

Summary of the Outcomes Working Group – Customer outcomes from water distribution

- The general consensus was that performance commitments should be as high level and simple as possible and there needs to be a strong reason to move towards either more granular or complex measures.
- While there was some debate around whether 3 hours was the right threshold for the supply interruptions PC, reducing the threshold may have unintended consequence of a greater focus on urban customers (at the expense of rural customers), where resolving within 3 hours is more practicable. It was also noted that we could give a higher weight within the measure to longer interruptions (or measure different lengths of interruptions), but that would add to complexity.
- We noted that GSS provided an extra element for interruptions beyond 12 hours. There was some discussion if more generally money should be returned to customers that were impacted, rather than spread across all customers.
- Most companies thought that complaints and problems with pressure were for a relatively small number of properties. Added to this the service failure is not as severe as for some other issues, such as a complete interruption.
- Some companies noted evidence that customers may be dissatisfied with pressure, but not complain. However, companies have an incentive to address this through C-MEX.
- Companies have found that the process of introducing a new bespoke PC has led them to understand both their systems and customers more.
- Some companies were interested in repeated incidents, such as those picked up by Welsh Water's worst customer measures. These could be built on existing definitions.
- Some companies suggested we should consider a common definition for resilience of water supply. [This will be discussed further in April].
- Overall the consensus was that, at this point in time, there was no reason to consider further common definitions to measure the reliability of water supply.