

December 2020

# **Strategic regional water resource solutions: Accelerated gate one draft decision for water recycling**

**Ofwat**

# Strategic regional water resource solutions: Accelerated gate one draft decision for water recycling

## Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. Background	3
3. Submission assessment process	5
4. Solution background	6
5. Solution assessment summary	9
6. Gate two activities	18
7. Next steps	19
Appendix: Remediation issues	20

## 1. Introduction

The purpose of this publication is to set out our draft decision in respect of the water recycling strategic regional water resource solution submitted for the accelerated gate one assessment by solution sponsor, Southern Water<sup>1</sup>.

This publication should be read in conjunction with the draft decision letter issued to each solution sponsor. Both this document and the draft decision letter have been published on our website today.

The solution sponsors and other interested parties can now respond to the draft decision. Representations are invited by email to [rapid@ofwat.gov.uk](mailto:rapid@ofwat.gov.uk) and the representation period will close at 5 pm on 31 December 2020. All representations will be considered before our final decision is published on 28 January 2021.

---

<sup>1</sup> Referred to in PR19 determination as “River Itchen effluent reuse”



The PR19 total development allowance associated with each gate decision is split in the following proportions: gate one - 10%, gate two - 15%, gate three - 35%, gate four - 40%.

Decisions made at the gates are implemented through an end of period reconciliation mechanism, which was explained in our final determination.

Other solutions may be identified, for example during the development of regional plans, and these can enter the gated process based on RAPID’s recommendations to us. They are subject to additional assessment to determine if there is a value in accelerating the solution’s development to be ‘construction ready’ for the 2025–2030 period, whether it needs additional enhancement and regulatory support, and if it provides a similar or better cost / water resource benefit ratio compared to current solutions.

There are two tracks in the gated process:

- standard gates, where timings align with other water resource planning processes; and
- accelerated gates, for solutions that address Southern Water’s need for large scale water resources, which occurs earlier than for other companies, in December 2027.

**Figure 2.2 Gated process for potential strategic regional water resource solutions**



### 3. Submission assessment process


Solution sponsors are required to complete a submission template for each strategic resource option. The submission template seeks to establish the progress of potential solutions.

At gate one, we make the following decisions for each solution based on the assessment process overseen by RAPID:

- whether the solution should progress through the gated process to gate two;
- whether expenditure has been incurred efficiently and should be allowed in full and - if not - what proportion of expenditure should be allowed;
- if the solution submission is not of sufficient quality or does not demonstrate that sufficient work has been carried out, what level of delivery incentive penalty should apply and what proportion of the penalty can be mitigated through the remediation action plan;
- whether there should be any change to solution partnering arrangements (if requested);
- if new or alternative solution options should enter the gated process (if presented); and
- confirmation of gate two activities.

The assessment process takes place over a number of stages before draft and final decisions are reached, as illustrated below.

**Figure 3.1 Submission assessment process**



## 4. Solution background


### 4.1 Solution summary

The submission includes five options for direct or indirect water recycling:

- B.1: 61 Ml/d Recycled water from Budds Farm Wastewater Treatment Works (WTW) to Lower Itchen, abstraction and transfer for treatment at Otterbourne Water Supply Works (WSW);
- B.2: 61 Ml/d Recycled water from Budds Farm WTW to Upper Itchen/Environmental Buffer – treated at Otterbourne WSW;
- B.3: 61 Ml/d Recycled water from Budds Farm WTW sent direct to Otterbourne WSW (direct recycling);
- B.4: 61 Ml/d Recycled water from Budds Farm WTW sent to Otterbourne WSW via Havant Thicket Reservoir; and
- B.5: 75 Ml/d Recycled water from Budds Farm WTW and Peel Common WTW sent to Environmental Buffer – treated at Otterbourne WSW.

The water recycling solution comprises the treatment of final effluent from a wastewater treatment works to provide a potable water supply. Each of the options presented comprise multiple treatment stages depending on whether it is a direct recycling or indirect via an environmental buffer. Treatment processes include ultrafiltration, reverse osmosis, UV disinfection and remineralisation at a new water recycling plant. With each option presented, water will be treated finally at Otterbourne WSW prior to supply.

Figure 4.1 Water Recycling schematic



## 4.2 Solution context

The Section 20 agreement with the Environment Agency sets out how Southern Water will use “all best endeavours” to implement the long-term solution for alternative water resource in order to address deficits arising from reductions in the volume of water that can be abstracted on the River Test and River Itchen, which are reflected in changes to abstraction licences made in March 2019.

This will enable the company not to require drought orders and permits from the River Itchen and the Candover boreholes and only to require a drought order or permit from the River Test in extreme drought events (1 in 500 year drought severity) after the end of 2027.

Southern Water’s WRMP19 sets out the proposals to meet the section 20 agreement which include: a 75Ml/d desalination plant at Fawley; water efficiency and leakage reductions; new bulk supplies from Bournemouth Water (20Ml/d) and Portsmouth Water (9Ml/d); construction of Havant Thicket reservoir and a further 21Ml/d bulk supply from Portsmouth Water; extensions to the existing water grid; and water quality schemes.

The 61Ml/d Water Recycling solution (Option B.1) was included as a ‘strategic alternative’ to the preferred strategy ‘base case’ desalination solution in WRMP19.

## 4.3 Solution key risks and issues

Southern Water has identified the following key risks associated with this solution:

- Programme delays, should there be a requirement to update and re-consult on its WRMP19.
- Direction under section 35 of the Planning Act 2008 might not be made to enable the solution to progress via the Development Consent Order (DCO) consenting process.
- The interaction between the DCO and Direct Procurement for Customers (DPC) processes may take longer than assumed.
- There are currently no reverse osmosis membranes approved for use for direct recycling by Drinking Water Inspectorate under regulation 31 (materials in contact with potable water).
- Owing to its relative novelty, public perception may be negatively skewed against water recycling as a solution leading to delays in the planning process as concerns are addressed.

## 5. Solution assessment summary

Table 5.1 Draft decision summary

Recommendation item	Water recycling
Solution Sponsors	Southern Water
Should further funding be allowed for the solution to progress to gate two?	Yes
Is there evidence all expenditure is efficient and should be allowed?	No
Delivery incentive penalty?	10%
Is there any change to partner arrangements?	NA
Is there a need for a remediation action plan?	Yes
<p>Funding is allowed for the solution to remain on the accelerated track subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Eliminating option B.1 (61 Ml/d to Lower Itchen).</li> <li>Option B.4 (61 Ml/d via Havant Thicket) should be closely aligned and considered in combination with the raw water transfer additional solution. This is because it depends on the Havant Thicket reservoir being operational.</li> </ul> <p>Efficient costs allowance for this solution is £2.347 million (of £3.130 million claimed). If Southern Water disagrees, then improved evidence of cost efficiency must be submitted as part of representation (that is, by 31 December 2020).</p> <p>Delivery incentive penalty will not be applied if the company provides a remediation action plan by 31 March 2021 and all priority actions are satisfactorily addressed by 26 July 2021.</p> <p>Remediation issues are listed in the Appendix categorised as priority actions, actions and recommendations.</p>	

### 5.1 Solution progression and funding to gate two

The evidence suggests that the water recycling solution is a potentially valuable way of supplying water to customers. Based on our assessment of the potential solution costs and benefits we have concluded that the solution should progress through the gated process to gate two, and that further funding be allowed except for the following option:

- Option B.1 (61 Ml/d to Lower Itchen) should be eliminated from further investigations. This is because of concerns raised by Natural England and the Environment Agency about the potential impact of the discharge on the integrity of the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation (SAC) in terms of flow and quality. The Environment Agency has also highlighted that this option would have little benefit in offsetting water resource deficit if inputted below the abstraction point.

It is important that Option B.4 (61 Ml/d via Havant Thicket) is closely aligned and considered in combination with the raw water transfer additional solution. This is because it depends on the Havant Thicket reservoir being operational.

Southern Water proposes that RAPID decides at gate two which solution/option should be progressed further. We clarify that the recommendation for which solution(s) and option(s) should progress beyond gate two is for Southern Water to make, based on the outcome of the assessments completed by that stage. The role of RAPID is to endorse or challenge the recommendation based on the strength of evidence presented.

We are not changing the funding of this solution as proposed by Southern Water to facilitate the development of its proposed additional raw water transfer solution. This solution's total allowance and gate allowances remain the same as the final determination.

## 5.2 Evidence of efficient expenditure

Our assessment of the efficient costs as spent on gate one activities results in an allowance for this solution of £2.347 million (of £3.130 million claimed).

We have made two adjustments to the costs claimed and we explain our reasons for these adjustments below:

**Table 5.2 Gate one cost adjustments**

Activity	Claimed expenditure	Allowed expenditure	Adjustment
Water resources modelling and network analysis	£543,536	£132,000	£411,536
Mobilisation and programme management	£496,955	£125,000	£371,955
<b>Total</b>	£1,040,491	£257,000	£783,491

The PR19 final determination specified that any expenditure on activities outside the gate activities for these solutions (or solutions that transfer in) will be considered as inefficient and be returned to customers. We will consider whether gate activity is efficient by considering the relevance, timeliness, completeness, and quality of the submission which should be supported by benchmarking and assurance.

We have identified two areas in particular where we consider expenditure to be inefficient or inappropriate based on the work that has been completed, these are programme management and modelling activities.

Water resources and network modelling and supply demand balance validation overlap with the company's base activities working on development of its next WRMP and regional plan. Southern Water does not clearly justify why additional work in these areas should be included in the accelerated gateway process. The funding for strategic regional water resource solutions was to accelerate the development of these specific solutions and not to fund updates to the tools to be used for future WRMPs or to identify issues or errors in the latest 2019 WRMP. These are baseline company activities and do not form part of this process.

The water resources modelling and network analysis costs for the West Country North Sources solution are only £132,000 compared to the £543,536 for water recycling (£1.087 million shared between desalination and recycling). We note that the modelling costs for water recycling are larger than the total costs for delivering the West Country North Sources joint solution submission (£499,000) and Southern Water's own additional solution (£150,000). Using the West Country North Sources modelling costs as an efficient benchmark we replace the Southern Water costs for this activity with this figure.

The costs for project set up, programme and project management appear very large for what is essentially a desk study over a period of approximately nine months. The water recycling share of joint mobilisation and programme management costs (£0.994 million) is £496,955. We replace these costs with the costs presented for project management in the West Country North Sources solution, £125,000. We have not challenged the shared project management costs nor the direct project management costs which total £70,648. The total efficient allowed costs for mobilisation, programme and project management for this solution is £195,648.

We have only made two adjustments but further observe that the submission includes limited evidence (such as benchmarking of costs or tenders) to demonstrate that expenditure incurred has been efficient. The list of activities undertaken does not include some key activities expected at this stage, such as an assessment of the potential risks to drinking water quality or customer engagement on acceptability of the different options and the membrane design approval process.

Should Southern Water disagree with our cost efficiency assessment, improved evidence of cost efficiency must be submitted as part of representation (that is, by 31 December 2020).

### **5.3 Completeness and quality of submission – delivery incentives**

The aim of the assessment was to determine whether appropriate progress has been made towards delivery of the solution. We assessed to what extent the activity has been completed (completeness) and whether the evidence provided was reliable and consistent (quality). We

recognise at this stage solutions may be at different development points and the assessment takes this into account.

In line with the guidance published to companies on 1 June 2020 (and updated on 7 September 2020) we made this assessment against the criteria of:

- solution design;
- costs and benefits;
- risk and programme management;
- consistency and context; and
- assurance and board engagement.

For each criterion we assessed whether or not the submission ‘Meets expectations’, ‘Falls short of meeting expectations in some areas’, ‘Falls short of meeting expectations in many areas’ or is ‘Unacceptable’ before concluding on an overall assessment as part of the gate one decision.

Our overall assessment for the solution submission is that it “Falls short in some areas”, as illustrated in Figure 5.1.

**Figure 5.1 Assessment of completeness and quality**

Overall:	Falls short in some areas
Completeness:	Falls short in some areas
Solution design:	Falls short in some areas
Costs and benefits:	Falls short in some areas
Risk & Prog. management:	Falls short in some areas
Consistency & context:	Falls short in some areas
Assurance & board engagement:	Falls short in some areas

We have decided to impose a potential delivery incentive penalty of 10%. This reflects that progress on this solution has not been as great as we would expect at gate one in a number of key areas, in particular we are concerned that:

- The currently planned construction timeline will not allow the solution to be operating by the end of 2027, which is the timescale referred to in the section 20 agreement.
- There is no information about why the timeline for delivery has slipped beyond 2027 and no plan for recovering the programme slip or proposed mitigation measures.
- There is a significant amount of work that needs to be completed for the environmental assessments.
- There is limited evidence that membrane manufacturers have been engaged to resolve the Regulation 31 approval requirements.

The full delivery incentive penalty for Southern Water is conditional on whether or not it takes prompt action to address the issues we have identified with its submission. The company has the opportunity to mitigate the delivery incentive penalty by addressing the issues identified and listed in the Appendix that need to be completed by 26 July 2021 ('priority actions'). If the company addresses all of the priority actions satisfactorily by this date then the 10% delivery incentive penalty in respect of this solution will not apply. If the company fails to address one or more of the issues by this date then the 10% delivery incentive penalty in respect of this solution will apply in full. This is explained further in section 5.5 below.

As explained in our final determination, the largest penalty across a company's suite of solutions will be applied to the company's total gate one allowed efficient expenditure.

Further details of our assessment are provided below.

## Completeness

Some elements of the submission are missing or are partially complete; for example, there is no mention of remediation with regards to potential risks to water drinking quality; evidence around the potential social, environmental and economic benefits that the solution could deliver is limited; and there is no consideration of solution delay impacts.

## Solution design

We have included in our assessment of solution design the solution description and technical information about the solution, and its water resource benefits.

The level of solution outline and option configuration is appropriate for this stage of development. However, we found shortfalls in some areas including specific consideration of drinking water quality risk mitigation and related operating strategy.

The water resource benefits for how each of the water recycling options will address the supply-demand balance has not been clearly presented. Southern Water has concluded that the water resource benefits will be comparable to the desalination solution and only propose to carry out strategic modelling to inform the gate two submission. There has been no consideration of the potential conjunctive use benefits of this solution.

Option B.4 (61 Ml/d via Havant Thicket) relies on the Havant Thicket reservoir being operational. It should therefore be closely aligned and considered in combination with the raw water transfer additional solution.

## **Evaluation of costs and benefits**

Our assessment of the evaluation of costs and benefits considered information provided about the costs of the solution, the social, environmental and economic assessments and how the solution takes into account the carbon challenge.

The estimated development and capital costs for Option B.1 have increased from £224 million to £497 million since WRMP19 was published in December 2019. Southern Water indicates this is due to greater clarity in the technical/delivery considerations and inclusion of optimism bias. The operating costs over the 60-year design period have been calculated as £646 million.

Southern Water describes its approach to estimating optimism bias (for capex and opex) and provides evidence that its approach has followed HM Treasury Green Book guidance. The approach to benchmarking, including selection of historic cost data for similar projects, is considered appropriate for a project of this type. Overall, the cost estimating approach described in the submission uses cost data and analysis methods that are appropriate for this stage of the project development.

Carbon emissions estimates (embodied, operational and whole life carbon estimates) have been evaluated using appropriate approaches at this stage, but use inconsistent assumptions regarding flow utilisation.

There are multiple environmental and spatial constraints affecting the pipeline corridors proposed for each option. The current level of the environmental appraisals cannot conclude there would be no adverse effects from each option on the integrity of a number of protected sites. There are environmental concerns about options that discharge to the River Itchen Special Area of Conservation without any additional buffer, and the Environment Agency's view is that there is no reasonable prospect of mitigating these impacts.

These potential impacts mean that development of Option B.1 should not progress further.

We consider the analysis has a number of specific deficiencies, including:

- There is limited evidence that membrane manufacturers have been engaged to resolve the Regulation 31 approval requirements.
- Customer acceptability of recycled water for potable supply, especially the direct option, is not well understood.
- Inconsistent flow utilisation estimates, which undermine confidence that that option operating costs are correctly calculated for different operating scenarios and that option comparisons on the basis of cost per m<sup>3</sup> are consistent.
- It is not clear which factors are included in the final out-turn cost adjustment and whether there is any double counting of allowance for cost uncertainty.
- It is not clear why 60 years has been used for opex and whole life cost calculations. It is noted that the Water Resources Planning Guideline (WRPG) recommends that costs are profiled over at least the next 80 years.
- No environmental or social benefits have been identified in the submission other than 'the provision of a secure water source'.
- Carbon values are inconsistent with those presented for West Country North Sources solution due to different flow utilisation estimates used in different part of the submission. The analysis of whole life carbon did not take into account the impact of future power grid decarbonisation.

## Risk and programme management

Our assessment of risk and programme management has considered information relating to the outline project plan, planning considerations, key risks and mitigation measures, drinking water quality considerations and proposed gate two activities and outcomes.

Our assessment is that risk and programme management falls short of meeting expectations in some areas.

Southern Water currently estimate that the earliest delivery date is between Q4 2028 and Q3 2029, which is after the end of 2027 (which is the date referenced in the section 20 agreement). However, it does not propose measures to bring it back on track.

The allowance for planning delays does not appear sufficient. This is a major risk given that the evidence suggests that a number of key stakeholders do not support the water recycling options.

The programme sets out key milestones but does not provide clear identification of causes of delay or mitigation measures needed to bring the completion date forward. The speed of risk mitigation is concerning, in particular in relation to drinking water quality risks. It is important that company drinking water quality teams are engaged in developing Drinking Water Safety Plans for all options of this solution. There is a lack of clarity on plans for regulation 15 assessment of raw water quality, and therefore appropriate treatment processes for this water including the requirement of regulation 31 approved membranes for

the direct reuse option (B3). Implications of this solution on the ongoing refurbishment at Otterbourne WSW should be identified and discussed with the Drinking Water Inspectorate.

### **Consistency and context**

Our assessment of consistency and context has considered information relating to the interaction of the solution with other solutions, an explanation of how this solution will meet the requirements set out in the National Framework and regional plans and a comparison of the costs and benefits of this solution with those of other solutions. Information regarding stakeholder engagement has also been taken into account in our assessment.

Our assessment is that consistency and context falls short of meeting expectations in some areas.

The flow utilisation estimates used in both the operating cost and carbon estimates are different to the flow utilisation estimates produced by Southern Water's scenario modelling and this inconsistency has been confirmed by Southern Water in its response to queries raised by the assessment team.

The quality of stakeholder/customer engagement should be improved. The evidence presented is a high-level generic assessment copied across all of the Southern Water submissions (Desalination, Recycling and Additional solution). Most of the evidence focuses on water recycling as a general topic but there is no specific reference to stakeholder engagement regarding the specific recycling options. More work is required to better understand customer acceptability and improve stakeholder engagement.

### **Assurance and Board engagement**

The evidence provided relating to assurance is largely of sufficient detail and quality for this stage of the gated process. However, there is insufficient detail of assurance of allowed costs against the final determination allowed activities, and of efficiency of costs.

The submission contains sufficient information on how the board was involved, including assurance statements and signed endorsements.

Information on future plans for board engagement would further improve future submissions.

We expect the Board to provide effective oversight of Southern Water's obligations under the section 20 agreement and to ensure that one or more solutions are in place and operating by the end of 2027. These solutions must secure sufficient alternative water resource such that the company no longer requires drought orders and permits from the River Itchen and the Candover boreholes and only requires a drought order or permit from the River Test in extreme drought events (1 in 500 year drought severity) after the end of 2027.

Future plans for board engagement must provide for this oversight by the Board. We expect Board assurance for gate two to include a statement that the Board is satisfied that progress on solutions is commensurate with solutions being in place and operating by the end of 2027.

## 5.4 Proposed changes to partner arrangements

Southern Water is expecting to work independently in delivering the water recycling solution.

## 5.5 Actions and recommendations

Where the submission has not been assessed as 'Meeting expectations' we have provided feedback on where we will seek remediation of the issues. We have categorised the remediation issues into priority actions, actions and recommendations.

Priority actions are those that should have been completed at gate one and must now be addressed on a short timescale in order to make sure the solutions stay on track. They require urgent remediation in full and for this reason directly relate to the assessment of delivery incentives set out in this publication. The response to the priority actions will determine whether a delivery incentive is imposed; and the extent to which the delivery incentives can be mitigated by the solution sponsors; if all priority actions are satisfactorily completed then penalty will not be imposed. If one or more of priority action is not satisfactorily completed then the whole of the penalty will be imposed.

We have also identified actions that require remediation in full in the gate two submission. The response to these actions will influence the assessment of the gate two submission.

Recommendations are issues where additional information or clarification could improve the quality of future submissions. All priority actions, actions and recommendations are listed in the Appendix.

We expect the solution sponsors to provide us with a remediation action plan by 31 March 2021 setting out how the priority actions identified will be resolved. If all priority actions are completed to a suitable quality by Monday, 26 July 2021, the delivery incentive penalty will not be applied. The full list of priority actions, actions and recommendations can be found in the Appendix.

## 6. Gate two activities

The solution (excluding option B.1) will continue to be funded to gate two as part of the accelerated gate track. Option B.4 should be closely aligned and considered in combination with the raw water transfer additional solution. This is because it depends on the Havant Thicket reservoir being operational.

For its accelerated gate two submission, we expect Southern Water to complete the activities listed in [PR19 final determinations: strategic regional water resources solutions appendix](#), as expanded on in its gate one Submission Annex 20. Activities we consider to be of particular importance are listed as actions in the Appendix.

## 7. Next steps

Following publication of this gate one draft decision solution sponsors and other interested parties are invited to respond to the draft decision. Representations can be made by email to [rapid@ofwat.gov.uk](mailto:rapid@ofwat.gov.uk). The representation period will close at 5pm on 31 December 2020. All representations will be considered before our final decision is published on 28 January 2021.

## Appendix: Remediation issues

<b>Priority Actions – to be addressed by 26 July 2021</b>		
<b>Number</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Detail</b>
1	3.3	Consider whether your WRMP19 needs amending and if so how. Explain the reasoning for this in light of potential changes to your best case plan, delivery times and costs for the solution.
2	3.4	<p>Provide information about why the timeline for delivery has slipped from 2027 to 2028. Provide a plan for recovering the programme slip, including a revised plan with mitigation measures to deliver alternative water resource by end 2027 (as referenced in the section 20 agreement). This should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the measures that are needed to meet the section 20 timescales</li> <li>• more detail of pre-construction activities and critical path activities (such as DWI engagement on membranes approvals (if applicable) and site location confirmation) and decision points</li> <li>• a clear statement to confirm any missing information and the potential impact this could have on the programme</li> <li>• consideration of solution delay impacts with reference to SRN's S20 obligations</li> <li>• details of regulator engagement and review points.</li> </ul>
3	14.1	Provide more information on cost including identification of activities which should have been undertaken by gate one but have not been completed.
<b>Actions – to be addressed in gate two submission</b>		
<b>Number</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Detail</b>
1	2.1, 2.2, 2.5, 2.8, 2.9, 4.3	Provide a 'conceptual design report developed in consultation with all regulators, to meet gate two requirements and timescales. Include a recommendation for which solution should progress beyond gate two, based on the outcome of the assessments completed by that stage.
2	2.3 (and relates to many other sections)	Undertake site selection process as detailed in Annex 9.2 in consultation with the Environment Agency and Natural England, to meet gate two requirements and timescales.
3	2.5	Provide a clear summary of the water resource benefit (DO) of each option including the conjunctive use benefits. The operational and utilisation assumptions for each benefit should be clear. The assumed drought scenario used to calculate the benefits should be made clear including why you present these for a 1-in-200 year scenario whilst your emergency drought order level of service is 1-in-500 year. The output of a solution for a 1-in-500 year scenario will need to be calculated to support achieving the 1-in-500 year emergency drought order level of service.
4	2.6, 5.1, 5.3, 5.4	Provide summaries of the further development of Strategic Environmental Assessment, Habitats Regulations Assessment, Water Framework Directive assessment, Natural Capital Assessment, Environmental Social and Economic

Accelerated gate one draft decision for water recycling solution  
OFFICIAL

		Valuation and Environmental Net Gain, that have been discussed and agreed with the Environment Agency and Natural England, to meet gate two requirements and timescales.
5	2.8	Provide more information about risks related to water quality. We expect to see substantial progress made towards an approved membrane for the direct re-use sub-option.
6	4.3	Provide a summary of the potential impact that the water recycling options could have on the supply-demand balance. This should also include the impact on any current options or programmes within the WRMP19 or AMP7.
7	5	Whilst use of historical sample data in this and other locations may serve to enable a continued planning progress, DWI would require evidence of the representativeness of these samples for the current project at gate two. We expect further development of the risks associated with differing effluent quality based on evidence gathered from future sampling surveys, particularly seasonal, as part of the gate two submission which should include information on viral and pathogen loading especially in light of well documented effluent sampling for CoVid-19.
8	5	Otterbourne WSW site is currently the subject of a legal instrument to carry out significant refurbishment works. The DWI has already amended the legal instrument, delaying some of the work, to take account of the strategic resource options at this site. Implications of this solution on the ongoing refurbishment at Otterbourne WSW should be identified and discussed with the Inspectorate.
9	5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4,	Provide details of a monitoring programme for the effluent to ensure that a baseline is available to inform treatment requirements.
10	6	Undertake a procurement strategy assessment including DPC eligibility assessment and value for money analysis. Include in this assumptions with respect to who would operate the solution under both the DPC and traditional delivery model.
11	8.4	Provide more information about stakeholder engagement and the understanding of customer acceptability including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– for individual options and sub-options;</li> <li>– on issues that could cause delay; and</li> <li>– how the views of vulnerable or harder to reach stakeholders and customers will be sought.</li> </ul>
12	9.1	Develop a fuller risk assessment that explores the areas of uncertainty associated with this solution. This should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– a clearer relationship between mitigation measures and residual risks</li> <li>– greater clarity on the scoring criteria applied</li> <li>– more direct read-across to the dashboard risk</li> </ul> <p>Full assessment of the upstream catchment, the effluent flow and mitigation, including emergency response, should the wastewater site be adversely affected in any way and should be reflected in the DWSP.</p>

13	12.2	Future plans for board engagement must provide for effective oversight of Southern Water's obligations under the section 20 agreement and to ensure that one or more solutions are in place and operating by the end of 2027. We expect Board assurance for gate two to include a statement that the Board is satisfied that progress on solutions is commensurate with solutions being in place and operating by the end of 2027.
15	14	Provide total gate expenditure and activity breakdown costs in a common cost base. These costs should be presented in 2017-18 prices.
<b>Recommendations</b>		
<b>Number</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Detail</b>
1	4.2	Please clarify what factors are included in the final out-turn cost adjustment included in the indirect capex estimates and whether there is any double counting of allowance for cost uncertainty included under the risk assessment and optimism bias assessment.
2	4.2	Correct the inconsistency confirmed in clarification response (SRN020 Western Grid Minimum Flows) to demonstrate that option operating costs are calculated correctly for different operating scenarios and therefore options are being compared consistently.
3	4.2	To aid comparison with other WRMP options provide the Average Incremental Costs (AIC). Please clarify why 60 years has been used for opex and whole life cost calculations. It is noted that the Water Resources Planning Guideline (WRPG) recommends that costs are profiled over at least the next 80 years.
4	4.2	The estimated capex for recycling options has increased since WRMP19. Please clarify which cost components have increased and the reasons for the change.
5	5.8	Provide both operational carbon emissions and carbon intensity using the same throughputs as used for the opex and whole life cost per m3 presented in Annex 12 (i.e. as a whole life carbon per m3 or MI using the expected flows over 60 years). However, the expected flows used in both cost and carbon analysis should be consistent with the flows stated in Annex 7. Include a clarification of whether operational carbon emissions calculations take into account the future decarbonisation of the power grid.
6	7.1	Provide further detail on the planning risks and the planned mitigation measures.
7	12.1	Provide information on future plans for board engagement and a compiled summary/log of assurance findings with actions taken.
8	12.1	Provide information on future plans for board engagement to improve future submissions.
9	14.1	Provide a breakdown of the costs to gate two that is consistent with the scheduled activities for gate two.

**Ofwat (The Water Services Regulation Authority)  
is a non-ministerial government department.  
We regulate the water sector in England and Wales.**

Ofwat  
Centre City Tower  
7 Hill Street  
Birmingham B5 4UA

**Phone:** 0121 644 7500  
**Fax:** 0121 644 7533

© Crown copyright 2020

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit [nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3](https://nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3).

Where we have identified any third party copyright information, you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This document is also available from our website at [www.ofwat.gov.uk](https://www.ofwat.gov.uk).

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to [mailbox@ofwat.gov.uk](mailto:mailbox@ofwat.gov.uk).

**OGL**