in order to drive and support further progress. We also highlight some developments which we are aware of that have happened since the end of 2018-19 reporting period and are relevant to helping companies demonstrate how they are meeting the objectives.

1.2 Approach

Companies will not report fully against the new objectives until July 2020 but we asked them to explain the steps they are taking towards meeting the new objectives in their 2018-19 annual reporting. Our assessment focuses on these explanations and the extent to which companies have addressed concerns we have raised previously about the quality and completeness of reporting. We also looked at examples from companies’ reporting against the 2014 principles which are relevant for the 2019 principles.

Having looked closely at past practice in relation to the 2014 principles, which were in place until April 2019, we said in the conclusions document that companies should challenge themselves afresh for their 2018-19 annual reporting. In the conclusions
document, we highlighted the following specific areas where we considered that companies needed to sharpen their focus in relation to reporting.

- Companies providing up-to-date, self-standing reporting which clearly explains to their customers and other stakeholders how they have ensured their approaches meet the objectives. Referring to letters from Ofwat as an explanation (or justification) for their arrangements without further explanation is not sufficient.

- Companies clearly articulating all matters that are reserved to shareholders or holding companies and providing an adequate explanation (if any) of how certain reserved matters – that go beyond company law requirements – nevertheless allow the regulated company board to have full control of the business and be equipped to make strategic decisions about all aspects of the business.

- Explanations relating to having a non-independent chair, not having independent non-executive directors (INEDs) as the largest single group on the board, or why a board considers a director to be independent despite circumstances that could be considered to impair their independence, must address the question of whether these alternative arrangements deliver sufficient independent membership.

From 2020 onwards companies will be required to fully report how they have met the objectives of the 2019 principles. As explained in the conclusions document we will review how companies have met the objectives by taking into account the provisions, past issues and best practice in the sector and beyond to assess whether companies’ substantive behaviours in the round are delivering the objectives. As this is a transitional year for company reporting, in this document we signal important areas of focus for companies in their explanations of how they are meeting the objectives. We will expand our assessment in future years, capturing whether companies’ behaviours have been in keeping with the objectives and the extent to which they have adopted best practice in the sector and beyond.

1.3 Key findings

The main findings from our review are outlined in this section. These highlight areas where we think companies could improve. On the whole, there is room for improvement across most areas, with some gaps in reporting. Nevertheless, we did see numerous examples of what could be considered good practice which other companies can learn from. These are detailed in the next section together with more detail on the position companies are in to meet each objective.
Some companies clearly set out the steps which they are taking to ensure they can meet the objectives of the new 2019 principles going forward while others were less clear. Now that companies have a licence obligation to meet the objectives and to explain how they are doing so, it is important that companies provide detailed explanations in their annual reporting that directly address the objectives. This will enable both Ofwat and other stakeholders to understand how companies interpret and implement each objective.

The vast majority of boards have already taken steps to establish or refresh their company purpose, reflecting an awareness of their social purpose. However there was limited evidence of actions taken by boards to embed the company purpose and values into the culture of the business. This is critical to ensuring that the culture of the business delivers the purpose throughout the organisation.

There were limited explanations of how companies’ approaches to board decision-making helped the board take full responsibility for the business, although there was an improvement in the transparency of reporting of reserved matters. There was also very little explanation of action taken in relation to conflicts of interest – particularly those resulting from significant shareholdings.

There was some improved transparency compared to previous years’ reporting of how dividend and executive performance pay policies are linked to delivery for customers. However, it was often difficult to understand from the explanations given by some companies how their dividend and bonus payments matched performance during the year. We expect to see a significant proportion of executive bonus payments to have been driven by delivery for customers, but most companies did not demonstrate this.

Most companies appear to have the board structures in place which can help restrict the dominance of any one group and are conducive to independent challenge and diversity of thought. A few companies are transitioning to new arrangements that can help them achieve this. While all companies carried out board evaluation exercises during the year, there was a varying degree of detail provided about the process undertaken, the outcomes of the exercise and any actions taken.
2. Detailed findings

In this section we outline each objective and the factors we considered in our assessment and we signal our observations of good practice and areas for improvement for companies to consider.

2.1 Purpose, values and culture

Objective 1: The board of the Appointee establishes the company’s purpose, strategy and values, and is satisfied that these and its culture reflect the needs of all those it serves.

This objective reflects the importance of a regulated water company’s purpose, values and culture in delivering long-term success, and building trust given its public service role. It also reflects the increasing focus in the wider economy on corporate values and culture, and the role of boards in driving them.

In our assessment we looked at whether companies have clearly stated their purpose and, for those that have, what information they set out about the active role their boards played in the development and promotion of that purpose, including their engagement activities. We considered how well companies explained the extent to which their purpose aligns with their strategy. We also looked for examples that demonstrate the efforts by boards to embed the purpose and values in the company’s culture.

Our findings

This is a new area for the 2019 principles so our focus here was on identifying what, if anything, companies were already doing. We were pleased to see that the vast majority of boards have already taken steps to establish or refresh their company purpose. Appendix 1 lists the purpose statements for those companies that have published them.

Most companies did not provide a clear explanation of the role that the board has played in developing or reviewing the company purpose. However, Anglian Water, Wessex Water and Yorkshire Water clearly explained how they went about developing or reviewing their purpose, including examples of how the board engaged more widely to do this.
Most companies explained at length their stakeholder engagement activities, which were mainly for their PR19 business plans. These explanations did not give a clear sense of how the company purpose was established by the board. For companies that have adopted a purpose that is shared with the group or other businesses in the group, it is important that they show what the board has done to test that this purpose is appropriate for the regulated company.

We found very limited examples of boards taking action to embed the company purpose and values into the culture of the business. This is important for ensuring that the culture delivers the purpose throughout the organisation. The levels of management below board in particular are key to turning the purpose into action and into better performance for the company. While we recognise that the development of a company’s culture is likely to take time and be unique to its circumstances, we do expect to see more evidence of the specific plans boards have put in place and the subsequent activities they have undertaken to ensure that the purpose and values of the company are embedded in its culture. Furthermore, explanations of how the purpose aligns with the company strategy were generally lacking and again we would expect to see more evidence of boards focusing on this.

**Examples of good practice**

- The board of United Utilities Water has a designated non-executive director to engage with the workforce to provide the board with a first-hand assessment of the culture of the business. We also saw evidence of a strong focus from the board on embedding the purpose into company policies and procedures.

- The board of Severn Trent Water focused on deepening its understanding of the group’s culture through a dedicated company purpose and culture session which was centred on the results of an all employee survey.

- The board of Bristol Water launched the company’s social contract in January 2019 which it says will ensure that boardroom and management decisions are made with the views of local communities at their heart. It says that the social contract will act as a framework through which the company’s customers and stakeholders can hold the company to account for the delivery of its purpose.

- The board of Southern Water recognised a need to take action to improve the company’s culture in response to the company’s manipulation of wastewater flows and for misreporting data to its regulators and, therefore, approved the development and launch of a new company purpose. This included developing
supporting materials such as a new code of ethics to set out the expectations of the board and to aid ethical decision-making.

2.2 Standalone regulated company

Objective 2: The Appointee has an effective board with full responsibility for all aspects of the Appointee’s business for the long-term.

This objective aims to secure that the board of the regulated company has the power to set its long-term direction and that it can make, and be held accountable for, all decisions regarding the company’s regulated activities as though these were substantially its sole business. This includes a new focus on responsibility for strategic decisions.

In our assessment we looked at how the board has demonstrated that it is taking full responsibility for all aspects of the company’s business. This included looking at evidence of long-term focus, and how the board ensures that it has the necessary information so that it can operate effectively. We considered how decisions were taken by company boards, including by considering companies’ explanations as to the matters reserved for the group, or parent company’s board. We also looked at companies’ explanations of the mechanisms that the board has put in place to identify and manage conflicts of interest among its members. In order to ensure that boards are able to take full responsibility for all aspects of their businesses, it is important that boards can assure themselves that the information they receive is accurate and complete and we looked for evidence of this.

Our findings

The role of the board in company decision-making is central to the board taking responsibility for all aspects of the regulated company’s business for the long-term. The quality of the explanations that companies provide for their approaches and actions is important and in a number of cases, there was room for improvement.

In particular, although there were some high quality explanations of how companies develop their long-term strategy or plans, there was limited evidence or explanation of the mechanisms in place to ensure that the short-term decisions that the board makes align with the long-term strategy or plans of the company.
It is also important to understand the relationship between boards and their shareholders or parent companies and how companies ensure that boards are able to make decisions in a manner consistent with them taking full responsibility for the regulated business. One aspect of this is the matters that are reserved to shareholders or parent companies (reserved matters). Overall there has been a significant improvement in the transparency of reporting of reserved matters, with the vast majority of companies presenting the matters reserved for shareholders in a clear and accessible way.

However, in the context of delivering this objective there were gaps in companies’ explanations of reserved matters, and why they are appropriate, particularly with reference to a company’s ownership model. A number of companies (Anglian Water, Yorkshire Water and Affinity Water) provided explanations that focused on the analogy with issues that shareholders would be expected to approve in a listed, or in the case of Yorkshire Water a limited, company, without explanation of why this analogy is appropriate to their ownership model and the regulatory environment. Even where there are no matters reserved to shareholders or parent companies, it would be helpful to explain how those matters that are properly of shareholder concern are addressed in the context of delivering the objective.

Regarding conflicts of interest most companies said that they have a policy in place to identify and manage such conflicts; however some companies (Anglian Water, South Staffs Water, Bristol Water) placed an overt reliance on directors having a statutory duty to avoid situations where they have directly or indirectly a conflict of interest, without explaining the policies they have in place for addressing any conflicts. Across the board there was very little explanation of action taken specifically in relation to conflicts of interest resulting from significant shareholdings to mitigate these, and the influence of third parties.

Finally, there was a lack of detail provided on how boards were assuring themselves that they had accurate and complete information on the company’s performance to enable them to operate effectively.

Overall, we continue to have a concern with the adequacy of companies’ approaches to this objective. Given the concerns raised we will be looking closely at companies’ behaviours over the coming period to develop a greater understanding of how these issues might interact to develop a holistic view of companies’ approaches to meeting the objectives.
Examples of good practice

- The board of Hafren Dyfrdwy, recognising the potential for conflict of interest to arise from the existence of shared directorships between itself and other companies within the group, acted by making modifications to its audit committee’s meeting structure.

- Southern Water has clearly described which of the matters that are listed for shareholder approval were actually subject to approval during the reporting year.
2.3 Board leadership and transparency

Objective 3: The board of the Appointee’s leadership and approach to transparency and governance engenders trust in the Appointee and ensures accountability for their actions.

The aim of this objective is to ensure that the board is at the forefront of ensuring that stakeholders can have trust and confidence in the business, particularly through its approach to transparency and governance.

In our assessment we were looking for evidence of how transparent boards have been on matters affecting their own performance and legitimacy, including their own companies’ group structures and the transparency of the link between executive performance pay and delivery for customers. Similarly, for dividend policies we considered the transparency of the link between dividends and delivery for customers and other performance obligations. We also looked for evidence of boards taking ownership of the approach which the company takes to meeting the board leadership, transparency and governance principles.

Our findings

All of the companies clearly explained their ownership and corporate structures, providing diagrams to add clarity. Some introduced additional clarity by providing more information or making the information more customer-friendly (see examples of good practice below).

The vast majority of companies this year produced a clear statement of company direction and performance, focusing on how the board has set its aspirations and performed for all those it serves. Companies that did this particularly well were able to show a strong link between previous statements and actions taken since. Examples of how trade-offs were taken into account also added to the quality and clarity of statements. Companies that did little more than sign-post other reporting will in future need to demonstrate how they are making their performance aspirations and achievements clear and accessible for a wider audience.

While all companies have committed to ensuring that their executive pay policies are stretching and substantially linked to delivery for customers for 2020-25, in 2018-19 most companies had not yet implemented these commitments. Almost all companies’ executive performance reward packages continue to show a limited link to delivery for customers. A number of companies’ long-term incentive plans still do not include any customer elements (Anglian Water, Northumbrian Water, South
West Water and SES Water). Other companies only disclosed limited details of customer targets in their long-term incentive plans (Severn Trent Water and Affinity Water).

While companies were often clear about how bonus payments should be derived in theory, it was not always clear how they had been arrived at in practice based on the actual performance achieved by the company in the year. Severn Trent Water provided a table which linked the actual performance level achieved in the year to the percentage of the bonus paid out for each area.

At Thames Water we saw an example of a board awarding a substantial proportion of available executive bonuses that did not reflect the actual delivery for customers during the year. Its remuneration report did not demonstrate there had been appropriate scrutiny by the remuneration committee of the company’s performance when making awards in 2018-19, given that the company’s delivery of services requires improvement in multiple areas, including customer satisfaction.

Companies have a licence obligation which requires them to ensure that dividends are only declared or paid in accordance with their dividend policy, and we expect companies to evidence this alignment within their reporting. However, while companies were often clear about how their dividend level should be derived in theory, it was not always clear how the dividend had been decided in practice or how the dividend aligned with the company’s policy in 2018-19. Only a few companies included detail of their dividend for the year which clearly evidenced how it aligned with their dividend policy.

All companies have committed to ensuring that their dividend policies take into account factors that matter to customers and employees across 2020-25\(^1\). However in 2018-19 just over half of companies explained that their assessment of the appropriate total level of dividend included consideration of the performance of the business, only half of companies explained that their assessment included consideration of the level of service provided for customers and only a few companies explained that their assessment included consideration of delivery for employees (with several of these companies only referring to pension scheme considerations). In addition, of these companies, very few explained how

---

\(^1\) We set out our expectations for companies’ dividend policies for 2020-25 in Putting the sector in balance: position statement as updated in PR19 final determinations: Aligning risk and return technical appendix
Performance is considered and the factors taken into account to specifically consider delivery for customers or employees.

In 2018-19, a few companies explained that part of the dividend they paid in the year was used by a group company to pay interest or capital back to them in relation to an intra-group loan, whereby the regulated company has lent money to its parent or another group company. We consider that companies’ dividend policies should be applied to the total dividend declared or paid. This includes any dividend paid by the company for any reason, such as dividends paid to a holding company to allow it to pay interest on an intra-group loan. In turn, we consider that when companies set out how dividends declared or paid have been determined and how they relate to their dividend policy, this should be with reference to total dividends declared or paid. In all cases, we expect companies to clearly justify and be transparent about dividend payments, explaining all factors that have been taken into account.

**Examples of good practice**

- **Bristol Water**, in addition to providing a clear diagram with commentary of the ownership and group structure of the company, also provided a pie chart showing beneficial ownership by investor type.

- **SES Water** published a document in November 2018 – Keeping it Clear – which provides a customer friendly guide to how it is owned, run and financed; it includes a diagram of the group’s ownership structure. The company also publishes a summary of its board minutes on its website.

- **United Utilities Water** produced a board statement that demonstrated a strong link between the aspirations that the board set out in last year’s statement, the actions the board has taken since to ensure they are met and how and why its future direction is evolving.

- **The board statement of Yorkshire Water** gave a clear overview of how the board has set its ambitions and how it retains oversight of performance. The quality and clarity of the statement was enhanced by some specific examples of how trade-offs were taken into account in decision-making, using the six capitals approach.

- **Tideway** has clearly set out its aspirations in its annual report in an accessible way. It has shown the key long-term activities which support these aspirations as well as the priorities for the coming year.
• Affinity Water’s dividend policy showed positive steps, explaining that the company’s dividend could increase or decrease based on performance, and includes an explanation of how the dividend paid in the year had been subject to this consideration.

2.4 Board structure and effectiveness

**Objective 4: The board of the Appointee and their committees are competent, well run, and have sufficient independent membership, ensuring they can make high quality decisions that address diverse customer and stakeholder needs.**

This objective reflects the importance of ensuring that boards have the right arrangements in place to ensure they operate effectively, including that there is sufficient independent challenge and judgement on boards in the context of the special responsibilities of a regulated water company delivering an essential public service. Boards should have the appropriate membership to ensure that the interests of customers and other stakeholders are appropriately taken into account in decision-making. It should be clear how the board structure allows directors to critically test, analyse and evaluate ideas and decisions.

In our assessment we considered the leadership and composition of company boards and committees, in the context of the group structure in which they operate. We looked at the information which had been reported on the balance of skills and experience and diversity of the board and any board evaluation which had been carried out.

**Our findings**

Most companies appear to have board structures in place which help to restrict the dominance of any one group and are conducive to independent challenge and diversity of thought. Most companies also have committees which are made up in such a way that should allow for appropriate independent challenge. We think that having appropriate structures in place is important to help companies demonstrate that wider group or investor interests are not able to override independent judgement and/or dominate decision-making. Companies will need to be clear in future years’ reporting how the particular structure which they have chosen helps them ensure that they meet the objective.
In the reporting year there were two companies, Northumbrian Water and Wessex Water, where it was not clear that appropriate structures were in place. However we are pleased that both companies have since reviewed their approaches. Wessex Water appointed two new INEDs to its board in June 2019. These two new appointments, in addition to the four INEDs already in post, make INEDs the largest single group on the board. Northumbrian Water has also committed to refreshing its board, so that INEDs are the largest single group.

The board of South West Water shares some of its non-executive directors and its chair with its parent company. The company made a change to its board just before year end which means that there are now an equal number of directors who also sit on its parent company board and INEDs on the regulated company board. The company will need to explain in next year’s reporting how its revised arrangements allow it to meet the objective.

All companies highlighted the skills represented on their boards in board members’ biographies, generally on a director by director basis. However, some companies set this out more clearly so that the mix of skills could be more readily identified. It was often not clear what steps companies are taking to identify and fill skills gaps.

Board evaluation exercises help boards maintain their effectiveness, including addressing any weaknesses, when carried out in a robust manner and where companies act on any findings. All companies carried out board evaluation exercises during the year with a mixture of internally and externally facilitated exercises; many companies carry out externally facilitated exercises every other year. There was a varying level of detail provided by companies on both the process undertaken and the conclusions of the exercise. Southern Water noted that an internally facilitated evaluation took place but did not provide any detail on the process that had been carried out nor the outcomes of the review.

### Examples of good practice

- Thames Water and United Utilities Water provided board skills matrices which clearly show both the skills which each board member brings and areas where there was an over- or under-concentration of skills. United Utilities Water explained how it uses the skills matrix to inform both its succession planning for board directors and the planning process for board appointments.

- The board of Tideway recognises that as the project progresses, its operational needs and the matters requiring its consideration will change, therefore it intends to keep its members’ range of skills and experience under review and
to refresh the membership from time to time, to ensure its breadth of sector experience appropriately reflects the project’s needs.

- United Utilities Water, SES Water and Severn Trent Water set out clearly the actions which had been taken in the reporting year to address the recommendations of the board evaluation which was carried out in the previous year.

- United Utilities Water has explained why it does not duplicate committees at holding company and regulated company level and why it thinks this is appropriate in the context of the group in which it operates.
3. Recent developments

In this section we highlight some recent developments which are relevant to helping companies demonstrate how they are meeting the objectives. We expect to report more fully on these developments in future publications.

We believe that water companies are uniquely placed to provide significant public value as they carry out their core function of delivering water and wastewater services for customers. Providing public value is an important goal of our strategy and involves companies looking for ways to deliver social value both through what they do and how they do it. Companies are responding to this challenge in different ways.

In May this year Water UK issued a commitment from all the English water companies to explore enshrining public interest within their business purpose. The public interest commitment contains goals for the sector on carbon, plastics, leakage, water poverty and social inclusion.

One company (Anglian Water) has already changed its Articles of Association to legally enshrine the wider public interest within the constitutional make up of its business and is now taking steps to embed those changes in the organisation. Bristol Water has recently published its first social contract impact report, setting out the benefits of its social contract in the first six months of its implementation.

While we want to leave space for companies to consider how best to embed a public purpose, we stand ready to assist early adopters where necessary. We are currently working with Severn Trent Water and Hafren Dyfrdwy on their proposal for a new licence condition to enshrine the company’s public purpose in everything they do.

We are also following the wider discussion about business being led by public purpose. Recent interventions, including by the British Academy\(^2\), give a flavour of the broader thinking on this issues and we are following it closely to make sure the water sector’s thinking on this agenda is not siloed or lagging behind.

We will continue to play a role in shaping these discussions as we seek to push water companies to go to the forefront of the agenda.
## Appendix 1: Companies’ stated purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water company</th>
<th>Purpose statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anglian Water</td>
<td>To conduct its business and operations for the benefit of members as a whole while delivering long-term value for its customers, the region and the communities it serves and seeking positive outcomes for the environment and society.³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dŵr Cymru</td>
<td>To provide high quality and better value drinking water and environmental services, so as to enhance the well-being of our customers and the communities we serve, both now and for generations to come.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hafren Dyfrdwy</td>
<td>To serve our communities and build a lasting water legacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumbrian Water</td>
<td>Water is life. Every living cell on earth needs water to survive. The single most essential ingredient for human life to thrive, is clean drinking water. Our work is instrumental in fulfilling our basic human needs and protecting the source of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severn Trent Water</td>
<td>To serve our communities and build a lasting water legacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West Water</td>
<td>Bringing resources to life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Water</td>
<td>We provide water for life to enhance health and wellbeing, protect and improve the environment and sustain the economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Water</td>
<td>To build a better future for our customers, our region and our planet by caring for water. Because without water, there is no future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Utilities Water</td>
<td>To provide great service to customers and communities in the North West, creating long-term value for all of our stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wessex Water⁴</td>
<td>We provide our customers and communities excellent service and value for money. We protect and improve the environment. We provide our people with the opportunity for personal development and a satisfying career. We provide our investors with a fair return for their investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire Water</td>
<td>The company refers to its long-term strategy which was published in August 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affinity Water</td>
<td>The board had not established a purpose statement for the company at the time of the 2018-19 annual report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Water</td>
<td>To have a positive impact on society and the environment – building trust beyond water.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³ The company provided its purpose as part of its articles of association which were updated in July 2019. See recent developments section above.
⁴ The company provided its purpose on its website rather than as part of its annual reporting.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portsmouth Water</td>
<td>The board had not established a purpose statement for the company at the time of the 2018-19 annual report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES Water</td>
<td>The company has set out an aspiration ‘to ensure a continuous supply of high-quality water, accurate and affordable bills, dealing with enquiries efficiently, reducing our impact on the environment and helping communities thrive’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Water</td>
<td>The company set out that it will define its purpose and develop its work on cultural change using its engagement with customers and other stakeholders as a basis, building on existing work to help deliver its responsible business commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Staffs Water</td>
<td>Delivering clean water every day and in all weathers to our customers, providing an essential public service that touches everything they do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tideway</td>
<td>Tideway is building the Thames Tideway Tunnel under the River Thames to give London the sewer capacity it needs now and for the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ofwat (The Water Services Regulation Authority) is a non-ministerial government department. We regulate the water sector in England and Wales.