

FINAL REPORT

Developer Services in the England and Wales Water Industry Horizontal audit of levels of service reporting

Prepared for
Water UK

July 2017



Halcrow Management Sciences Limited
Elms House
43 Brook Green
London W6 7EF



Revision History

Date	Version Ref	Status	Issued To	Completed By	Checked By	Approved By
20/03/2017	V1.0	Preliminary Draft	Water UK	C Turner J Ellis	G Hindley G Hawken C Morley	C Turner
29/03/2017	V2.0	Draft Final	Water UK	C Turner	J Ellis	C Turner
30/03/2017	V3.0	Draft Final	Water UK	C Morley	C Turner	C Turner
05/07/2017	V4.0	Final	Water UK	J Ellis	C Turner	C Turner
18/07/2017	V4.1	Final	Water UK	J Ellis	G Hindley	G Hindley
24/07/2017	V4.2	Final	Water UK	J Ellis	G Hindley	G Hindley

Halcrow Management Sciences Limited has prepared this report in accordance with the instructions of client Water UK for the client's sole and specific use. Any other persons who use any information contained herein do so at their own risk.

Contents

Section	Page
Acronyms and Abbreviations.....	v
Preface	vii
Executive Summary.....	0-1
Introduction and overview	0-1
Summary of approach and audit activity.....	1-1
1.1 Approach.....	1-1
1.2 Summary of activity	1-4
Analysis of company activity volumes by metric.....	2-1
2.1 Introduction	2-1
2.2 Findings - Water Metrics.....	2-1
2.2.1 General.....	2-1
2.2.2 Pre-development enquiry (W1).....	2-6
2.2.3 s45 quotations and connections (W2 to W4)	2-6
2.2.4 Mains design <500 plots (excluding where off-site reinforcement / engineering or land difficulties) (W5 to W6)	2-6
2.2.5 Mains design >500 plots or where off-site reinforcement / engineering or land difficulties (W7).....	2-6
2.2.6 Mains construction (W8)	2-7
2.2.7 Self-lay administrative activities (W9 to W13)	2-7
2.2.8 Self-lay on-site activities (W14 to W15)	2-7
2.3 Findings - Sewerage metrics	2-7
2.3.1 General.....	2-7
2.3.2 Pre-development enquiry (S1).....	2-12
2.3.3 Sewer requisition administrative activity (S2 to S3)	2-12
2.3.4 Sewer requisition, construction and commissioning (S4)	2-12
2.3.5 Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions (S5 to S6)	2-12
2.3.6 Adoption legal agreement (S7)	2-13
2.3.7 s106 sewer connection approval (S8 to S9).....	2-13
General observations	3-1
3.1 General, company-specific observations.....	3-1
3.2 General, industry-wide observations.....	3-2
3.2.1 General Comments	3-2
3.2.2 General areas of potential inconsistency	3-2
3.2.3 Management and Governance	3-3
3.2.4 Discussion on the Metrics.....	3-5
Audit findings on the Metrics	4-1
4.1 Water Metrics	4-1
4.1.1 W1 - Pre-development enquiries.....	4-1
4.1.2 W2 to W4 - s45 applications.....	4-2
4.1.3 W5 and W6 - Mains design <500 plots	4-5
4.1.4 W7 - Mains design >500 plots.....	4-6
4.1.5 W8 - Mains construction.....	4-7
4.1.6 W9 to W13 - Self-lay administrative activities.....	4-9
4.1.7 W14 and W15 - Self-lay on-site activities	4-11
4.2 Sewerage Metrics	4-13

4.2.1	S1 – Pre-development enquiries.....	4-13
4.2.2	S2 and S3 – Sewer Requisitions – administrative activities.....	4-14
4.2.3	S4 – Sewer Requisitions - construction and commissioning activities	4-15
4.2.4	S5 and S6 – Technical vetting of adoptions and diversions.....	4-16
4.2.5	S7 – Adoption legal agreements.....	4-17
4.2.6	S8 and S9 – s106 connections – letters	4-17

Appendices

Appendix 1 Audit questionnaire form

Appendix 2 Metric definitions

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ANH	Anglian Water
NES	Northumbrian Water
SVT	Severn Trent Water
SWT	South West Water
SRN	Southern Water
TMS	Thames Water
UU	United Utilities
WSH	Welsh Water
WSX	Wessex Water
YKY	Yorkshire Water
AFW	Affinity Water
BRL	Bristol Water
DVW	Dee Valley Water
PRT	Portsmouth Water
SBW	Bournemouth Water
SEW	South East Water
SSC(WM)	South Staffs & Cambridge – West Midlands
SSC(CAM)	South Staffs & Cambridge – Cambridge
SES	Sutton & East Surrey Water

Preface



Water UK is a membership organisation which represents and works with the major water and wastewater service providers.

Since April 2015, we have co-ordinated the reporting of water industry performance across a range of 24 individual measures for services provided by water companies in England and Wales to support and enable new development. These have been complemented by another 13 measures to provide further information on some of the performance-related measures, making 37 different measures in total.

The headline performance figures have been very encouraging, with significant increases in performance levels since this scheme was introduced, but water companies wanted to be assured that their returns were an accurate reflection of their performance. CH2M, was therefore commissioned to undertake an extensive horizontal audit of companies' reporting. CH2M was also asked to identify any shortcomings and make recommendations for improvements. This report sets out CH2M's conclusions.

We are encouraged to see high levels of compliance across most metrics although, as might be expected in the first such audit, some non-compliances with the reporting regime were identified.

Most of these reflect differing interpretations of the reporting definitions which CH2M notes could lead to substantial inconsistencies in reported levels of activity and hence on levels of performance. However, it is encouraging that CH2M considers these are unlikely to be significant.

CH2M has highlighted that non-compliance with a reporting definition is not always a reflection of poor performance because a company may be providing a higher level of service than that set by the industry-wide target standard.

The industry will now be looking to implement the findings of the report. In some cases, companies have already embraced improvements identified in the report.

Water UK intends to take this opportunity to consider with stakeholders how the current regime can be improved, particularly in the light of the likely adoption by Ofwat of a qualitative assessment of companies' performance in this area of activity.

Our members are committed to improving further the services they offer to developers so that the industry continues to play its part in supporting the English and Welsh Governments' growth agendas.

Water UK, July 2017.

Executive Summary

Since April 2015 water and sewerage companies in England and Wales have been reporting to Water UK on their levels of service against a set of standards that developers and others can expect in relation to the provision of water and wastewater infrastructure to support the timely provision of new housing and non-household development required for general economic development and growth. Water UK independently compiles quarterly data and has been reporting on the levels of service achieved since July 2015.

In November 2016 Water UK appointed CH2M to perform an independent industry-wide “horizontal” audit of companies’ data and reporting arrangements to provide a baseline assessment evaluating water companies’ processes and procedures for levels of compliance with the definitions and to assess the accuracy of reporting against the performance measures.

Our audits and subsequent horizontal analysis of the industry confirmed that, at the time of audit, all companies have appropriate processes, data recording and reporting arrangements in place which are suitable for reporting performance against Water UK’s developer services metrics. Whilst we identified some areas of non-compliance with the definitions, the majority of which arise from different interpretations among companies, overall we have confidence in companies’ processes, recording and reporting provisions. The non-compliances are generally not having a material impact on the reported performance and many companies have already taken steps to rectify some of the issues identified. Overall we consider the processes and systems are sufficiently robust to present a fair and reasonable account of companies’ compliance against the requirements. We consider that Water UK and other stakeholders should be able to have trust and confidence in the reported performance.

There are 15 water and 9 sewerage metrics, some of which have sub-metrics, making 37 in all.

The approach incorporated: a series of preliminary meetings with Water UK, company representatives and developer representatives; a review of each company’s methodologies; a standard questionnaire; then meetings with each company where their responses to the questionnaire were tested and evidence of methodology implementation and compliance with the definitions was sought. The audit findings for each company were summarised in a RAG-based template and shared with that company to confirm factual accuracy or to provide further evidence to support any changes to those findings. The Audit Summaries were then reviewed together and the areas of non-compliance, inconsistency or noted good practice were brought together and moderated to improve our consistency in comparing companies across the industry. We also analysed the activity levels that the companies report to Water UK (which were weighted to make them more comparable) specifically to identify whether there were any significant outliers (high or low) in each reported activity which may indicate a difference in developer activity or self-lay maturity, or an inconsistency caused by non-compliance or by another factor. Finally, we compared the accessibility and clarity of information provided to developers on the companies’ web-sites.

In sections 4 and 5 we have presented the findings from our audits. These have been moderated to improve consistency and have been assembled into groups of metrics and into four categories of: identified good practice; areas for improvement; areas of inconsistency; and areas of non-compliance.

We recommend that the areas of non-compliance identified by company are eliminated and the areas of inconsistency are considered such that better definitions or guidance can be developed to eliminate or reduce these inconsistencies.

Companies noted in the areas for improvement should consider these suggestions and implement them where appropriate and practicable to do so.

Areas of good practice have also been identified. We acknowledge that there is more subjectivity in this area and companies other than those noted may be applying similar or better practice. Nonetheless, we encourage all companies to consider these areas of good practice and to implement similar or better measures with a view to helping the industry, as a whole, move towards further improving levels of service for developers.

The draft report showing the moderated findings was shared with all the companies. Various amendments to improve the accuracy, clarity and consistency were suggested and some potential omissions were further investigated and the results incorporated in this final report.

Further moderation was then undertaken jointly by our team and representatives of Water UK and the companies. This resulted in further movement of identified issues between the categories, generally identifying more of the issues as non-compliant and only one or two removed from the report altogether following further clarifications and consideration.

Whilst our audits indicate that the industry is highly compliant with the requirements (99% of all audit questions received compliant responses) we found significant variations in interpretation and approaches which can lead to substantial inconsistencies in reported levels of activity and which (though not likely to be significant) may therefore be having an influence on the levels of performance reported. We found that some areas of non-compliance have arisen from companies adopting higher levels of service which enhance the customer's experience. Where points of non-compliance have been identified, these are highlighted red under the RAG colours. We highlight that non-compliance with definitions is not always a reflection of poor performance because it can be the case that non-compliance arises from, and results in, higher levels of service that other companies could usefully consider.

In total, of the 375 performance measurements produced by companies (19 companies with 15 water metrics, 10 companies with 9 sewerage metrics), we found 32 cases of non-compliance, where each company issue with a given metric is counted as a single case.

We assessed metric compliance, ignoring multiple company issues on a given metric (of which there were four cases) to be approximately 93% overall, 92% for the water metrics (262 compliant metrics out of 285) and 94% for the sewerage metrics (85 compliant metrics out of 90).

The final moderated assessments are summarised in the table below. Instances of the same company issue applying to multiple metrics have been counted separately as one for each metric; this applies to issues of non-compliance, inconsistency, opportunities for improvement and good practice.

Table A - Number of issues covered by audit and noted in this report (moderated)

RAG Assessment	Water metrics	Sewerage metrics	General, but Company-specific findings	More General industry-wide findings
RED Areas of non-compliance	27	5	0	0
AMBER Areas of real or potential inconsistency	52	10	0	17
JUDGED COMPLIANT	1880	544	n/a	n/a
BLUE Opportunities for improvement	24	2	3	18
GREEN Good/exemplary practice	31	9	13	8

Over 95% of the issues covered during this horizontal audit were found to be satisfactory and not requiring further comment. Except for areas of exemplary practice these are not covered in this report.

Companies are well versed in performance reporting with decades of experience of detailed data submission and annual performance reports and well versed in the standards that are expected. Companies have established and documented procedures for such reports and the expectation would be that similar rigour and care would be applied to the Developer Service metric reports. We found this generally to be the case, unless noted otherwise in our report, and that across the industry:

- Methodologies are based on established regulatory reporting procedures that have been developed to comply specifically with the Water UK guidance
- The methodologies were found to be compliant and well implemented
- The source data (eg dates of relevant activities and correspondence) supporting the performance statistics was well evidenced
- Responsibilities were assigned with good evidence of checks and implementation of the overarching governance process.
- Procedures and reporting systems have been subject to regular internal review processes and gradual improvement, with management review and internal audit deployed on a regular basis.

The reporting of confidence grades by companies is not a requirement, however it is pleasing to note they are being used successfully by a number of companies as a tool to expose the quality of the reporting process and data as well as to target their efforts to ensure the reported data quality and improve the level of service performance.

In the small number of companies where the reporting procedures were found to be less well documented the intent to improve was evident and the variability in the quality assurance systems is to a large extent explained by company size and the volume of work that is reported. We considered it to be only a matter of time before a more uniform quality of procedural documentation is in place and this is likely to accelerate as the metrics mature.

Notwithstanding these minor shortcomings in documentation our audit found evidence of a sound base of reporting procedures in place across the industry, with governance and oversight processes commensurate with the volumes of work being reported.

Table B below shows how our moderated assessments, as presented in section 5, are distributed across the companies and the number of compliant metrics reported by company by service.

Table B – Numbers of compliant metrics and types of issue identified by company (moderated)

Company	Water Metrics					Sewerage Metrics				
	Compliant	Red	Amber	Blue	Green	Compliant	Red	Amber	Blue	Green
Anglian Water	15	0	1	1	0	9	0	1	1	0
Northumbrian Water	15	0	4	0	0	9	0	0	0	3
Severn Trent Water	15	0	1	2	5	9	0	0	0	1
South West Water	15	0	4	0	6	9	0	0	0	2
Southern Water	14	1	2	0	0	8	1	0	0	0
Thames Water	10	7	1	0	0	7	2	0	0	0
United Utilities	13	2	3	0	2	9	0	3	1	2
Welsh Water	15	0	4	1	7	9	0	2	0	0
Wessex Water	14	1	5	1	0	9	0	1	0	1
Yorkshire Water	15	0	3	2	0	7	2	3	0	0
Affinity Water	14	1	3	4	0					
Bournemouth Water	15	0	0	5	0					
Bristol Water	15	0	6	2	2					
Dee Valley Water	15	0	5	5	4					
Portsmouth Water	15	0	1	1	0					
South East Water	14	1	0	0	0					
South Staffs & Cambridge – Cambridge	12	3	1	0	3					
South Staffs & Cambridge – West Midlands	8	9	8	0	2					
Sutton & East Surrey Water	13	2	0	0	0					
Totals	262	27	52	24	31	85	5	10	2	9

The table above shows differences between the levels of compliance, interpretation and practice between the companies. The issues found are diverse and not easily summarised for this section.

To identify whether there are any specific areas of non-compliance or inconsistency in the metrics, we have compiled the following tables, C.1 and C.2.

However, whilst a few of the metrics have a number of Reds and Ambers (non-compliance and inconsistencies) there are no metrics or metric groups which present as particular problem areas.

Fewer issues have been found in the Sewerage metrics, even accounting for the fewer companies and fewer metrics involved.

The tables do indicate that substantially more areas of potential inconsistency have been identified than have instances of non-compliance. It is clear that the guidance allows for there to be significant variations in companies' approaches to delivering these services and it would benefit the industry if the definitions could be suitably tightened to improve the consistency of delivery and of performance reporting. In this regard there are some noteworthy observations:

- a. There has been variation in how companies interpret the start date for activities and departure from the guidelines, resulting in some companies reporting against higher levels of service than envisaged in the guidelines. This may or may not result in those companies actually delivering better service but it does introduce inconsistency into any assessment of cross company performance.
- b. There is a single metric for each service for predevelopment enquiry performance, there is no subcategorization for example by the size or complexity of the developments being considered. The metric therefore reports performance against the large number of enquiries of a simple nature alongside the fewer complex ones; this could lead to performance on the larger development enquiries not being fully exposed. It also relies on the metric definition being robust enough to be applicable for all levels of complexity of enquiry and it is notable that these two metrics have comparatively high numbers of non-compliance and inconsistency observations against them.
- c. There is variety in how extensions to the time periods for activities are reported and the level of documentation filed that supports whether or not the extension was with full agreement of the applicant. In some cases, companies cannot provide the service within the time specified by the metric guidance so rather, they agree timetables acceptable to the applicant against which they then measure and report performance. These metrics are therefore not being reported on a like for like basis, neither within a company nor across companies; and may be reporting their achievement against varying targets for the level of service. Whilst target times may differ as a result, there are fully justifiable reasons for such extensions as companies may be constrained by third parties and other legislation. The circumstances under which extensions may be employed are defined within the reporting guidance.

Tables C.1 – Numbers and types of issue shown by Water metric (moderated)

Water Metric	Ref	Red	Amber	Blue	Green
Pre-development enquiry – reports issued within target	W1.1	3	3	7	2
s45 applications – written acknowledgements within target	W2.1	1	4	0	0
s45 applications - refused/returned/questioned	W2.1a				
s45 quotations - within target	W3.1	1	6	2	1
s45 service pipe connections - within target	W4.1	1	8	2	5
s45 service pipe connections - within extended target	W4.1a				
Mains design <500 plots - written acknowledgement within target	W5.1	0	5	0	0
Mains design <500 plots - forms refused/returned/questioned	W5.1a				
Mains design <500 plots - quotations within target	W6.1	1	4	0	1
Mains design >500 plots - quotations within target	W7.1	3	4	0	2
Mains designs >500 plots - as % of total mainlaying jobs	W7.1a				
Mains designs >500 plots - % where extension agreed	W7.1b				
Mains construction within target	W8.1	5	5	2	2
Mains construction within extended target - as % of all mainlaying jobs	W8.1a				
Self-lay application – written acknowledgements within target	W9.1	2	5	1	2
Self-lay applications - refused / returned/ questioned	W9.1a				
Self-lay new connection - quotations within target	W10.1	1	1	0	3
Self-lay <500 plots - written terms (quotations) within target	W11.1	3	2	2	4
Self-lay design >500 plots - written terms (quotations) within target	W12.1	5	2	0	7
Self-lay design >500 plots - % of written terms (quotations) extended by agreement	W12.1a				
Self-lay signed agreement - written acknowledgement of receipt	W13.1	0	0	2	0
Water provision for testing self-lay mains - within target	W14.1	1	2	4	1
Water provision for testing self-lay mains - within extended target	W14.1a				
Provision of permanent supply for self-lay mains – within target	W15.1	0	1	2	1

Tables C.2 – Numbers and types of issue shown by Sewerage metric (moderated)

Sewerage Metric	Ref	Red	Amber	Blue	Green
Pre-development enquiry – reports issued within target	S1.1	3	2	2	2
Sewer requisition - written acknowledgement of applications within target	S2.1	0	1	0	1
Sewer requisition - applications refused/returned/questioned	S2.1a				
Sewer requisition design – offers issued within target	S3.1	0	0	0	4
Sewer requisition – constructed and commissioned within agreed extension	S4.1	1	0	0	1
Sewer requisition – constructed and commissioned - extensions agreed	S4.1a				
Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions– acknowledgements within target	S5.1	0	2	0	1
Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions – applications refused/returned/questioned	S5.1a				
Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions – approval or rejection letters within target	S6.1	0	1	0	0
Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions – extensions agreed	S6.1a				
Adoption legal agreement – draft agreements issued within target	S7.1	0	0	0	0
s106 sewer connection - approval letters issued within target	S8.1	0	3	0	0
s106 sewer connection - rejection letters issued within target	S9.1	1	1	0	0

The volumes of many of the reported activities are substantial and checks through spreadsheets, databases and corporate systems to supporting source data are time-consuming. We have therefore checked the companies' methodologies to confirm or otherwise that they are compliant, and checked implementation by sampling key procedures, some of which drill back to source data. We consider that this is sufficient to identify areas of non-compliance, material inconsistency and any systemic issues causing mis-reporting, but it is insufficient to provide an estimate of the accuracy in the reported numbers. We have noted, in our findings, the areas of non-compliance and inconsistency. In only a few instances did we find errors and nowhere did we identify concerns that there was systemic or deliberate mis-statement.

Introduction and overview

Since April 2015 water and sewerage companies in England and Wales have been reporting on their levels of service for developer customers to provide transparency about water company performance over activities to support the provision of new infrastructure and assist in accelerating the building of new homes in the UK. Water UK and its member companies worked with developers and their representative organisations to produce guidelines and guidance on good practice to ensure that the water and sewerage infrastructure needed for modern homes is efficiently provided.

Water UK produced a set of standards that developers and others can expect from water companies in relation to the provision of infrastructure for housing development. Associated performance metrics were also developed to cover the majority of services provided by water companies' Developer Services departments to developer and self-lay customers. Water UK independently compiles quarterly data and has been reporting on the levels of services achieved since July 2015.

In November 2016 Water UK appointed CH2M, to perform an independent industry-wide "horizontal" audit of companies' data and reporting arrangements to provide a baseline assessment evaluating water companies' processes and procedures for level of compliance and accuracy in reporting against the performance measures.

The evaluation and assessment was to include but not be limited to meetings with Water UK and company representatives, the review and audit of company interpretation of metric definitions including the treatment of extensions of time for certain metric activities, data collection processes and procedures with particular attention to those used where contractors provide services to a company.

The results of the audit were then to be summarised and concluded in a written report providing the findings against the targeted standards of service and information only metrics in the areas of:

- a. identified good practice and areas for improvement in data collection and reporting
- b. consistency / inconsistency of reporting on each standard of service and information metric
- c. specific company weaknesses which need addressing
- d. material errors in the data which require correction because of non-compliance with the Water UK reporting manual and/or metric definitions
- e. recommendations / observations:
 - i. in company specific areas
 - ii. industry wide
 - iii. reporting definitions
 - iv. on the use being made of extensions

This report has been prepared to meet these requirements and is a comprehensive summary of the findings of that horizontal audit and as such the report presents our objective views on the evidence we have seen.

Summary of approach and audit activity

1.1 Approach

Our approach was designed to meet Water UK's objectives and involved the following tasks:

1. A meeting with Water UK and water company representatives to help determine the final scope of the audit and the metrics that are to be audited.
2. Meetings with interested third party stakeholders such as Ofwat, developers' and Self Lay Organisations' (SLO) representative bodies to understand their concerns over the reporting system and any suggestions they might have in relation to the conduct of the audit.
3. A desktop review of company documentation of the processes/procedures in place at each water company to obtain a high-level view of how each company interprets the standards of service definitions and targets set out in the data manual.
4. Compilation of a set of audit questions to be asked of all companies in advance of on-site audits.
5. On-site audits to test methodologies, processes, systems and data.
6. Provision to the audited company of a summary audit report documenting our findings and recommendations for the company.
7. Subsequent follow up horizontal analysis of all company audit reports and results through an assimilation and moderation process to:
 - i. Moderate each individual auditor's views on their findings at a company with the findings across the industry
 - ii. Identify any common areas of non-compliance
 - iii. Identify any common areas which are problematic for reporting and or where we believe the guidance could be improved to avoid misinterpretation
 - iv. Confirm that interpretation of the guidance across the Companies is consistent or identify where there are differences
 - v. Provide a comparison of data sources and robustness including confidence grades if necessary as a comparative measure
 - vi. Comment on any variations between companies
 - vii. Identify examples of good and poor practice
 - viii. Highlight any areas of risk
 - ix. Make recommendations on a company basis for enhancements
8. Collation and presentation of the results of the two phases of audit, at the company level and the subsequent horizontal analysis level, in this report.

During the audit and subsequent analysis of findings in both the questionnaire form and the summary audit report we utilised a RAG approach to the categorisation of findings and observations where the following classification was applied:

RED	Areas of specific company deviation and/or noncompliance with metric definition
AMBER	Points of note and observations requiring further cross company comparison of practices as part of our horizontal analysis. These are potential variances between and inconsistencies within company practices and are not necessarily wrong or in contravention of the metric standard definition.
BLUE	Identified opportunities for improvement in company reporting methodology and/or opportunity for improvement in metric definition
GREEN	Methods based on correct and consistent interpretation of the metric definition.
PURPLE	Identified good and exemplary practice in the use and interpretation of the metric definition and in the approach used by the company.

These definitions and colours were used to report back to each company in their individual Audit Reports.

A blank template of our Detailed Audit Questionnaire is contained in Appendix 1. This covered over 100 questions on water metrics and around 60 questions on sewerage metrics at each relevant company, focussed on their reporting methodologies and assumptions.

During the audit, we also asked the companies to demonstrate the accuracy of their methodologies and assumptions by providing the evidence which supported their compliance and their performance.

Whilst our audits established instances of non-compliance with the requirements of the metrics among individual companies, and differences between companies' interpretations and approaches, overall we found all companies were able to demonstrate a generally good degree of compliance across each relevant metric. This is demonstrated in the table on the following page. Rather than produce a very substantial report which demonstrates this, we have opted to report by exception.

Thus the GREEN findings (used in the above definitions) have not been covered in this report. This has resulted in a change in the colour coding used for this report, which is as follows:

RED	Areas of specific company deviation and/or noncompliance with metric definition
AMBER	Points of note and observations requiring further cross company comparison of practices as part of our horizontal analysis. These are potential variances between and inconsistencies within company practices and are not necessarily wrong or in contravention of the metric standard definition.
BLUE	Identified opportunities for improvement in company reporting methodology and/or opportunity for improvement in metric definition
JUDGED COMPLIANT	Methods based on correct and consistent interpretation of the metric definition.
GREEN	Identified good and exemplary practice in the use and interpretation of the metric definition and in the approach used by the company.

Section 5 covers the Metrics in groups, Section 4 covers more general issues found, which either relate to specific companies, or are of a more industry-wide nature. The findings of the horizontal analysis are presented against the latter RAG categories and numerically, are tabulated below:

Number of issues covered by audit/ noted in this report.

RAG Assessment	Water metrics	Sewerage metrics	General, but Company-specific findings	More General industry-wide findings
RED Areas of non- compliance	27	5	0	0
AMBER Areas of real or potential inconsistency	52	10	0	17
JUDGED COMPLIANT	1880	544	n/a	n/a
BLUE Opportunities for improvement	24	2	3	18
GREEN Good/exemplary practice	31	9	13	8

Some 95% of the issues covered during this horizontal audit were found to be satisfactory (judged compliant) and therefore deemed to not warrant comment. See Appendix 1 for the template used in our audits at each company.

1.2 Summary of activity

- 06 December 2016 - A meeting with Water UK and representatives from all water companies to determine the final scope of the audit and the metrics that are to be audited.
- 14 December 2016 teleconference meeting with the following interested third party stakeholders:
 - Sally Irgin – Ofwat
 - Ruth Shin – DEFRA
 - Stephen Wielebski – Homebuilders Federation
 - Paul Voden/Richard Thomson – Kier
 - Martyn Speight – Fairwater Connections
 - Lee Crabtree/Frank McDonald – Energetics
 - Gary McConnell – Aquamain
 - Matthew Richardson/Shane Rendell – Triconnex
 - Xavia Morbey/Caroline Winter – Department for Communities and Local Government
 - Natalie Elphicke – The Housing & Finance Institute
- 17 January 2017 face to face meeting with the following interested third party stakeholders:
 - Martyn Speight – Fairwater Connections
 - Matt Richardson – Triconnex
 - Gary McConnell – Aquamain
 - Ray Farrow – HBF (Homebuilders Federation)

Plus:

- Mike Sloan – South Staffs Water
- Paul Griffiths – Severn Trent Water

The purpose of this meeting was to allow these stakeholders the opportunity to provide their experience and perspective on companies' working arrangements and performance in relation to the stakeholders' roles as Self Lay Organisations and a Trade Association. The meeting enabled the stakeholders to highlight aspects of the processes/metrics that were important to them, and where they have observed apparent inconsistencies between companies through their own interactions. We adjusted our approach by supplementing our audit questionnaires to accommodate these themes.

- mid-January 2017 to late-February 2017: questionnaires issued and completed by most companies in advance of audits, response reviews and specific question tailoring, audits and validation checks at company offices, submission of follow up clarification questions and summary audit reports provided to companies for verification of facts.
- February to March 2017: a first moderation process applied to all findings to promote consistency of findings across all metrics and all companies which were then incorporated into a consolidated draft report.
- 29 March 2017: Draft report provided to Water UK and circulated to all companies for comment.
- 19 April 2017; Collated industry comments on draft report provided by Water UK.
- 23 May 2017: Meeting with Water UK and company representatives to discuss approach and responses to industry comments.

- 7 June 2017: Meeting of CH2M, Water UK and a number of water company representatives to clarify CH2M's moderation and detailed understanding of a few LoS definitions to ensure the audit findings were consistent.
- June – July 2017 production of draft final report.

Analysis of company activity volumes by metric

2.1 Introduction

As part of the reporting requirements, each company is required to submit the volumes of activity that have been used to derive their performance against each metric. This was seen as potentially useful information which may indicate different levels of developer activity in the company area or perhaps to indicate differences in interpretation of the guidance, differences in assumptions or reporting practices, or in the company's approach to dealing with developer requirements.

For this analysis, we have used the data on volumes by metric from the Water UK Developer Services website for the whole of 2016 to increase the data set particularly for those metrics with little activity in a month and to avoid any seasonal issues. The data from the Water UK site has been tabulated in Tables 3.1 for Water and 3.4 for Sewerage.

Whilst it would have been most appropriate to have weighted the volumes of activity by an indicator more closely aligned to development activity, such information is not readily available by company area. We have therefore chosen to weight the dataset by dividing the volumes for each company by the number of households each serves for water or for sewerage services and whilst these may not be fully up to date, this should not cause a material inaccuracy, as the changes over time are small when compared to the overall numbers of households served. We recognize that there may be some differences in definitions used for these figures, but have done some cross-checks and are satisfied that these denominators are suitable for the purpose of indicating whether the volumes being reported will identify significant outliers. The weighted volumes are presented in Tables 3.2 and 3.5.

In order to identify the outliers, the Average of the weighted volumes for each metric has been calculated. Each company's weighted figure has then been divided by this Average to indicate how far they are from the average. Those with significantly high or low (disproportionate) results have been highlighted for investigation/ discussion. Multipliers of 1.7 and 0.3 times the Average have been used as a guide. This analysis is presented in Tables 3.3 and 3.6.

During our company audits, it was noted that in some cases, companies had amended their methodologies within the 2016 period pursuant to further guidance or in recognition of a misinterpretation of the definitions. This may have had an impact on their subsequent reported performance.

Our commentaries on the companies' approaches and performance in section 5 consider our findings from the audits of the company audits of methodologies, assumptions and reporting practice and, where reasonably evident, looks to incorporate the reasons for any disproportionate volumes being reported.

2.2 Findings - Water Metrics

2.2.1 General

See Figure 3.1 – Water Metrics – Total Actual Volumes (2016)

For the majority of companies, their reported performance is identical for each of the following pairs of metrics:

- W2.1/W2.1a all companies report same volumes for both except Affinity
- W4.1/W4.1a all companies report same volumes for both except Affinity, Severn Trent
- W5.1/W5.1a all companies report same volumes for both except Affinity

- W8.1/W8.1a all companies report same volumes for both except Affinity
- W9.1/W9.1a all companies report same volumes for both except Affinity, Portsmouth
- W12.1/W12.1a all companies report same volumes for both
- W14.1/W14.1a all companies report same volumes for both except Bristol Water

These pairs of lines utilise the same volume data as denominators to report their performance against the levels of service. We would expect each pair to be the same for each company and this has been confirmed by Water UK.

In the case of the metrics W4.1/W4.1a the difference in performance observed for Severn Trent is attributed to a correction being made to reported volume data for W4.1 without a commensurate correction to the data in W4.1a.

AFW	The volumes in these pairs of lines are materially different in several metrics for Affinity Water, suggesting that there is a general inconsistency from common practice in their methodology or assumptions. We have not identified the cause specifically but consider that it may be due to limitations on their current spreadsheet-based event recording system which has a limited number of fields and may affect the count of the numbers of applications which require resubmission.
------------	--

Figure 3.1

Metric	Ref	Type	Water Metrics: Total Actual Volumes (2016)																		
			Affinity	Anglian	Bournemouth	Bristol Water	Dee Valley	Dwr Cymru	Northumbrian	Portsmouth	Severn Trent	South East	South Staffs	South West	Southern	Sutton & East Surrey	Thames	United Utilities	Wessex	Yorkshire	
Note - Each shaded row should be similar to the row above it as the same (or similar) denominator values are used to derive different performance metrics. These are investigated further where the numbers are not similar.	Nr Households (m)		1.48	2.00	0.20	0.50	0.12	1.30	1.90	0.30	3.30	0.86	0.67	0.80	1.00	0.27	3.80	3.00	0.60	2.10	
Pre-development enquiry – reports issued within target	W1.1	PERF	132	379	34	80	35	344	203	10	577	171	120	244	49	20	539	381	142	130	
s45 applications – written acknowledgements within target	W2.1	PERF	2,187	4,478	414	1,272	197	2,545	2,627	571	4,540	2,579	1,154	2,768	1,842	285	8,483	4,477	1,326	2,737	
s45 applications - refused/returned/questioned	W2.1a	INFO	2,000	4,478	414	1,272	197	2,545	2,627	571	4,540	2,579	1,154	2,768	1,842	285	8,483	4,477	1,326	2,737	
s45 quotations - within target	W3.1	PERF	23,701	16,837	2,313	5,673	519	11,130	31,151	1,991	23,345	21,454	13,142	9,718	13,501	6,315	80,319	9,998	5,878	19,224	
s45 service pipe connections - within target	W4.1	PERF	11,263	12,056	1,455	2,864	378	6,841	12,277	1,709	12,644	6,576	3,249	7,954	6,227	2,117	35,014	4,588	4,573	9,399	
s45 service pipe connections - within extended target	W4.1a	INFO	10,200	12,056	1,455	2,864	378	6,841	12,277	1,709	12,649	6,576	3,249	7,954	6,227	2,117	35,014	4,588	4,573	9,399	
Mains design <500 plots - written acknowledgement within target	W5.1	PERF	334	288	32	115	18	178	467	157	573	599	91	159	105	24	384	443	193	199	
Mains design <500 plots - forms refused/returned/questioned	W5.1a	INFO	297	288	32	115	18	178	467	157	573	599	91	159	105	24	384	443	193	199	
Mains design <500 plots - quotations within target	W6.1	PERF	352	244	29	97	20	146	328	61	658	464	107	145	104	32	718	230	140	384	
Mains design >500 plots - quotations within target	W7.1	PERF	14	39	0	5	0	10	2	7	16	2	1	0	1	6	5	2	6	21	
Mains designs >500 plots - as % of total mainlaying jobs	W7.1a	INFO	366	283	29	102	20	156	330	68	674	466	108	145	105	38	723	232	146	405	
Mains designs >500 plots - % where extension agreed	W7.1b	INFO	6	20	0	4	0	10	2	14	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	
Mains construction within target	W8.1	PERF	266	325	28	75	29	91	603	41	308	163	91	491	124	53	179	520	113	312	
Mains construction within extended target - as % of all mainlaying jobs	W8.1a	INFO	238	325	28	75	29	91	603	41	308	163	91	491	124	53	179	520	113	312	
Self-lay application – written acknowledgements within target	W9.1	PERF	54	130	0	27	8	35	40	1	34	8	43	11	1	0	147	34	20	92	
Self-lay applications - refused / returned/ questioned	W9.1a	INFO	42	130	0	27	8	35	40	2	34	8	43	11	1	0	147	34	20	92	
Self-lay new connection - quotations within target	W10.1	PERF	3,754	10,007	0	1,808	76	148	2,304	0	3,974	292	5,022	326	0	0	6,788	204	2,046	13	
Self-lay <500 plots - written terms (quotations) within target	W11.1	PERF	46	128	0	19	3	7	22	0	71	3	48	5	0	2	99	287	12	88	
Self-lay design >500 plots - written terms (quotations) within target	W12.1	PERF	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Self-lay design >500 plots - % of written terms (quotations) extended by agreement	W12.1a	INFO	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Self-lay signed agreement - written acknowledgement of receipt	W13.1	PERF	7	109	0	15	0	5	17	0	150	0	20	14	0	0	181	252	11	61	
Water provision for testing self-lay mains - within target	W14.1	PERF	4	62	0	10	2	1	5	0	74	0	28	9	0	0	41	292	0	70	
Water provision for testing self-lay mains - within extended target	W14.1a	INFO	4	62	0	9	2	1	5	0	74	0	28	9	0	0	41	292	0	70	
Provision of permanent supply for self-lay mains – within target	W15.1	PERF	1	108	0	2	0	1	3	0	303	0	34	0	0	0	36	84	0	77	

Figure 3.2

Metric	Ref	Type	Water metrics: Weighted Actual Volumes (= Actuals / m H'holds)																		AVE
			Affinity	Anglian	Bournemouth	Bristol Water	Dee Valley	Dwr Cymru	Northumbrian	Portsmouth	Severn Trent	South East	South Staffs	South West	Southern	Sutton & East Surrey	Thames	United Utilities	Wessex	Yorkshire	
Note - These figures have been derived from Table 3.1 data divided by the Nr Households (millions) served by the relevant Company		Nr Households (m)	1.48	2.00	0.20	0.50	0.12	1.30	1.90	0.30	3.30	0.86	0.67	0.80	1.00	0.27	3.80	3.00	0.60	2.10	
Pre-development enquiry – reports issued within target	W1.1	PERF	89	190	170	160	292	265	107	33	175	199	179	305	49	74	142	127	237	62	158.5
s45 applications – written acknowledgements within target	W2.1	PERF	1478	2239	2070	2544	1642	1958	1383	1903	1376	2999	1722	3460	1842	1056	2232	1492	2210	1303	1939.4
s45 applications - refused/returned/questioned	W2.1a	INFO	1351	2239	2070	2544	1642	1958	1383	1903	1376	2999	1722	3460	1842	1056	2232	1492	2210	1303	1932.3
s45 quotations - within target	W3.1	PERF	16014	8419	11565	11346	4325	8562	16395	6637	7074	24947	19615	12148	13501	23389	21137	3333	9797	9154	12630.9
s45 service pipe connections - within target	W1.1	PERF	7610	6028	7275	5728	3150	5262	6462	5697	3832	7647	4849	9943	6227	7841	9214	1529	7622	4476	6132.8
s45 service pipe connections - within extended target	W4.1a	INFO	6892	6028	7275	5728	3150	5262	6462	5697	3833	7647	4849	9943	6227	7841	9214	1529	7622	4476	6093.0
Mains design <500 plots - written acknowledgement within target	W5.1	PERF	226	144	160	230	150	137	246	523	174	697	136	199	105	89	101	148	322	95	215.5
Mains design <500 plots - forms refused/returned/questioned	W5.1a	INFO	201	144	160	230	150	137	246	523	174	697	136	199	105	89	101	148	322	95	214.1
Mains design <500 plots - quotations within target	W6.1	PERF	238	122	145	194	167	112	173	203	199	540	160	181	104	119	189	77	233	183	185.4
Mains design >500 plots - quotations within target	W7.1	PERF	9	20	0	10	0	8	1	23	5	2	1	0	1	22	1	1	10	10	6.9
Mains designs >500 plots - as % of total mainlaying jobs	W7.1a	INFO	247	142	145	204	167	120	174	227	204	542	161	181	105	141	190	77	243	193	192.4
Mains designs >500 plots - % where extension agreed	W7.1b	INFO	4	10	0	8	0	8	1	47	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	6.0
Mains construction within target	W8.1	PERF	180	163	140	150	242	70	317	137	93	190	136	614	124	196	47	173	188	149	183.8
Mains construction within extended target - as % of all mainlaying jobs	W8.1a	INFO	161	163	140	150	242	70	317	137	93	190	136	614	124	196	47	173	188	149	182.7
Self-lay application – written acknowledgements within target	W9.1	PERF	36	65	0	54	67	27	21	3	10	9	64	14	1	0	39	11	33	44	27.7
Self-lay applications - refused / returned / questioned	W9.1a	INFO	28	65	0	54	67	27	21	7	10	9	64	14	1	0	39	11	33	44	27.5
Self-lay new connection - quotations within target	W10.1	PERF	2536	5004	0	3616	633	114	1213	0	1204	340	7496	408	0	0	1786	68	3410	6	1546.3
Self-lay <500 plots - written terms (quotations) within target	W11.1	PERF	31	64	0	38	25	5	12	0	22	3	72	6	0	7	26	96	20	42	26.1
Self-lay design >500 plots - written terms (quotations) within target	W12.1	PERF	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	1.0
Self-lay design >500 plots - % of written terms (quotations) extended by agreement	W12.1a	INFO	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	1.0
Self-lay signed agreement - written acknowledgement of receipt	W13.1	PERF	5	55	0	30	0	4	9	0	45	0	30	18	0	0	48	84	18	29	20.8
Water provision for testing self-lay mains - within target	W14.1	PERF	3	31	0	20	17	1	3	0	22	0	42	11	0	0	11	97	0	33	16.1
Water provision for testing self-lay mains - within extended target	W14.1a	INFO	3	31	0	18	17	1	3	0	22	0	42	11	0	0	11	97	0	33	16.0
Provision of permanent supply for self-lay mains – within target	W15.1	PERF	1	54	0	4	0	1	2	0	92	0	51	0	0	0	9	28	0	37	15.4

Figure 3.3

Metric	Ref	Type	Water Metrics: Weighted Actual Volumes/AVE																		Thresholds	
			Affinity	Anglian	Bournemouth	Brasov Water	Dee Valley	Dwr Cymru	Northumbrian	Portsmouth	Severn Trent	South East	South Staffs	South West	Southern	Sutton & East Surrey	Thames	United Utilities	Wessex	Yorkshire	UPPER	LOWER
Note - These figures have been derived from Table 3.2 data divided by the Nr Households (millions) served by the relevant Company	Nr Households (m)		1.48	2.00	0.20	0.50	0.12	1.30	1.90	0.30	3.30	0.86	0.67	0.80	1.00	0.27	3.80	3.00	0.60	2.10	1.7	0.3
Pre-development enquiry – reports issued within target	W1.1	PERF	0.56	1.20	1.07	1.01	1.84	1.67	0.67	0.21	1.10	1.25	1.13	1.92	0.31	0.47	0.89	0.80	1.49	0.39		
s45 applications – written acknowledgements within target	W2.1	PERF	0.76	1.15	1.07	1.31	0.85	1.01	0.71	0.98	0.71	1.55	0.89	1.78	0.95	0.54	1.15	0.77	1.14	0.67		
s45 applications - refused/returned/questioned	W2.1a	INFO	0.70	1.16	1.07	1.32	0.85	1.01	0.72	0.98	0.71	1.55	0.89	1.79	0.95	0.55	1.16	0.77	1.14	0.67		
s45 quotations - within target	W3.1	PERF	1.27	0.67	0.92	0.90	0.34	0.68	1.30	0.53	0.56	1.98	1.55	0.96	1.07	1.85	1.67	0.26	0.78	0.72		
s45 service pipe connections - within target	W4.1	PERF	1.24	0.98	1.19	0.93	0.51	0.86	1.05	0.93	0.62	1.25	0.79	1.62	1.02	1.28	1.50	0.25	1.24	0.73		
s45 service pipe connections - within extended target	W4.1a	INFO	1.13	0.99	1.19	0.94	0.52	0.86	1.06	0.93	0.63	1.25	0.80	1.63	1.02	1.29	1.51	0.25	1.25	0.73		
Mains design <500 plots - written acknowledgement within target	W5.1	PERF	1.05	0.67	0.74	1.07	0.70	0.64	1.14	2.43	0.81	3.23	0.63	0.92	0.49	0.41	0.47	0.69	1.49	0.44		
Mains design <500 plots - forms refused/returned/questioned	W5.1a	INFO	0.94	0.67	0.75	1.07	0.70	0.64	1.15	2.44	0.81	3.25	0.63	0.93	0.49	0.42	0.47	0.69	1.50	0.44		
Mains design <500 plots - quotations within target	W6.1	PERF	1.28	0.66	0.78	1.05	0.90	0.61	0.93	1.10	1.08	2.91	0.86	0.98	0.56	0.64	1.02	0.41	1.26	0.99		
Mains design >500 plots - quotations within target	W7.1	PERF	1.36	2.81	0.00	1.44	0.00	1.11	0.15	3.36	0.70	0.34	0.22	0.00	0.14	3.20	0.19	0.10	1.44	1.44		
Mains designs >500 plots - as % of total mainlaying jobs	W7.1a	INFO	1.29	0.74	0.75	1.06	0.87	0.62	0.90	1.18	1.06	2.82	0.84	0.94	0.55	0.73	0.99	0.40	1.26	1.00		
Mains designs >500 plots - % where extension agreed	W7.1b	INFO	0.67	1.66	0.00	1.33	0.00	1.28	0.17	7.75	0.00	0.00	2.73	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.11	1.11	1.19		
Mains construction within target	W8.1	PERF	0.98	0.88	0.76	0.82	1.31	0.38	1.73	0.74	0.51	1.03	0.74	3.34	1.31	1.07	0.26	0.94	1.02	0.81		
Mains construction within extended target - as % of all mainlaying jobs	W8.1a	INFO	0.88	0.89	0.77	0.82	1.32	0.38	1.74	0.75	0.51	1.04	0.74	3.36	0.68	1.07	0.26	0.95	1.03	0.81		
Self-lay application – written acknowledgements within target	W9.1	PERF	1.32	2.34	0.00	1.95	2.40	0.97	0.76	0.12	0.37	0.34	2.31	0.50	0.04	0.00	1.39	0.41	1.20	1.58		
Self-lay applications - refused / returned / questioned	W9.1a	INFO	1.03	2.37	0.00	1.97	2.43	0.98	0.77	0.24	0.38	0.34	2.34	0.50	0.04	0.00	1.41	0.41	1.21	1.60		
Self-lay new connection - quotations within target	W10.1	PERF	1.64	3.24	0.00	2.34	0.41	0.07	0.78	0.00	0.78	0.22	4.85	0.26	0.00	0.00	1.16	0.04	2.21	0.00		
Self-lay <500 plots - written terms (quotations) within target	W11.1	PERF	1.19	2.46	0.00	1.46	0.96	0.21	0.44	0.00	0.83	0.13	2.75	0.24	0.00	0.28	1.00	3.67	0.77	1.61		
Self-lay design >500 plots - written terms (quotations) within target	W12.1	PERF	0.00	5.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.91	0.00	4.46	4.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.66	0.00		
Self-lay design >500 plots - % of written terms (quotations) extended by agreement	W12.1a	INFO	0.00	5.98	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.91	0.00	4.46	4.99	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.66	0.00		
Self-lay signed agreement - written acknowledgement of receipt	W13.1	PERF	0.23	2.62	0.00	1.44	0.00	0.19	0.43	0.00	2.19	0.00	1.44	0.84	0.00	0.00	2.29	4.04	0.88	1.40		
Water provision for testing self-lay mains - within target	W14.1	PERF	0.17	1.92	0.00	1.24	1.03	0.05	0.16	0.00	1.39	0.00	2.59	0.70	0.00	0.00	0.67	6.03	0.00	2.06		
Water provision for testing self-lay mains - within extended target	W14.1a	INFO	0.17	1.93	0.00	1.12	1.04	0.05	0.16	0.00	1.40	0.00	2.61	0.70	0.00	0.00	0.67	6.07	0.00	2.08		
Provision of permanent supply for self-lay mains – within target	W15.1	PERF	0.04	3.50	0.00	0.26	0.00	0.05	0.10	0.00	5.95	0.00	3.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.61	1.81	0.00	2.38		
Nr below Threshold (Green)			6	0	12	3	6	8	7	11	1	9	1	5	12	11	6	8	3	3		
Nr above Threshold (Red)			0	11	0	3	3	0	2	4	2	5	10	7	0	2	1	5	1	3		
Green-Red			6	-11	12	0	3	8	5	7	-1	4	-9	-2	12	9	5	3	2	0		
Nr above 1.00			11	15	5	16	7	5	7	6	7	12	13	9	3	6	10	5	18	10		
Nr below 1.00			13	9	19	8	17	19	17	18	17	12	11	15	21	18	14	19	6	14		

See Figure 3.3 – Water Metrics – Weighted Actual Volumes/AVE (2016)

Of the 18 companies reporting:

- There are 9 companies which consistently report generally low volumes of activity across >70% of the metrics, particularly across the self-lay metrics (W9 – W15).
- 1 company, Wessex Water, reports generally high volumes of activity across >70% of the metrics.

2.2.2 Pre-development enquiry (W1)

W1 - % of reports issued within target period

- Dee Valley Water and South West Water report disproportionately higher volumes of pre-development enquiries
- Portsmouth Water reports disproportionately low volumes

2.2.3 s45 quotations and connections (W2 to W4)

W2 - % of written acknowledgments of an application issued within target period

W3 - % of quotations completed within target period

W4 - % of service pipe connections completed within target period

There seems to be a reasonably proportionate volume of these activities across the industry with the exceptions of:

- South West Water, which reports high volumes against metric W2
- South East Water, Sutton and East Surrey and Thames Water report high volumes of quotations (W3)
- United Utilities reports low volumes against quotations and connections (W3 and W4)

2.2.4 Mains design <500 plots (excluding where off-site reinforcement / engineering or land difficulties) (W5 to W6)

W5 - % of written acknowledgments issued within target period

W6 - % of quotations issued within target period

- Portsmouth Water (for W5) and South East Water (W5 and W6) report disproportionately high volumes of activity.

2.2.5 Mains design >500 plots or where off-site reinforcement / engineering or land difficulties (W7)

W7 - % of quotations issued within target period

There is a high degree of polarization in the measures in this metric, perhaps suggesting different approaches are taken by the companies.

- Several companies report zero or very low activity (Bournemouth Water, Dee Valley Water, Northumbrian Water, South West Water, Southern Water, Thames Water and United Utilities)
- Portsmouth Water reports disproportionately low volumes

2.2.6 Mains construction (W8)

W8 - % of mainlaying schemes constructed and commissioned within the target period

- Northumbrian and South West Water report disproportionately high volumes for these activities, whilst Thames Water reports disproportionately low volumes.

2.2.7 Self-lay administrative activities (W9 to W13)

W9 - % of written acknowledgements issued within target period

W10 - % of quotations issued within target period

W11 - Self lay plots <500 plots (excluding offsite reinforcement / engineering difficulties / Schedule 13 Water industry Act 1991 exclusions) - % of written terms (quotations) issued within target period

W12 - Self lay plots >500 plots or where offsite reinforcement, engineering or land difficulties apply - % of self lay written terms (quotations) issued within target period

W13 – Self lay signed agreement - % of written acknowledgements of receipt issued within target period

The levels of activity on these metrics appear polarized, suggesting that companies adopt different approaches to self-lay applications. In particular:

- Anglian Water and South Staffs consistently report disproportionately high volumes
- Zeros are reported for all these metrics by Bournemouth Water and by Sutton and E Surrey.
- Welsh Water, Northumbrian Water, Portsmouth Water, South East Water, Southern Water consistently report low volumes.

2.2.8 Self-lay on-site activities (W14 to W15)

W14 – Provision of supply of water for pressure /bacteriological testing of self lay mains - % of supplies provided within target period

W15 – Provision of permanent supply of water for self lay mains - % of supplies made available within the target period

As noted for metrics W9 to W13 above, there is significant polarization:

- Anglian Water, South Staffs, United Utilities and Yorkshire Water are reporting disproportionately high volumes;
- Affinity Water, Bournemouth Water, Welsh Water, Northumbrian Water, Portsmouth Water, South East Water, Southern Water, Sutton and E Surrey, and Wessex Water are reporting disproportionately low volumes.

2.3 Findings - Sewerage metrics

2.3.1 General

See Figure 3.4 - Sewerage Metrics - Total Actual Volumes (2016)

For the majority of companies, their reported performance is identical for each of the following pairs of metrics:

SECTION 2 – ANALYSIS OF COMPANY ACTIVITY VOLUMES BY METRIC

- S2.1/S2.1a all companies report same volumes for both
- S4.1/S4.1a all companies report same volumes for both
- S5.1/S5.1a all companies report same volumes for both
- S6.1/S6.1a all companies report same volumes for both except Yorkshire

As noted for the water metrics, these pairs of lines utilise the same volume data as denominators to report performance against the levels of service. We would expect each pair to be the same for each company and this has been confirmed by Water UK. Where they are materially different we have sought to find explanations: see section 3.

Figure 3.4

Metric	Ref	Type	Sewerage Metrics: Total Actual Volumes (2016)									
			Anglian	Dŵr Cymru	Northumbrian	Severn Trent	South West	Southern	Thames	United Utilities	Wessex	Yorkshire
Note - Each shaded row should be similar to the row above it as the same (or similar) denominator values are used to derive different performance metrics. These are investigated further where the numbers are not similar.	Nr Households (m)		2.60	1.30	1.10	3.80	0.80	1.70	6.30	3.00	1.10	2.10
Pre-development enquiry – reports issued within target	S1.1	PERF	926	344	368	1,240	278	274	1,037	1,236	1,009	615
Sewer requisition - written acknowledgement of applications within target	S2.1	PERF	39	20	6	38	70	111	81	11	14	17
Sewer requisition - applications refused/returned/questioned	S2.1a	INFO	39	20	6	38	70	111	81	11	14	17
Sewer requisition design – offers issued within target	S3.1	PERF	26	5	2	30	35	71	41	5	9	13
Sewer requisition – constructed and commissioned within agreed extension	S4.1	PERF	4	3	0	0	18	0	5	1	0	1
Sewer requisition – constructed and commissioned - extensions agreed	S4.1a	INFO	4	3	0	0	18	0	5	1	0	1
Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions – acknowledgements within target	S5.1	PERF	516	909	177	555	143	282	562	361	373	1,304
Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions – applications refused/returned/questioned	S5.1a	INFO	516	909	177	555	143	282	562	361	373	1,304
Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions – approval or rejection letters within target	S6.1	PERF	484	727	168	430	115	457	364	425	294	2,162
Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions – extensions agreed	S6.1a	INFO	484	727	168	430	115	457	364	425	294	1,952
Adoption legal agreement – draft agreements issued within target	S7.1	PERF	251	607	67	347	78	91	176	281	113	295
s106 sewer connection - approval letters issued within target	S8.1	PERF	1,580	761	461	2,277	425	1,025	2,905	887	557	771
s106 sewer connection - rejection letters issued within target	S9.1	PERF	1,573	181	27	0	242	1,174	1,767	566	53	742

Figure 3.5

Metric	Ref	Type	Sewerage Metrics: Weighted Actual Volumes (= Actuals / m H'holds)											AVE
			Anglian	Dŵr Cymru	Northumbrian	Severn Trent	South West	Southern	Thames	United Utilities	Wessex	Yorkshire		
Note - These figures have been derived from Table 3.4 data divided by the Nr Households (millions) served by the relevant Company			Nr Households (m)	2.60	1.30	1.10	3.80	0.80	1.70	6.30	3.00	1.10	2.10	
Pre-development enquiry – reports issued within target	S1.1	PERF	356.2	264.6	334.5	326.3	347.5	161.2	164.6	412.0	917.3	292.9	357.7	
Sewer requisition - written acknowledgement of applications within target	S2.1	PERF	15.0	15.4	5.5	10.0	87.5	65.3	12.9	3.7	12.7	8.1	23.6	
Sewer requisition - applications refused/returned/questioned	S2.1a	INFO	15.0	15.4	5.5	10.0	87.5	65.3	12.9	3.7	12.7	8.1	23.6	
Sewer requisition design – offers issued within target	S3.1	PERF	10.0	3.8	1.8	7.9	43.8	41.8	6.5	1.7	8.2	6.2	13.2	
Sewer requisition – constructed and commissioned within agreed extension	S4.1	PERF	1.5	2.3	0.0	0.0	22.5	0.0	0.8	0.3	0.0	0.5	2.8	
Sewer requisition – constructed and commissioned - extensions agreed	S4.1a	INFO	1.5	2.3	0.0	0.0	22.5	0.0	0.8	0.3	0.0	0.5	2.8	
Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions– acknowledgements within target	S5.1	PERF	198.5	699.2	160.9	146.1	178.8	165.9	89.2	120.3	339.1	621.0	271.9	
Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions – applications refused/returned/questioned	S5.1a	INFO	198.5	699.2	160.9	146.1	178.8	165.9	89.2	120.3	339.1	621.0	271.9	
Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions – approval or rejection letters within target	S6.1	PERF	186.2	559.2	152.7	113.2	143.8	268.8	57.8	141.7	267.3	1029.5	292.0	
Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions – extensions agreed	S6.1a	INFO	186.2	559.2	152.7	113.2	143.8	268.8	57.8	141.7	267.3	929.5	282.0	
Adoption legal agreement – draft agreements issued within target	S7.1	PERF	96.5	466.9	60.9	91.3	97.5	53.5	27.9	93.7	102.7	140.5	123.2	
s106 sewer connection - approval letters issued within target	S8.1	PERF	607.7	585.4	419.1	599.2	531.3	602.9	461.1	295.7	506.4	367.1	497.6	
s106 sewer connection - rejection letters issued within target	S9.1	PERF	605.0	139.2	24.5	0.0	302.5	690.6	280.5	188.7	48.2	353.3	263.3	

Figure 3.6

Metric	Ref	Type	Sewerage Metrics: (Weighted Actual Volumes/AVE)										Thresholds		
			Anglian	Dŵr Cymru	Northumbrian	Severn Trent	South West	Southern	Thames	United Utilities	Wessex	Yorkshire	UPPER	LOWER	
Note - these figures have been derived by dividing the data in Table 3.5 by the AVE calculated for each metric (row)			Nr Households (m)	2.60	1.30	1.10	3.80	0.80	1.70	6.30	3.00	1.10	2.10	1.7	0.3
Pre-development enquiry – reports issued within target	S1.1	PERF	1.00	0.74	0.94	0.91	0.97	0.45	0.46	1.15	2.56	0.82			
Sewer requisition - written acknowledgement of applications within target	S2.1	PERF	0.64	0.65	0.23	0.42	3.71	2.77	0.54	0.16	0.54	0.34			
Sewer requisition - applications refused/returned/questioned	S2.1a	INFO	0.64	0.65	0.23	0.42	3.71	2.77	0.54	0.16	0.54	0.34			
Sewer requisition design – offers issued within target	S3.1	PERF	0.76	0.29	0.14	0.60	3.32	3.17	0.49	0.13	0.62	0.47			
Sewer requisition – constructed and commissioned within agreed extension	S4.1	PERF	0.55	0.83	0.00	0.00	8.05	0.00	0.28	0.12	0.00	0.17			
Sewer requisition – constructed and commissioned - extensions agreed	S4.1a	INFO	0.55	0.83	0.00	0.00	8.05	0.00	0.28	0.12	0.00	0.17			
Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions– acknowledgements within target	S5.1	PERF	0.73	2.57	0.59	0.54	0.66	0.61	0.73	0.44	1.25	2.28			
Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions – applications refused/returned/questioned	S5.1a	INFO	0.73	2.57	0.59	0.54	0.66	0.61	0.33	0.44	1.25	2.28			
Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions – approval or rejection letters within target	S6.1	PERF	0.64	1.92	0.52	0.39	0.49	0.92	0.20	0.49	0.92	3.53			
Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions – extensions agreed	S6.1a	INFO	0.66	1.98	0.54	0.40	0.51	0.95	0.20	0.50	0.95	3.30			
Adoption legal agreement – draft agreements issued within target	S7.1	PERF	0.78	3.79	0.49	0.74	0.79	0.43	0.23	0.76	0.83	1.14			
s106 sewer connection - approval letters issued within target	S8.1	PERF	1.22	1.18	0.84	1.20	1.07	1.21	0.93	0.59	1.02	0.74			
s106 sewer connection - rejection letters issued within target	S9.1	PERF	2.30	0.53	0.09	0.00	1.15	2.62	1.07	0.72	0.18	1.34			
Nr below Threshold (Green)			0	1	9	3	0	2	7	5	3	4			
Nr above Threshold (Red)			2	3	0	0	5	4	0	0	1	2			
Green-Red			-2	-2	9	3	-5	-2	7	5	2	2			
Nr above 1.00			11	7	13	12	6	8	12	12	9	7			
Nr below 1.00			2	6	0	1	7	5	1	1	4	6			

See Figure 3.6 – Sewerage Metrics - Weighted Actual Volumes/AVE

Of the 10 Water and Sewerage Companies (WaSCs):

- There are 5 (Anglian Water, Northumbrian Water, Severn Trent Water, Thames Water and United Utilities) which consistently report disproportionately low volumes of activity across >70% of these metrics.
- There are none which consistently report disproportionately low volumes.

This may suggest that there is a difference in approach to developer services in these areas, or a difference in interpretation or assumptions.

2.3.2 Pre-development enquiry (S1)

S1 - % of reports issued within target period

- Wessex Water reports the disproportionately high volumes of activity

This can be attributed in part to Wessex Water double counting Surface Water and Foul Waste enquiries up to September 2016 after which time it has used a revised and compliant approach.

2.3.3 Sewer requisition administrative activity (S2 to S3)

S2 - % of written acknowledgements of an application issued within the target period

S3 - % of requisition offer letters issued within agreed target period

- South West Water and Southern Water report disproportionately high levels of activity
- Northumbrian Water and United Utilities report disproportionately low levels

2.3.4 Sewer requisition, construction and commissioning (S4)

S4 - % of sewer requisitions constructed and commissioned within target period

- Only South West Water reports very high levels of activity (which may support the levels of administrative activity in S2 and S3 above).
- Seven companies report disproportionately low or zero volumes (Northumbrian Water, Severn Trent Water, Southern Water, Thames Water, United Utilities, Wessex Water and Yorkshire Water).

2.3.5 Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions (S5 to S6)

S5 - % of written acknowledgements issued within target period

S6 - % of approval or rejection letters issued within target period

- Welsh Water and Yorkshire report disproportionately high volumes of activity against all these metrics.
- Thames Water reports generally low volumes, more so against S6.

In the case of Welsh Water, this is partly explained by the fact that in their service area adoption of the sewers is mandatory (so higher volumes are being reported) but adoption is not mandatory in England, despite the recent transfers to WaSCs of responsibilities for private sewers, laterals and pumping stations which existed at 1 July 2011.

We have also found that at Welsh Water, to accommodate the mandatory adoption requirement foul and surface connections are counted separately as only one connection is possible per application whereas our audits indicate that other companies count combined applications. This would be consistent with Welsh Water's numbers being approximately double that of the others.

2.3.6 Adoption legal agreement (S7)

S7 - % of draft adoption agreements issued within target period

- Welsh Water reports disproportionately high volumes of legal agreements, Yorkshire Water to a lesser extent, but both of these appear consistent with the high activity levels in S5 to S6.
- Thames Water reports low volumes, but again this appears consistent with the volumes reported in metrics S5 to S6.

As observed above for the S5 metric volumes in the case of Welsh Water, this is partly explained by the fact that in their service area adoption of the sewers is mandatory.

2.3.7 s106 sewer connection approval (S8 to S9)

S8 - % of approval letters issued within target period

S9 - % of rejection letters issued within target period

- There are no significant outliers on metric S8.
- Anglian Water and Southern Water report disproportionately high levels of activity against metric S9.
- Northumbrian Water, Severn Trent Water and Wessex Water report low volumes against S9.

General observations

In addition to the findings on each of the metrics presented in section 3 the review process revealed the following points which are of a more general nature. We identified areas of good practice, potential for improvement or general weakness.

In section 4.1 we present those that are company specific, in 4.2 those that can be considered to relate to the industry as a whole.

3.1 General, company-specific observations

CO.	COMMENT
ANH	At Anglian Water, the reporting of these metrics to Water UK has been incorporated into their internal governance processes and is subject to internal/external audits based on the level of risk.
WSH	WSH's governance, overall management and records of the Developer Services process are considered to be extremely robust.
SVT	An internal audit (IA) was undertaken of the initial data following introduction of the Water UK metrics. Recommendations were implemented and an assurance framework was introduced. A second IA has taken place and there are plans for regular annual IAs and an external audit every 3 years. Along with the regular checks undertaken we consider this to be very good practice.
UU	UUs governance, overall management and records of the Developer Services process are extremely robust.
UU	UU host a 'Developer Day' each year, providing an opportunity for UU to engage directly with Developers/SLOs to obtain feedback and buy-in to the DS process
WSH	Quotations are peer-reviewed on technical and cost aspects by the Commercial Team and Lead Project Engineer.
AFW	Affinity Water monitors its contractor's performance and their percentage compliance with Water UK's metrics. Affinity Water also takes a forward look at what work has been received and what may be at risk of failing the targets.
SBW	The developer services levels of service reporting processes have undergone regular internal and external audit. This has been put into the internal audit programme. SBW also engaged their technical assurer to carry out an independent audit for regulatory assurance purposes.
PRT	The PRT methodology document has shorter timescales than the Water UK for acknowledgements (3 days), response to pre-development / capacity enquiry sent to developer (15 working days), etc.
SEW	South East Water provide every option available to a Developer within their quotes. In this way, the Developer receives completely transparent information resulting from only one application.
SRN	Southern Water have developed a sophisticated system for the majority of reporting lines (other lines are supported by spreadsheet). This system provides a significant amount of automated tracking.
UU	UUs internal targets are significantly tighter than Water UK, reducing risk of failure of Water UK metrics.
YKY	We found that 10% of all applications are audited on a weekly basis by Team Leader. Daily checks are also completed by work-flow schedulers to ensure applications are actioned. The Performance Team undertakes additional checks on a monthly basis. Very thorough internal assurance process necessitated by manual based reporting system.

DVW	Access Dbase used to capture connections applications (W2). Should consider using this to capture other DS applications. Evidence has only been captured electronically for last 3 months for connections, but this has resulted in a significant improvement to the audit trail.
SES	We consider that written methodology documents would be useful for knowledge management processes.
SSC (CAM)	Whilst various regular checks take place within the small Developer Services team and an internal audit on commencement of metric reporting was conducted, we noted that there was currently no documentation of the methodology for compiling and reporting data to Water UK.

3.2 General, industry-wide observations

The following issues have been identified as being applicable industry wide. They are presented as general comments, areas of inconsistency in the reporting of the metrics, matters relating to management and governance of the metric reporting process and general discussion points on specific metrics.

3.2.1 General Comments

1.	Whilst we have developed our audit questionnaire to try and identify inconsistencies in companies' approaches to reporting, to seek reasons why performances may differ and to help identify areas of good practice and good management, there may be other factors which are impacting on the relative volumes of activity or their reported performance. Such factors would include the levels of new development in the region, the maturity of the developer services market, the company's approach to the funding of growth, the scale of charges levied and a plethora of softer, more qualitative, factors such as the quality of information presented on the company's web-site or guidance notes and application forms, the spare capacity they generally have in their networks, the levels of assistance that companies provide to applicants (e.g. the degree to which they assist rather than reject applications), or the tolerance they have for delays to their on-site teams. It has not been possible to explore these qualitative factors in any detail nor with any implied accuracy, but where we have observed and considered that it may have an impact, particularly a positive one, we have endeavoured to note it.
2a	We also briefly looked at the information available, its accessibility and clarity on the company web-sites. This was not a formal review but in general we found it reasonably easy to navigate to the developer services information and for the most part, the more specific information required was easy to find and well laid out.
2b.	For developer organisations, there is obviously a lack of consistency in terminology, presentational format and information requirements across the regions: greater standardisation may help the process.
2c.	For individual applicants, who are likely to only apply in one company area, we considered that the Northumbrian Water web-site offered a slightly more accessible presentation of information.

3.2.2 General areas of potential inconsistency

1.	Our audits indicate that a small number of companies still incorrectly calculate the Metric target date – i.e. they count the day after receipt of a contact as Day zero. These should be corrected to Day one.
2.	We have identified a variety of procedures used by companies to track the time of an activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Start the clock and keep it running despite not having the full details - non-compliant but better than required

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Start the clock and freeze it until the required information is provided - non-compliant but better than required • Start the clock only once all the necessary details and payments have been provided – compliant <p>Whilst we acknowledge that the time the applicant takes to provide the necessary details and payment is not directly within the companies control (which is a random component that should be similar for all companies), we consider that the best overall levels of service may be promoted if the 'Average Cycle-time' is reported, timed from the day following the first receipt. This would embrace the quality/clarity of material the company provide to applicants as well as their speed of response in dealing with the application.</p>
3.	<p>We have noted that many companies are not correctly recording the date of receipt of the initial contact which should trigger the start dates, most notably when first contact arrives by post at a weekend, which is often date-stamped on the Monday (unless a Bank Holiday). Such provisions should already be in place, for example for recording receipt of written correspondence and written complaints, so wherever reasonably practicable, we recommend that improvements should be made for greater consistency. We also note that our audits indicated that companies appear to be performing reasonably well with regard to the cycle times for the activities (i.e. processing them quickly), so we do not believe that mis-recording the start time by a day or two, will significantly affect the reported performance figures, except where a weekend or bank holiday also impacts on a short duration target.</p>
4.	<p>A small number of companies, where an activity was completed within the target time, may not record the actual date of completion, but the date on which it was reviewed (so long as this was still within the target time). Whilst this would not currently impact on the levels of performance, we recommend that the actual completion date is recorded, especially if an 'average cycle time', rather than binary pass-fail metric were to be introduced.</p>
5.	<p>A potential inconsistency arises when a company agrees a shorter delivery with the developer than the metric target requires. (This was noted on metric W7 and seems unlikely to have a significant impact on overall performance, as many companies do not have any or many W7 designs > 500 plots).</p> <p>For example SWT, where the metric allows 42 days for these quotes. SWT treats the metric as failed if it has told the customer it will take 28 and then takes between 28 and 42. SWT's interpretation that 28 days becomes the "date agreed with the developer" in this case is reasonable, however we believe that most companies would either not offer this option or might not report it as a 'fail' until the metric as passed.</p>

3.2.3 Management and Governance

1.	<p>The guidance anticipates that companies will apply similar levels of rigour to these metrics as they do for other regulatory returns. Our audits indicate that the quality of information which the companies have prepared in support of their internal processes for processing developer applications and associated work and for ensuring that reporting is robust is quite variable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metric definitions are generally available, either reproduced from or linked to the Water UK site • Roles and responsibilities are, for about 60% of the companies, clear. For the others, this information appears lacking. • Suitable methodologies are available for about 60% of those seen. The remainder vary from poorly explained screenshots of the processes to presumed absence. • Process flow charts vary from around 60% which are very helpful, relatively simple and clear to the very complex and unhelpful or presumed absent. • The key assumptions used are included in only a few of the examples we have seen. • Metric and internal activity targets are clearly shown in only a few cases (c 30%) we have seen.
----	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirements for version control and protection, basic data checks, supervisory reviews and QA are well laid out in perhaps 30% of the documents seen and are otherwise presumed absent. <p>Although this variability in the assurance and governance processes has been observed at companies, in only a few instances did we find any errors and nowhere were we concerned that there was evidence of systemic or deliberate mis-statement.</p>
2.	The reporting of confidence grades by companies is not a requirement specified in the Water UK guidelines for reporting. They are widely used and accepted in other areas of water company performance reporting and it is disappointing that few have chosen to employ them on these levels of service metrics. They are a useful tool to expose the quality of the reporting process and data and thus drive improvement. Notwithstanding this minor shortcoming there is a sound base of reporting procedures in place across the industry, with governance and oversight processes commensurate with the volumes of work being reported.
3.	We have noted that many companies subject their developer services processes and application thereof to internal and to a lesser extent external audit, and one company which had invited an audit from a representative body. This indicates good practice and that those companies are aspiring to achieve quality standards that are consistent with other regulatory submissions.
4.	One company reported that it holds a 'Developer Day' which enables them to present their processes to the more active developers in their area and, we assume allows the developers to feedback their views on those processes, performance, service and information that is provided. This should lead to improvements in understanding each other's issues and so to resolving them, to better relationships and a more efficient and to an effective process.
5.	We commend for their good practice, those companies which securely hold and manage the detailed processes and methodologies for all these metrics, including a comprehensive list of assumptions and risks for each metric.
6.	We also consider it good practice where a company provides a high-level cost estimating tool on their web-site.
7.	Several companies generate a daily 'Jeopardy Report' (or similar) which shows the progress and age of tasks versus the due date. Some systems have an escalation process which indicate those approaching failure of the internal activity target (IAT) or the Metric target. Individual daily reports can also be generated for each company team member to assess performance against IAT for applications allocated to them.
8.	There are some specific areas of Good Practice which appear to be beneficial to the developers or process, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where companies have capacity in their networks, or take responsibility for reinforcements, the costs to the developer are reduced and the process is faster The provision of suitable information on the web-site which identifies all the details that the applicant may be required to provide to ensure a successful application or inspection. This may significantly reduce the number of iterations and time spent by both company and applicant and speed up the whole cycle time. Offering on their websites to assist with the legal aspects of new mains and sewers.
9.	We have noted that SAP has been used to very good effect at several companies to manage all or much of their Developer Services processes with routines which automatically transfer relevant information between applications for reporting purposes. This maintains highly reliable, robust records of every stage of the process, who the current stage is with, each interaction and document transfer. Our audit confirmed the highest level of confidence in the information.
10.	Several companies rely heavily on spreadsheets, in some instances, these are well managed, necessary cells are well protected and well checked/audited, but where not, there is an increased risk of transposition error, particularly of date information. This reduces confidence in the reported results.

11.	Whilst perhaps helping to improve the relationships and developer-care aspects of these activities, we have found that the use of personal email inboxes can lead to poorer performance at times when the relevant individuals are not available. A team inbox can be more easily monitored and actions managed.
------------	--

3.2.4 Discussion on the Metrics

1.	Whilst in general, companies were able to provide adequate evidence that a date for an extension had been proposed to the developer, there was rarely evidence of a response from the developer, which is necessary for confirmation of an agreement. We have deemed the companies' communication to be sufficient but this is not strictly compliant with the definitions. We recommend that the definition be amended to reflect this.
2.	<p>W1 - Modelling requirement. There is significant variability between companies in determining when modelling is required to be carried out. In some cases, it is applied to every application, in others there is a more selective view of when modelling is required, and where data from network assessments is thought adequate and modelling may not be required. In some cases the scope of capacity check applied to an enquiry is left to the choice of the developer. There is therefore variability in the risk adopted by companies at this stage of the enquiry and the metric does not capture the quality of the response provided.</p> <p>The metric expects that where modelling is required to identify a point of connection, it is carried out within the metric target period, the open interpretation possible of whether or not modelling is required leaves the metric open to potential inconsistency across the industry.</p>
3.	W1 - Up-front payment is not required in order to process the PDE application at a number of companies where this is provided as a free service. With these companies applicants benefit from a higher level of service through the zero cost and the reduced risk of delay in the overall timetable that could arise from payment in the payment process.
4.	W3 – The Quotation validity period is frequently given as 6 months (by WSH and YKY). It is not clear how widespread this time limit is and whether, post expiry, a new (and separately counted) application is required or whether the expired quote is simply revived with no addition to the count and the clock restarted.
5.	W4 requires greater clarity of definition to ensure alignment with the objective behind the use of this indicator metric. There is variation in the reported performance where some companies count the total number of connections made (e.g.: all separate internally metered premises in a block of flats) as opposed the singular supply pipe to the premises.
6.	A number of companies expressed degrees of uncertainty over the design acknowledgment's to be reported against metric W5 [see SSC(WM), SVT, WSX]. Several companies assuming that all mains design acknowledgements should be reported i.e. >500 plots and where there are off-site reinforcement/engineering or land difficulties in addition to <500 plots requested in the metric title. We consider that assumption is the correct interpretation and recommend that Water UK makes this explicit and amend the metric title accordingly.
7.	The metric W5 non-statutory target period of 5 days is considered by some companies to be short and that a longer period is often required to fully consider whether the information provided is sufficient for the purposes of progressing to design. Thus, the purpose of the metric, which simply acknowledges receipt, perhaps requires confirmation and may not be the most appropriate if it is thought to be a measure of the quality of the information submitted.
8.	W5, 6, 7 - Design metrics. Major changes to a completed design are frequently, but not exclusively, treated as a new application. Several companies noted that if major work is required to re-design the mains, then the plot numbers would be counted again. If it is a self-lay application (which is generally much simpler), they are counted only once. The difference in treatment with self-lay applications and the definition of what constitutes a major change are issues for variability in this metric. Non-statutory time-frames are specified and would thus permit the reporting of average response periods as an alternative, irrespective of changes.

9.	W8 - The phasing of developments was observed as leading to inconsistency of reporting. Many companies do not report separate phases of developments and this may lead to the breaching of the 90-day target on some of the phases.
10.	There may be some merit in an explanatory metric that illustrates the proportion of activities that are SLO delivered. In the volumes analysis, it is apparent that there is polarization among the companies in some metrics that may in part be explained by the SLO activity in the company areas.
11.	<p>S1 Modelling requirement. There is significant variability between companies in determining when modelling is required to be carried out. In some cases, it is applied to every application, in others there is a more selective view of when modelling is required, and where data from network assessments is thought adequate and modelling may not be required. In some cases the scope of capacity check applied to an enquiry is left to the choice of the developer. There is therefore variability in the risk adopted by companies at this stage of the enquiry and the metric does not capture the quality of the response provided.</p> <p>The metric expects that where modelling is required to identify a point of connection, it is carried out within the metric target period, the open interpretation possible of whether or not modelling is required leaves the metric open to potential inconsistency across the industry.</p>
12.	S6 and equally applicable to W4, 7, 8 & 12 - We noted a concern that developers may feel 'pressured' to accept extensions. We consider it is good practice for companies to keep a central list of allowable extension reasons (or codes) that is shared with the developer (or suitably available on the company web-site) and cross-referenced when an extension is requested by the company. If an undocumented reason is given and considered reasonable, it is added to the list. This could be standardized.
13.	With regard to the short duration targets, the time a company has available to respond is determined by the day on which the first contact is received because it is not based on working days. Although this would not alleviate the issue of Bank Holidays, we recommend that a 7-day (one week) target is set in place of those which are 5-day targets. This would imply for example that an s45 application received on a Monday would need to be acknowledged by the close of play on the following Monday.
14.	S3 - The requirements measured by metric S3 might be better split to account for information gathering, definition of scope, offer letter, and the phasing of the design activities etc. to make it more reflective of the interaction required between Company and Developer, rather than only to measure the Company for elements that the Developer is responsible for.
15.	S5 & S6 - Some potential for ambiguity is observed here regarding whether to count: only the responses to the initial application, or only those where an offer is issued, or all initial responses plus all re-submissions.
16.	S6 - Some companies include very minor diversions by individual homeowners (e.g. around a home extension). There appear to be inconsistencies in the interpretation of what is included in this metric. Improvement of the definition is recommended.
17.	S7 – At several companies, we found that their legal teams are not involved in the process for standard s104 agreements, which is in contrast to what we have found at others. However, the legal teams will be involved in the more complex agreements and in the finalisation stages.
18.	S8 - It is noted that some companies require an application per connection and others count the number of applications regardless of the number of connections. Others count the number of connections approved. The metric definition should be reviewed to ensure reporting is on the same basis (e.g. nr of plots).
19.	S8 - It was noted that adoption of the sewers is mandatory in Wales (so higher volumes are being reported) but not in England. This is inconsistent, both across the industry, and with the recent requirement for companies to adopt the legacy of private sewers.

20.	S8 - There is some ambiguity here about whether Companies count minor modifications (e.g. minor secondary connections) or mis-connections or re-connections. The metric definition should be improved.
21.	It may be better if all metrics had the same polarity, i.e. a high score always represents better performance. This would improve consistency and clarity of performance.
22.	Companies have generally developed suitable performance monitoring processes to record volumes and to track their progress. To improve levels of performance generally, we consider that the binary metrics (which report % of Pass/Fail against a target) should be replaced by 'average cycle time' metrics, as well as % which Passed (the Statutory or Water UK target deadline). This will expose the turnaround times that the companies achieve and encourage further improvements in performance towards the best.
23.	It is apparent that the metrics which measure the performance of the more administrative activities are (generally) considerably more voluminous than those relating to the on-site activities, and whilst the more administrative activities are important, their achievement appears to be quite well managed across the industry. The way in which the metrics are currently aggregated to provide a Company performance score is very heavily dominated by the volumes of administrative metrics. We recommend that the industry consider an alternative, perhaps one where the metrics are all given the same polarity (as noted above), then the relevant performance percentages added to provide an overall score per company.
24.	We consider that it may be better to measure some of these metrics by the positive achievements divided by the full volumes handled, e.g. % of applications dealt with within the target. All applications, including those refused/returned/questioned would be counted in the denominator and only those which are successfully responded to within the target period are counted in the numerator. This should encourage companies to find ways to improve the quality of applications and to deal with more of them within the target time. The percentage dealt with within the target time should also be reported as should the average cycle time.
25.	Water UK site – we note that there is no comprehensive downloadable version of the Metric definitions and performance measures on the site. We suggest that a consolidated, downloadable document, fed from the centrally-controlled version on Water UK's bespoke reporting system, would be a useful addition to the site.

Audit findings on the Metrics

4.1 Water Metrics

4.1.1 W1 - Pre-development enquiries

W1 - % of reports issued within target period

4.1.1.1 Areas of good practice

DVW	W1 - Impact of possible development is modelled for all pre-development enquiries, regardless of size of development, which is over and above that undertaken elsewhere. Modellers are consultees as part of the assessment process. As developments are generally relatively small, no issues reported for completing modelling within 1 wk.
SSC(Cam)	W1 - All pre-development enquires undergo an initial assessment of network adequacy irrespective of size. Good practice considering small staff numbers and no requirement for advance payment.

4.1.1.2 Areas for improvement in data collection and reporting

ANH	W1 - The system has weekends built in as non-working days. However, bank holidays require a manual adjustment. This should be automated to eliminate potential errors.
SBW	W1 - All Pre-development enquiries are logged in the Preliminary Enquiries/Planning Strategy folder that is situated in the developer services mailbox. The number of enquiries and responses are manually counted in the above folder location within the date range of the month being reported on. Recommend that these are logged/copies saved outside of Outlook for ease of counting and keeping track.
SBW	W1 - Correspondence with the modelling team is currently held in a personal mailbox. Recommend that this is moved to a shared location. E.g. within developer services mailbox.
DVW	W1 - Some applications are forwarded directly to individual email accounts, slight risk of applications being missed.
DVW	W1 - DVW are reliant on the Finance Department to advise when PDE/application payment is received. Some payments are received without a reference and as such are occasionally missed, delaying processing of application. Process could be improved by providing DS with a list of payments on a weekly basis to allocate to known applications
PRT	W1 - Modelling is undertaken outside of PRT. No target is set for completion and therefore this can be a cause of delay and failures to this metric.
WSX	W1 - We note that WSX is considering moving to formal service level agreements for its modelling team.

4.1.1.3 Areas causing inconsistency in reported performance

- Dee Valley Water and South West Water report disproportionately higher volumes of pre-development enquiries.

As noted below, in the case of Dee Valley Water, the high volumes reported appear to be explained at least in part by that fact that it recounts applications in cases where original applications have been incomplete and a second submission of the full information required has been made.

- Portsmouth Water reports disproportionately low volumes.

BRL	W1 - Where an application is received and rejected because it is incomplete with advice to the applicant on the information that needs to be provided, Bristol Water stops the clock and records the application as 'on hold'. When the required information is received, the clock is resumed with the remaining time left within the target. For example, a pre-development enquiry (21-day target) is rejected on day 2 with the missing information received 5 days later (day 7). The clock is resumed on day 7 but with 19 days remaining to complete the task within target.
NES	W1 - Combined applications received. Though compliant, we note that some companies must require there to be separate applications.
SSC(WM)	W1 - The 21-day clock starts on the day after receipt day, even when the application is missing information or payment. The clock is not reset when information/payment received and hence the company may be reporting a number of passes as failures.

4.1.1.4 Areas of non-compliance with the Water UK guidance

SES	W1 - We noted that small sites (individual property developments) may not be recorded on STIMSON. This is a function of the manual entry process. Email data is maintained but is not reported through the Water UK process.
SEW	W1 - We located an error in NARS which resulted in the measure being set to 28 days rather than 21 days. This error was fixed on the day of the audit. However, as most applications are cycled quickly, the impact is likely to be small. South East Water advised that it will re-state this data.
SRN	<p>W1 - Separate applications are required for water and sewerage services.</p> <p>SRN provide responses to each enquiry, however modelling/network availability assurance is provided only when requested by the developer as part of what is called the capacity check which is a voluntary service from the company. Two levels of capacity check can be requested, a basic level confirmation of capacity being available at the point of connection, a second more detailed level of check providing from modelling an indication of reinforcement required. The detailed capacity check does not provide a reliable solution as no buildability checks are carried out and this level of check has not been available during the last quarter of 2016 as the company was reorganising its modelling provision.</p> <p>Southern Water state that there is a connection size limit above which the capacity check is required, this is therefore not required from the affected network where the application is below the size threshold. Two levels of check for the same enquiry is counted as two enquiries for the calculation of the metric.</p>

4.1.2 W2 to W4 - s45 applications

W2 - % of written acknowledgments of an application issued within target period

W3 - % of quotations completed within target period

W4 - % of service pipe connections completed within target period

4.1.2.1 Areas of good practice

WSH	W3 - Quotations are peer-reviewed on technical and cost aspects by the Commercial Team and Lead Project Engineer
WSH	W4 - A daily Jeopardy Report is generated by SAP BPM which tracks progress and age of tasks versus the due date. The system has an escalation process with trigger thresholds based on the SLA timescales for the metrics
DVW	W4 - Extensions are agreed in writing and recorded on the report. Good practice that keeps the Developer informed.
SVT	W4 - The company keeps a central list of allowable extension reasons that is shared with the contractor and cross-referenced when an extension is requested. If an undocumented reason is given and considered reasonable, it is added to the list.
SWT	W4 - SWT have interfaces available into their suppliers' systems which allow them to check the reliability of the data.
UU	W4 - Extensions are agreed by telephone and followed up by email/letter, which is recorded on the contractors JMC system. All confirmed correspondence is held with the contractor. We have noted that other companies don't formally acknowledge/agree extensions.

4.1.2.2 Areas for improvement in data collection and reporting

SBW	W3 - Have a separate spreadsheet(s) to compile and finalise the Water UK reporting. Manual counts. Could this be automated to any degree to reduce risk of human error?
YKY	W3 - When an extension is agreed, we consider formal agreement/confirmation should be sought from the developer to ensure they are content with the proposed response. YKY advises that a phone call would be made to agree an extension prior to written confirmation.
SBW	W4 - Some manual intervention/cross-checking required with meter counts between SBW LOS spreadsheet and NSERVM report data.
SVT	W4 - There was no evidence of an agreed completion date for a small percentage of samples reviewed. We recommend that a written agreement is obtained and attached to the record where possible and that this step be included in the documentation of the process.

4.1.2.3 Areas causing inconsistency in reported performance

There seems to be a reasonably proportionate volume of these activities across the industry with the exceptions of:

- South West Water, which reports high volumes against metric W2
- South East Water, Sutton and East Surrey Water and Thames Water report high volumes of quotations (W3)
- United Utilities reports low volumes against quotations and connections (W3 and W4)

In the case of United Utilities and W3, the relatively low volume of quotations reported can be explained, at least in part, by their approach which only includes connections off existing mains, the connections to new mains are recorded in metric W5. United Utilities also has a more mature self-lay sector operating in their area which may reduce the volumes of connections requested.

AFW	W2 - Affinity Water records the date a full and complete application is received as the relevant day as opposed to the day after as in the guidelines, thus it is reporting a response on the 6 th day as a failure when it is not.
WSH	W2 - Where an application is incomplete, Welsh Water issues an acknowledgement letter to the developer advising the information that is required to complete the application. If this

	information is subsequently received, Welsh Water does not issue a letter acknowledging the now complete application whereas others may, introducing an inconsistency. The original application is updated with the date of the complete application and the clock resets and restarts.
UU	W2 - When a water application is incomplete, UU issues an acknowledgement and records the application as a rejection. When additional information is provided, UU records the application again as a complete record and the clock starts. Other companies do not count both; UU advised that it sought clarification on this and was advised that this approach was correct.
YKY	W2 - Where information is missing from the application and the developer is notified YKY restart the clock on receipt of additional information, but only count the application once. Whilst this approach is consistent with some other companies, we note a possible variance in approach across the industry.
BRL	W3 - Where an application is received and rejected because it is incomplete with advice to the applicant on the information that needs to be provided, Bristol Water stops the clock and records the application as 'on hold'. When the required information is received, the clock is resumed with the remaining time left within the target.
SSC(WM)	W3 - Currently the clock is "paused" for quotations when requesting additional information and resumed when received. Other companies reset back to day 0 on the date the final piece of information is received. The company may therefore be reporting a number of passes as failures.
SWT	W3 - This is one of several metrics which have no provision for agreeing extensions with the developer, leaving companies to make their own decision as to what is reasonable in cases where the customer requests a delay, or causes a delay through non-response. Where the site visit is delayed by the developer, SWT sets a deadline for the quote 14 days after the site visit, if the delay was excessive. This generally applies to applications of individual connections: it is not unreasonable, but is not universal – some companies set themselves more stringent targets, others more lax.
SWT	W3 Metric, which the Definition asks to be reported per plot. Where the connection is replaced with an unmetered connection (i.e. like for like), SWT reports the number of connections made and not plots. All metered connections (which is the norm for new plots) are counted on a per plot basis. This is considered to make only a minor difference so has been categorised as an inconsistency rather than as non-compliant.
WSX	W3 - This is one of several metrics which have no provision for agreeing extensions with the developer, leaving companies to make their own decision as to what is reasonable in cases where the customer requests a delay, or causes a delay through non-response. WSX's approach is relatively stringent – WSX does not give itself extra time unless the customer's preferred date for the site visit or their non-reply to queries take the enquiry beyond the target date.
WSX	W3 - For applications which seek quotes for both main-laying and connections, the application for connections is paused (effectively treated as incomplete) while the main is dealt with. Confirmation from the customer that the main has been laid is treated as the final element of the connection application, starting the clock. This is not an unreasonable interpretation of the guidelines, but it may be that other companies would progress a quote, based on an assumed location for the future main.
DVW	W4 - Whilst the % compliance should be based on number of meter connections DVW's policy is to install meters internally to the property. Therefore, compliance is based on connecting the main to the service pipe. This approach appears to be in contrast to other companies.
NES	W4 - The Company count nr of flats (= nr of meters). The Company default definition relates to how the council would rate it. There may be some inter-company differences here.
PRT	W4 – Noted that hydraulic modelling is undertaken by an external provider and can be a cause of extended timescales, however this was not observed as the reason to grant/agree an extension.

SRN	W4 - SRN arranges and agrees the soonest possible date for connection and works to and reports against that programme. Extensions or failures for third party reasons are shown as exceptions and not counted as failures. Extensions that are 'agreed' are based around reasons why completions cannot be completed, this can be due to issues on site, such as scaffold or skips, or due to highways issues /restrictions. No extensions due to lack of resource were noted.
SSC(WM)	W4 - Compliance is based on number of meter connections but flats over three stories with internal meters are only counted as one connection.
TMS	W4 - The company counts the total number of connections made (e.g.: all separate internally metered premises in a block of flats). This does not appear to be fully compliant with the requirements, but we note similar assumptions at other companies.
WSH	W4 - At the time of audit, WSH considered Day 0 = the day after the conditions were met which was non-compliant with the Water UK definition but this had no impact on the reported performance for the metric for the quarter. WSH advised it is moving to Day 0 = the day on which the conditions are met and therefore the Relevant day = Day 1, which will be compliant.
WSX	W4 - Part of the pre-requisite for the clock starting on applications for connections is for the customer to confirm the site is ready (including scaffolding removed). This seems a sensible precaution to reduce the number of wasted visits by work teams. However, some other companies may ask the developer to confirm that the scaffolding will have been removed by the date proposed for the connection, rather than that it has already been removed.

4.1.2.4 Areas of non-compliance with the Water UK guidance

SSC(WM)	W4 - The company does not currently obtain written agreement to extensions but there are plans to introduce this as a mandatory requirement.
TMS	W2 - The company generally counts the day after receipt as Day Zero rather than Day One, thus affording them with an extra day against this and several other metrics. However, we noted that the cycle times for dealing with the item were generally well within the target response times, so the impact on reported performance would be low, even for the short-cycle metrics.
UU	W3 - Only includes connections off existing mains. Connections to new mains are recorded in metric W5.

4.1.3 W5 and W6 - Mains design <500 plots

W5 - % of written acknowledgments issued within target period

W6 - % of quotations issued within target period

4.1.3.1 Areas of good practice

WSH	W6 - Quotations are peer-reviewed on technical and cost aspects by the Commercial Team and Lead Project Engineer
------------	--

4.1.3.2 Areas for improvement in data collection and reporting

There are no audit findings or items of note to report in this section.

4.1.3.3 Areas causing inconsistency in reported performance

- Portsmouth Water (for W5) and South East Water (W5 and W6) report disproportionately high volumes of activity.

WSH	W5 - Where an application is incomplete, WSH issues an acknowledgement letter to the developer advising the information that is required to complete the application. If this information is subsequently received, WSH does not issue a letter acknowledging the now complete application, whereas other companies may. The original application is updated with the date of the complete application and the clock resets and restarts.
UU	W5 - When a water application is incomplete, UU issues an acknowledgement and records the application as a rejection. When additional information is provided, UU records the application again as a complete record and the clock starts.
WSX	W5 - In common with many companies, WSX interprets this metric as covering acknowledgements of all mains design quote requests, although the guidelines say it would only cover quotes relevant to metric W6, not W7.
WSX	W5 - WSX acknowledge requests either by sending a request for further information or by sending an acknowledgement. Either of these counts for this metric, in line with general practice. WSX's practice is that, if it sends an acknowledgement of a complete application, but subsequently discover there is information missing, it treats itself as having failed if the request for further information is sent later than day 5. Some companies may treat this as a pass.
YKY	W5 - Where information is missing from the application and the developer is notified YKY restarts the clock on receipt of additional information, but only count the application once. Whilst this approach is consistent with some other companies, we note a possible variance in approach across the industry which we will need to investigate
BRL	W6 - Where an application is received and rejected because it is incomplete with advice to the applicant on the information that needs to be provided, Bristol Water stops the clock and records the application as 'on hold'. When the required information is received, the clock is resumed with the remaining time left within the target. Other companies may restart at zero.
DVW	W6 - Major changes to a completed design are treated as a new application. Approach appears to be in contrast to other companies.
NES	W6 - The Company noted that if major work is required to re-design / re-quote, then the plot numbers would be counted again. Possible scope for different interpretation/application between companies.
SSC(WM)	W6 - Currently the clock is "paused" for quotations when requesting additional information and resumed when received. Other companies reset back to day 0 on the date the final piece of information is received. The company may therefore be reporting a number of passes as failures.

4.1.3.4 Areas of non-compliance with the Water UK guidance

SSC(WM)	W6 - All quotations for mains design are captured under metric W6 including off-site reinforcement/engineering or land difficulties, which should be reported as W7. The company is aware and making the necessary changes.
----------------	---

4.1.4 W7 - Mains design >500 plots

W7 - % of quotations issued within target period

4.1.4.1 Areas of good practice

WSH	W7 - Quotations are peer-reviewed on technical and cost aspects by the Commercial Team and Lead Project Engineer
------------	--

SVT	The company keep a central list of allowable extension reasons that is shared with the contractor and cross-referenced when an extension is requested. If an undocumented reason is given and considered reasonable, it is added to the list.
------------	---

4.1.4.2 Areas for improvement in data collection and reporting

There are no audit findings or items of note to report in this section.

4.1.4.3 Areas causing inconsistency in reported performance

There is a high degree of polarization in the measures in this metric, perhaps suggesting different approaches are taken by the companies.

- Several companies report zero or very low activity (Bournemouth Water, Dee Valley Water, Northumbrian Water, South West Water, Southern Water, Thames Water and United Utilities)
- Portsmouth Water reports disproportionately low volumes

No immediate explanation was found during the review of the methodologies for the identified polarization. We surmise that this has been driven for some by the nature / character of the companies' area which for a number is relatively small and with fewer opportunities for large scale developments and also potentially by the level of success of new entrants in supplying the larger developments.

BRL	W7 - Where an application is received and rejected because it is incomplete with advice to the applicant on the information that needs to be provided, Bristol Water stops the clock and records the application as 'on hold'. When the required information is received, the clock is resumed with the remaining time left within the target.
DVW	W7 - Major changes to a completed design are treated as a new application. This approach appears to be in contrast to that of other companies.
SSC(WM)	W7 - Currently the clock is "paused" for quotations when requesting additional information and resumed when received. Other companies reset back to day 0 on the date the final piece of information is received. The company may therefore be reporting a number of passes as failures.
SWT	W7 - The metric allows 42 days for these quotes. SWT treats the metric as failed if it has told the customer it will take 28 and then take between 28 and 42. SWT's interpretation that 28 days becomes the "date agreed with the developer" in this case is reasonable, however some companies might interpret this as only applying to extensions and treat the metric as passed.

4.1.4.4 Areas of non-compliance with the Water UK guidance

AFW	W7 - Reasons for extensions were not always clear. We suggest the records should be made more robust.
SSC(WM)	W7 - All quotations for mains design are captured under metric W6 (which has a shorter target period) including off-site reinforcement/engineering or land difficulties, which should be reported as W7. The company is aware and making the necessary changes.
SSC(WM)	W7 - The company does not currently obtain written agreement to extensions but there are plans to introduce this as a mandatory requirement.

4.1.5 W8 - Mains construction

W8 - % of mainlaying schemes constructed and commissioned within the target period

4.1.5.1 Areas of good practice

SVT	W8 - The company keep a central list of allowable extension reasons that is shared with the contractor and cross-referenced when an extension is requested. If an undocumented reason is given and considered reasonable, it is added to the list.
SWT	W8 - SWT has interfaces available into its suppliers' systems which allows SWT to check the reliability of the data.

4.1.5.2 Areas for improvement in data collection and reporting

SBW	W8 - A manual count back from the date the main is commissioned to the relevant date of the main (payment or valid security received). This is made by accessing the date the receipt letter for payment of the mains is sent which is located in the relevant scheme file and on the network drive, manually working out the calendar days between the commissioned and relevant dates. This is a retrospective calculation, and it is suggested logging in a spreadsheet to give a target date to aim for and a simpler way of tracking/counting could ease and improve reporting.
WSH	W8 - Dates agreed between the contractor and developer for Mains construction - % of main laying schemes commissioned within target period is recorded on the "Whereabouts report" from weekly meetings with the contractor. WSH recognises that this is an area that can be formalised/improved.

4.1.5.3 Areas causing inconsistency in reported performance

- Northumbrian Water and South West Water report disproportionately high volumes for these activities, whilst Thames Water reports disproportionately low volumes. This may relate to the relative volumes of infill developments in each company's area.

AFW	W8 - There were instances recorded of as much as 437 days after security had been received for the whole scheme (received within 90 days). AFW's system is limited because it is unable to record construction and commissioning of mains connections where they have been phased and completed within 90 days for each phase. Since the clock continues to run in this example, the data shows the cumulative days which appears to exceed the 90-day target.
NES	W8 a) For site-specific but off-site mains, the Company may consider it an allowable extension if there are engineering difficulties. However, the Company generally consider that Mains reinforcements are their responsibility, not that of the Developer. This may be different for other companies. b) We suggest that this process should include a letter to the Developer confirming that the main is 'live'. The date of the letter would be the date of completion.
SRN	W8 - The relevant day is agreed with the developer to fit into their build programme. This means that it may not be related to the 90 days post-application and SRN therefore query whether the 90 days is relevant for the metric.
SVT	W8 - Minor observation - Clock-start of the 90-day SLA is treated as the day after the relevant day but Water UK's definition specifies the SLA should commence on the relevant day.
SWT	W8 - This metric relies on data passed to SWT by its framework contractor on a spreadsheet. Our spot checks identified one error in which information about a construction job had been entered against a different job. This was a minor issue and we note SWT has QA processes in place for the data.

4.1.5.4 Areas of non-compliance with the Water UK guidance

SSC(CAM)	W8 - Where payment is received in advance, the relevant day is set when the "job pack" is issued to the contractor rather than when payment/security is received from the developer. This is not in keeping with metric guidance.
-----------------	---

SSC(WM)	W8 - The relevant day is recorded as when a folder of information is passed from one department to another, which may be several days later than when customer agreement made and payment/valid security received. The company is aware and making the necessary changes.
SSC(WM)	W8 - The company does not currently obtain written agreement to extensions but there are plans to introduce this as a mandatory requirement.
TMS	W8 - The company also includes performance on mains diversions in this metric; these are approximately 50% of the totals reported.
TMS	W8 - Separate phases of a development scheme are not separately reported. This is non-complaint but not deemed material because the correct totals are eventually reported, however it is likely to be different across the industry.

4.1.6 W9 to W13 - Self-lay administrative activities

W9 - % of written acknowledgements issued within target period

W10 - % of quotations issued within target period

W11 - Self lay plots <500 plots (excluding offsite reinforcement / engineering difficulties / Schedule 13 Water industry Act 1991 exclusions) - % of written terms (quotations) issued within target period

W12 - Self lay plots >500 plots or where offsite reinforcement, engineering or land difficulties apply - % of self lay written terms (quotations) issued within target period

W13 – Self lay signed agreement - % of written acknowledgements of receipt issued within target period

4.1.6.1 Areas of good practice

BRL	W9 & 10 - Bristol Water provides a quotation for a Self-Lay connection (W10, 21 days) at the time of sending the written acknowledgement of a Self-Lay application (W9, 5 days).
SWT	W9, 10, 11, 12 - In August 2014 SWT brought in an outside party (Martyn Speight from Fair Water Connections) to conduct a second party audit of its SLO processes and confirm they were fair and transparent.
WSH	W10 11 12 - Quotations are peer-reviewed on technical and cost aspects by the Commercial Team and Lead Project Engineer.
DVW	W12 - Extensions are agreed in writing and recorded on the report. Good practice that keeps the Developer informed.
SSC(CAM)	W11 & 12 - Occurrences of off-site reinforcement, engineering or land difficulties and schedule 13 exclusions have been reported against the smaller timescale i.e. metric W11 rather than W12. Numbers are very small however and the company has advised that it intends to change the initial categorisation in the spreadsheet to ensure the appropriate metric is used but until this is done it is potentially reporting against a higher level of service.
SSC(WM)	W11 & 12 - All self-lay quotations are captured under metric W11 including off-site reinforcement/engineering or land difficulties, which should be reported as W12. The company is aware and making the necessary changes but until this is done it is potentially reporting against a higher level of service.
SVT	W12 - The company keeps a central list of allowable extension reasons that is shared with the contractor and cross-referenced when an extension is requested. If an undocumented reason is given and considered reasonable, it is added to the list.

UU	W12 - Off-site reinforcement, engineering or land difficulties are not separately reported by UU. Thus, where such arise under W11 UU does not benefit from the available additional 14 days to the target of W12 and reported performance is therefore potentially to a higher level of service.
-----------	---

4.1.6.2 Areas for improvement in data collection and reporting

DVW	W9 - Some applications are forwarded directly to individual email accounts with the resulting slight risk of applications being missed
AFW	W11 - We recommend a second independent check is made on information from APM Alarm where we found a minor error between reported information and what came off APM Alarm.
DVW	W11 - Need to consider how Schedule 13 Water Industry Act exclusions should be assessed and recorded.
AFW	W13 - Data is recorded on a separate spreadsheet that has no controls and can therefore be changed. This is a potential vulnerability which we suggest is tightened with spreadsheet controls/governance.
DVW	W13 - Original signature required for self-lay agreements, therefore reliant on postal service. Ability to accept certified electronic signature would improve process

4.1.6.3 Areas causing inconsistency in reported performance

The levels of activity on these metrics appear polarized, suggesting that companies adopt different approaches to self-lay applications. In particular:

- Anglian Water and South Staffs consistently report disproportionately high volumes
- Zeros are reported for all these metrics by Bournemouth Water and by Sutton and E Surrey. We understand that the self-lay sector is not well developed in these areas.
- Welsh Water, Northumbrian Water, Portsmouth Water, South East Water, Southern Water consistently report low volumes. We understand that the self-lay sector is not well developed in these areas.

AFW	W9 - Affinity Water records the date a full and complete application is received as opposed to the day after as the metric definition requires, even though it may be accepted six days later and therefore failing the 5-day target.
DVW	W9 - Where information is missing from the application and the developer is notified, and subsequently provides additional information to complete the application, we note that DVW records the application for a second time and reset the clock.
UU	W9 - When a water application is incomplete, UU issues an acknowledgement and records the application as a rejection. When additional information is provided, UU records the application again as a complete record and the clock starts.
WSH	W9 - Where an application is incomplete, WSH issues an acknowledgement letter to the developer advising the information that is required to complete the application. If this information is subsequently received, WSH does not issue a letter acknowledging the now complete application. The original application is updated with the date of the complete application and the clock resets and restarts.
YKY	W9 - Where information is missing from the application and the developer is notified YKY restarts the clock on receipt of additional information, but only count the application once. Whilst this approach is consistent with some other companies, we note a possible variance in approach across the industry which we will need to investigate

SSC(WM)	W10 11 12 - Currently the clock is “paused” for quotations when requesting additional information and resumed when received. Other companies reset back to day 0 on the date the final piece of information is received. The company may therefore be reporting a number of passes as failures.
BRL	W11 & 12 - Where an application is received and rejected because it is incomplete with advice to the applicant on the information that needs to be provided, Bristol Water stops the clock and records the application as ‘on hold’. When the required information is received, the clock is resumed with the remaining time left within the target. Other companies may restart at zero.

4.1.6.4 Areas of non-compliance with the Water UK guidance

SES	W9 - Sutton and East Surrey Water do not receive many SLO requests. Due to a system limitation in its ‘STIMSON’ system, the requests are not defined as SLOs in the system. SES has yet to develop a reporting methodology for itself. The company will be putting in place a means of capturing and reporting this data. To date SLO’s have been reported as under S45.
SSC(CAM)	W11 & 12 - Occurrences of off-site reinforcement, engineering or land difficulties and schedule 13 exclusions have been reported against the smaller timescale i.e. metric W11 rather than W12. Numbers are very small however and the company has advised that it intends to change the initial categorisation in the spreadsheet to ensure the appropriate metric is used.
SSC(WM)	W11 & 12 - All self-lay quotations are captured under metric W11 including off-site reinforcement/engineering or land difficulties, which should be reported as W12. The company is aware and making the necessary changes.
TMS	W9 10 & 12 - As 1. b) The company generally counts the day after receipt as Day Zero rather than Day One, thus affording them with an extra day against this and several other metrics. However, we noted that the cycle times for dealing with the item were generally well within the target response times, so the impact on reported performance would be low, even for the short-cycle metrics.
TMS	W12 a) There can be a material delay between the actual receipt of a communication from the developer and the company ‘Creating’ it on their systems (4 days was noted as the maximum) due to weekend and concurrent staff shortages.
UU	W12 - Off-site reinforcement, engineering or land difficulties are not separately reported by UU against this metric. We note that this results in UU potentially reporting against a higher level of service for W11 when instances arise of off-site reinforcement, engineering or land difficulties.
WSX	W11 - WSX report on the basis of number of connections rather than plots. This makes sense when dealing with self-lay arrangements.

4.1.7 W14 and W15 - Self-lay on-site activities

W14 – Provision of supply of water for pressure /bacteriological testing of self lay mains - % of supplies provided within target period

W15 – Provision of permanent supply of water for self-lay mains - % of supplies made available within the target period

4.1.7.1 Areas of good practice

DVW	W15 - DVW allows SLOs to make connections with new development, as long as existing customers are not affected. As a result, Metric W15 is not applicable to their activities. DVW believes it is unique in allowing SLOs to make these connections which it considers simplifies and speeds up the process.
------------	--

SVT	W14 - The company keeps a central list of allowable extension reasons that is shared with the contractor and cross-referenced when an extension is requested. If an undocumented reason is given and considered reasonable, it is added to the list.
------------	--

4.1.7.2 Areas for improvement in data collection and reporting

AFW	W14 & 15 - Data is recorded on a separate spreadsheet that has no controls and can therefore be changed. This is a potential vulnerability which we suggest is tightened with spreadsheet controls/governance.
BRL	W14 & 15 - The Company is aware of the lack of formal procedures for W14 and W15 and that there may be some uncertainty around start dates because of the current arrangements which are made through dialogue with the Developer Services Operations Manager.
SVT	W14 - There was no evidence of agreed completion date for a small percentage of samples reviewed. We recommend that a written agreement is obtained and attached to the record where possible and that this step be included in the documentation of the process.
YKY	W14 - Verbal agreement required from developer for YKY to provide a supply. Can be agreed on site, but email confirmation needs to be forwarded to ICE, to enable job to be raised and completed in 21 days. There is a risk that verbal agreements aren't formalized and captured on ICE: causing a delay and poor performance in meeting the level of service target; and a lack of supporting evidence of the reported performance.

4.1.7.3 Areas causing inconsistency in reported performance

As noted for metrics W9 to W13 above, there is significant polarization:

- Anglian Water, South Staffs, United Utilities and Yorkshire Water are reporting disproportionately high volumes
- Affinity Water, Bournemouth Water, Welsh Water, Northumbrian Water, Portsmouth Water, South East Water, Southern Water, Sutton and E Surrey, and Wessex Water are reporting disproportionately low volumes.

Nothing noted in the audit and reviews of methods that would indicate these variations in volumes are anything other than due to the local characteristics of general development activity and the maturity of the self-lay sector.

ANH	W14 100% of these will be extended. This is because Anglian Water has lead in times with its partners for scheduling the works and it is beneficial from a programming perspective for a source of water date to be agreed at the earliest opportunity and in line with the developer's build programme.
SSC(CAM)	W14 - Clock-start is currently the day the request is received, not the day after as specified in the metric definition and the company is reporting against a harsher level of service compared to others and that specified.
DVW	W15 - DVW allows SLO to make connection with new development as long as existing customers are not affected. As a result, Metric W15 is not applicable to their activities. DVW believes it is unique in allowing SLO to make these connections.

4.1.7.4 Areas of non-compliance with the Water UK guidance

SSC(WM)	W14 - The company operates a default 6-week lead-in period which is agreed with the developer. This is inconsistent with approaches at other companies and is automatically non-compliant unless valid reasons arise that require an extended period greater than 6 weeks.
----------------	--

4.2 Sewerage Metrics

4.2.1 S1 – Pre-development enquiries

S1 - % of reports issued within target period

4.2.1.1 Areas of good practice

NES	S1 - Day Zero can begin without payment. This is not consistent across the industry and whilst it indicates that the Company offers a better service, it may lead to higher numbers of failures of the target.
UU	S1 - Up-front payment is not required in order to process the PDE application. Payment is required by most companies before the process can commence.

4.2.1.2 Areas for improvement in data collection and reporting

UU	S1 - The application logging and allocation process is largely a manual exercise. Whilst no issues were detected at audit there is a risk that an application may be missed or deleted. As the system generates an automatic acknowledgement of receipt email, lost applications would not be picked up until the issue is raised by the Developer
ANH	S1 - The system has weekends built in as non-working days. However, bank holidays require a manual adjustment. This should be automated to eliminate potential errors.

4.2.1.3 Areas causing inconsistency in reported performance

- Wessex Water reports disproportionately high volumes of activity

As noted below, the high volumes reported by Wessex Water appears to be explained by that fact that Wessex Water, until October 2016, was erroneously counting enquiries for foul and surface connections as two. This has since been corrected.

UU	S1 - When a sewerage application is incomplete, UU issues an acknowledgement letter to the developer advising the information that is required to complete the application. If this information is subsequently received, UU will acknowledge the now complete application, but will only record the resubmission for internal purposes - as UU considers resubmissions are out of scope for Water UK reporting. This may be an area of inconsistency.
WSX	S1 - Like most companies, Wessex Water handles sewerage enquiries for foul sewers and surface water drainage separately. Until October 2016 a methodology error was causing enquiries relating to both to be counted as two enquiries. This would not affect performance but would increase the number of cases. This has been corrected part way through the audit period from September 2016 onwards to provide complaint reporting of the volume of enquiries.

4.2.1.4 Areas of non-compliance with the Water UK guidance

SRN	<p>S1 - Separate applications are required for water and sewerage services.</p> <p>SRN provides responses to each enquiry, however modelling/network availability assurance is provided only when requested by the developer as part of what is called the capacity check which is a voluntary service from the company. Two levels of capacity check can be requested, a basic level confirmation of capacity being available at the point of connection, a second more detailed level of check providing from modelling an indication of reinforcement required. The detailed capacity check does not provide a reliable solution as no buildability checks are carried out and this level of check has not been available during the last quarter of 2016 as the company was reorganising its modelling provision.</p> <p>Southern Water states that there is a connection size limit above which the capacity check is required, this is therefore not required from the affected network where the application is below the size threshold. Two levels of check for the same enquiry is counted as two enquiries for the calculation of the metric.</p>
TMS	<p>S1 - When the company requires additional strategic modelling, this is not undertaken within the 21-day target: the time of the response to advise the developer of this is measured. This is not compliant.</p>
YKY	<p>S1 - Modelling is not generally required for Pre-development enquiries. However, if modelling is required, a separate additional fee is agreed and paid. Applications requiring modelling would not be reported against this metric. This is non-compliant.</p>

4.2.2 S2 and S3 – Sewer Requisitions – administrative activities

S2 - % of written acknowledgements of an application issued within the target period

S3 - % of requisition offer letters issued within agreed target period

4.2.2.1 Areas of good practice

NES	<p>S2 - Although not Level of Service reporting related, the company is generally funded to maintain the capacity of the sewer network and the system is deemed to generally have capacity to accommodate extra demand; this provides a better service for developers and may account for the lower volumes reported.</p>
SWT	<p>S3 - SWT undertakes sewer construction by competitive design-and-build tender rather than through a framework contractor. This is possibly due to the timescales allowed. This would be expected to provide good value for money for developers and may encourage greater use of this approach. It does not affect SWT's monitoring or reporting of performance on this metric, but may affect the volumes and could adversely affect performance if none of the potential suppliers were to bid.</p>
UU	<p>S3 - A UU derived SLA is agreed with Developer of 8 weeks for standard and 12 weeks for complex requisition design requests. SLAs are fixed with no extensions. If these periods are of acceptable length to the developers and other companies, this approach could be adopted more widely.</p>
WSX	<p>S3 - There are some cases when the developer applies for a requisition with the intention of doing the construction themselves on behalf of Wessex Water (to benefit from Wessex's powers). Wessex Water includes these cases in the metrics, which seems reasonable. The use of the company's powers may be beneficial to developers and if appropriate could be adopted more widely.</p>
SVT	<p>S3 - The company keep a central list of allowable extension reasons that is shared with the contractor and cross-referenced when an extension is requested. If an undocumented reason is given and considered reasonable, it is added to the list.</p>

4.2.2.2 Areas for improvement in data collection and reporting

There are no audit findings or items of note to report in this section.

4.2.2.3 Areas causing inconsistency in reported performance

- South West Water and Southern Water report disproportionately high levels of activity
- Northumbrian Water and United Utilities report disproportionately low levels

UU	S2 - When a sewerage application is incomplete, UU issues an acknowledgement letter to the developer advising the information that is required to complete the application. If this information is subsequently received, UU will acknowledge the now complete application, but will only record the resubmission for internal purposes - as UU considers resubmissions are out of scope for Water UK reporting. The metric definition is silent on resubmissions and this may be an area of inconsistency in reporting.
-----------	--

4.2.2.4 Areas of non-compliance with the Water UK guidance

There are no audit findings or items of note to report in this section.

4.2.3 S4 – Sewer Requisitions - construction and commissioning activities

S4 - % of sewer requisitions constructed and commissioned within target period

4.2.3.1 Areas of good practice

NES	S4 - Although not Level of Service reporting related, the company is generally funded to maintain the capacity of the sewer network and the system is deemed to generally have capacity to accommodate extra demand; this provides a better service for developers and may account for the lower volumes reported.
------------	--

4.2.3.2 Areas for improvement in data collection and reporting

There are no audit findings or items of note to report in this section.

4.2.3.3 Areas causing inconsistency in reported performance

- Only South West Water reports very high levels of activity (which may support the levels of administrative activity in S2 and S3 above).

Sewer Diversions are excluded if SWT undertakes design (they are managed as a Requisition, but excluded from that metric as it applies only to new sewers). They are included as diversions delivered by others if the third party did the design but SWT did the construction.

- Seven companies report disproportionately low or zero volumes (Northumbrian Water, Severn Trent Water, Southern Water, Thames Water, United Utilities, Wessex Water and Yorkshire Water).

This is likely to be due to these companies allowing developers to do more of the associated work.

There are no audit findings or items of note to report in this section.

4.2.3.4 Areas of non-compliance with the Water UK guidance

TMS	S4 - Separate phases of a development scheme are not separately reported. This is non-compliant but not deemed to be material due to low occurrence of phased schemes.
------------	--

4.2.4 S5 and S6 – Technical vetting of adoptions and diversions

S5 - % of written acknowledgements issued within target period

S6 - % of approval or rejection letters issued within target period

4.2.4.1 Areas of good practice

SWT	S5 - If an application is received which is complete other than lacking payment, the metric allows companies to satisfy the metric by sending a written request for payment. SWT attempts to contact the developer by phone to obtain payment, in order to speed the process, which provides a better customer experience.
------------	--

4.2.4.2 Areas for improvement in data collection and reporting

There are no audit findings or items of note to report in this section.

4.2.4.3 Areas causing inconsistency in reported performance

- Thames Water reports generally low volumes, more so against S6, possibly due to the proportions of infill development.
- Welsh Water and Yorkshire Water report disproportionately high volumes of activity against both of these metrics.

This may be partly explained by the fact that adoption of the sewers is mandatory in Wales (so higher volumes are being reported) but adoption is not mandatory in England, despite the recent transfers to WaSCs of responsibilities for private sewers, laterals and pumping stations which existed at 1 July 2011.

We have also found that at Welsh Water, to accommodate the mandatory adoption requirement foul and surface connections are counted separately as only one connection is possible per application whereas our audits indicate that other companies count combined applications. This would be consistent with Welsh Water's numbers being approximately double that of the others.

Our audits indicate (see 3.3.4.4) that Yorkshire Water recounts re-submissions. This is out of step with the other companies and is likely to largely account for their significantly higher volumes.

Our audits also indicate that Yorkshire Water includes very minor diversions by individual homeowners (H4S185) in their figures for S5 and S6. These appear to represent around 30% of the figures being reported.

Wessex Water has advised that it includes all diversions in their reported volumes, emphasising that the guidelines are silent on exclusions of any particular category.

UU	S5 - When a sewerage application is incomplete, UU issues an acknowledgement letter to the developer advising the information that is required to complete the application. If this information is subsequently received, UU will acknowledge the now complete application, but will only record the resubmission for internal purposes - as UU considers resubmissions are out of scope for Water UK reporting. This may be an area of inconsistency.
YKY	S5 & S6 - When additional information is requested YKY records the revised application a second time and reports the acknowledgement again. This approach appears to be out of step with other companies, and may explain the relatively high numbers reported by YKY for S5 and S6.

4.2.4.4 Areas of non-compliance with the Water UK guidance

There are no audit findings or items of note to report in this section.

4.2.5 S7 – Adoption legal agreements

S7 - % of draft adoption agreements issued within target period

4.2.5.1 Areas of good practice

There are no audit findings or items of note to report in this section.

4.2.5.2 Areas for improvement in data collection and reporting

There are no audit findings or items of note to report in this section.

4.2.5.3 Areas causing inconsistency in reported performance

- Welsh Water reports disproportionately high volumes of legal agreements, where adoption is mandatory; Yorkshire Water to a lesser extent, but both also appear consistent with the high activity levels in S5 to S6.
- Thames Water reports low volumes, but again this appears consistent with the volumes reported in metrics S5 to S6.

There are no audit findings or items of note to report in this section.

4.2.5.4 Areas of non-compliance with the Water UK guidance

There are no audit findings or items of note to report in this section.

4.2.6 S8 and S9 – s106 connections – letters

S8 - % of approval letters issued within target period

S9 - % of rejection letters issued within target period

4.2.6.1 Areas of good practice

There are no audit findings or items of note to report in this section.

4.2.6.2 Areas for improvement in data collection and reporting

There are no audit findings or items of note to report in this section.

4.2.6.3 Areas causing inconsistency in reported performance

- There are no significant outliers on metric S8.
- Anglian Water and Southern Water report disproportionately high levels of activity against metric S9.
- Northumbrian Water, Severn Trent Water and Wessex Water report low volumes against S9.

ANH	S8 - Highway drainage connections/correction of misconnections would be applied for under the normal s106 application form; therefore these would not be discounted. However, ANH very rarely receives these. May cause slight over-reporting with respect to other companies
WSH	S8 & S9 - s106 applications for foul and surface water require separate applications as WSH is subject to mandatory adoption requirements necessitating one connection only per application. Companies in England allow combined applications and report as one, whereas WSH reports both foul and surface applications.
YKY	S8 - Foul and surface water connections to a single site are counted as two separate applications and counted twice against this metric. This is in contrast with our findings at many other companies, where each application allows and foul and SW connection and would only be counted as one.

4.2.6.4 Areas of non-compliance with the Water UK guidance

YKY	S9 - Additional information received following a s106 application is treated as a new application by YKY.
------------	---

Appendix 1
Audit questionnaire form

Water UK – Developer Services Horizontal Audit - General audit questions

Audit question / audit tests
Targets are measured in calendar days per Water UK's requirements. How are email applications handled regarding date of receipt when receipt may be on a weekend? I.e. when does the clock start – when the email lands in the IN box or when the company retrieves/opens the email?
What governance arrangements are in place for monitoring and reporting of performance against all metrics?
What are the arrangements for checking the accuracy and reliability where information is sourced from third parties (e.g. contractors)
How is performance monitored, root causes of poor performance identified and action plans to improve compliance and implemented?
Are methodologies documented, compliant with internal reporting requirements and Water UK guidance?
Are methodologies appropriately applied?
Where assumptions have been made, are they justified and reasonable? Do they impact on the quality of the reported information?
Have changes from previous information returns been adequately explained?
Is data reasonably aligned to other reported information (or otherwise explained)
Are confidence grades used, if so are these appropriate and supported by evidence?
Has Water UK's Guidance, or other relevant guidance been followed?
Confirm the Company's internal review and sign off / governance processes have been followed
Is the data and processes subject to internal audit and how are recommendations / action plans implemented?
What is the extent of spreadsheet controls for input data and any manipulation to produce the reported data?
Is any data excluded, or are there known gaps in data, and why?
What are the contingency arrangements for staff resources who are proficient in DS processes?
Does the company have data on the proportion of each request type being raised or (where relevant) delivered by DLO, Framework Contractors, SLO's individual private applicants?
Are all requests received and treated, and all services delivered in the same way regardless of the origin or delivery route, e.g. direct labour organization, framework contractors, SLO's or individual private applicants.
What independent internal/external audit has this information been subject to, at what frequency, and with what findings/outcomes?
Does the company have any observations on the value, shortcomings or representativeness of these metrics? E.g. should some of the metrics be more heavily weighted to represent the importance of meeting the deadlines? Or, given the high levels of performance being reported, are the timescales too long or too flexible to be challenging?
What percentage of each activity is undertaken in-house by a Direct Labour Organisation, vs a framework contractor, vs a Self Lay Organisation?
Developers expressed concern that they sometimes need to agree to an extension of time rather than it necessarily being approved. Who instigated the extension and why?
Where a new connecting main extends beyond the site boundary but only connects to the site, is this a reason for an extension of the timescales? (off-site main vs off-site network reinforcement).
Do companies have a checklist to help make a successful application/enquiry?
Do companies have a checklist indicating the criteria for a successful inspection to take place?

Water UK – Developer Services Audit Questions - Water Metrics

Metric	Audit question
W1 - Pre-development enquiry - % of reports issued within target period (21 days)	How are enquiries/applications submitted to the Company? How do you ensure all routes are captured/monitored?
	What assumptions do you make about the composition of a pre-development report?
	What are the requirements for a 'full' application? Do you require advance payment?
	How do you record receipt of the 'full' application?
	How do you record the clock-start or finish for incomplete applications and compare to the target?
	How do your systems cope with reporting response durations on a calendar day basis
	Where information is missing from the application and the developer is notified, who subsequently provides the information, do you record the application a second time and reset the clock?
	In order to process each enquiry is modelling/network availability assurance required from the affected network? Are there exceptions where network impact assessment is not required?
	Do you set internal targets for network modelling? If so, what are they and do you monitor them as part of this metric?
	Do you receive combined water and sewerage applications? If so how do you record receipt of these?
	Are there any assumptions that underpin this metric?
	What are the typical causes for missing the response deadline?
	Is the agreed 21 day response time appropriate for all types of enquiry/application or is there scope to offer different
Is overall performance internally monitored	
W2 & W2a - S45 quote - % of written acknowledgements of an application issued within target period (5 days)	How are S45 applications submitted to the Company? How do you ensure all routes are captured/monitored?
	How do you record receipt of the application?
	How do you record the clock-start or finish and compare to the target?
	Where information is missing from the application and the developer is notified, who subsequently provides the information, do you record the written acknowledgement on a second time?
	What format is your written acknowledgement? Does this have any implication for performance against the target (e.g. email dispatch, letter/postal collection time/arrangements (failure of the PO)
	Confirm records are per application not per plot
	Are there any assumptions that underpin this metric?
W3 - S45 quote - % of quotations completed within target period (28 days)	What assumptions, if any, do you make about this metric, and W4a below?
	How do you record receipt of the application?
	How do you record completion of the quotation?
	Confirm performance is monitored for s45 and s55 applications
	Confirm service level is in respect of each individual plot regardless of whether the application is for service connections only or made jointly with a requisition application. If the latter, how is this recorded?

APPENDIX 1 AUDIT QUESTIONNAIRE FORM

Metric	Audit question
	<p>Confirm records are per application not per plot</p> <p>Is there any manual intervention/manipulation of data (e.g. via offline spreadsheets) used to produce the data for Water UK reporting? If so how is this controlled?</p> <p>How are cancelled requests handled/removed from reported data?</p> <p>Does this full application receipt date change if a full application is subsequently confirmed at a site survey/site meeting with the developer or third party? (i.e. is the site survey considered to be part of the application?)</p>
<p>W4 & W4a - S45 connection - % of service pipe connections completed within target period (21 days)</p>	<p>How do you record the 'relevant day'? (day after all relevant conditions have been satisfied)</p> <p>What are your conditions to satisfy the 'relevant day'? How are these recorded?</p> <p>How do you record completion of service connections and calculate performance against target?</p> <p>Confirm % compliance is based on number of <u>meter connections</u></p> <p>What conditions are considered applicable to grant/agree an extension? Can be extended by agreement with customer due to third party constraints (Schedule 13 Water Industry Act 1991 /traffic management legislation / third party land). NB, lack of resource by the water co is not a valid reason.</p> <p>How do you agree and record extension to the 21day target? Agreement to an extension must be confirmed in writing (letter or email) as soon as practicable after the agreement is made.</p> <p>Is performance the same for DLO, Framework Contractors, SLO's, individual applicants?</p> <p>How soon is 'as soon as practicable' after the agreement is made?</p> <p>Do you specify an extension to a date or as a further number of days? If the latter, when does the new count start?</p>
<p>W5 & W5a - Mains design <500 plots (excluding where off-site reinforcement/engineering or land difficulties) - % of written acknowledgements issued within target period (5 days)</p>	<p>What assumptions, if any, do you make about this metric?</p> <p>How do you record receipt of the application?</p> <p>How do you record completion of the quotation?</p> <p>Where information is missing and the developer is notified who subsequently provides the information, do you record the written acknowledgement on a second time?</p>
<p>W6 - Mains design <500 plots (excluding where off-site reinforcement/engineering or land difficulties) - % of quotations issued within target period (28 days)</p>	<p>What assumptions, if any, do you make about this metric?</p> <p>What are the requirements for a 'full' application?</p> <p>How do you record receipt of the 'full' application?</p> <p>How do you record issue of the quotation vs target?</p>
<p>W7 - Mains design >500 plots or where off-site reinforcement/engineering or land difficulties) - % of quotations issued within target period (42 days)</p>	<p>What assumptions, if any, do you make about this metric?</p> <p>What are the requirements for a 'full' application?</p> <p>How do you record receipt of the full application? Does this full application receipt date change if a full application is subsequently confirmed at a site survey/site meeting with the developer or third party? (i.e. is the site survey considered to be part of the application?)</p> <p>How are re-quotes handled for design changes? Are these counted again or supersede earlier quotes?</p> <p>How do you record issue of the quotation vs target?</p> <p>How do you record issue of the quotation vs target?</p>

Metric	Audit question
	<p>How are site specific details assessed to support a date (outside of the target) agreed with the developer?</p> <p>How are agreed dates recorded?</p> <p>How is performance vs agreed dates incorporated into the metric?</p> <p>How are extensions agreed and recorded? Are these extensions to the original agreed date, or is an 'extension' an original agreed date in excess of the 42 day target?</p>
<p>W8 - & W8a - Mains construction - % of main laying schemes constructed and commissioned within the target period (90 days)</p>	<p>What assumptions, if any, do you make about this metric?</p> <p>What exceptions are deemed allowable?</p> <p>What are the requirements for the 'relevant day'? The relevant day is when an undertaking under s42 of the Water Industry Act 1991 signed by the developer and a valid security have been received.</p> <p>What is considered to be 'valid security'?</p> <p>How is the 'relevant day' recorded?</p> <p>How is completion of main laying recorded vs target? The construction and commissioning of the new water main is completed when the new water main is under pressure from the company's network.</p> <p>Is result of satisfactory bacti-test also required?</p> <p>This service level is applied separately in respect of each individual phase on a development site.</p> <p>How are individual phase durations recorded and omissions/double-counting avoided?</p>
<p>W9 - Self lay application - % of written acknowledgements issued within the target period (5 days)</p>	<p>How are applications submitted to the Company? How do you ensure all routes are captured/monitored?</p> <p>How do you record receipt of the application?</p> <p>How do you record the clock-start or finish and compare to the target?</p> <p>Where information is missing from the application and the developer is notified who subsequently provides the information, do you record the written acknowledgement on a second time?</p> <p>What format is your written acknowledgement? Does this have any implication for performance against the target (e.g. email dispatch, letter/postal collection time/arrangements (failure of the PO</p> <p>Are there any assumptions that underpin this metric?</p>
<p>W10 - Self lay application - % of quotations issued within the target period (28 days)</p>	<p>What assumptions, if any, do you make about this metric?</p> <p>How do you record receipt of the application?</p> <p>How do you record completion of the quotation vs target?</p> <p>How are cancelled requests handled/removed from reported data?</p> <p>What format does the quotation take? Hard copy in the post, email?</p> <p>Confirm records are per application not per plot</p>
<p>W11 - Self lay <500 plots (excluding where off-site reinforcement/engineering or difficulties/Schedule 13 Water Industry Act 1991 exclusions) - % of written terms</p>	<p>What assumptions, if any, do you make about this metric?</p> <p>What are the requirements for a 'full' application?</p> <p>How do you record receipt of the 'full' application? Does this full application receipt date change if a full application is subsequently confirmed at a site survey/site meeting with the developer or third party? (i.e. is the site survey considered to be part of the application?)</p>

APPENDIX 1 AUDIT QUESTIONNAIRE FORM

Metric	Audit question
(quotations) issued within target period (28 days)	How are re-quotes handled for design changes? Are these counted again or supersede earlier quotes?
	How do you record issue of the quotation vs target?
	How are Schedule 13 Water Industry Act exclusions assessed and recorded?
	How are the exclusions incorporated into metric W12 and double counting is avoided (i.e. confirm they are not included in W11)?
W12 & W12a - Self lay >500 plots or where off-site reinforcement, engineering or land difficulties apply - % of self lay written terms (quotations) issued within target period (42 days)	What assumptions, if any, do you make about this metric?
	What are the requirements for a 'full' application?
	How do you record receipt of the 'full' application?
	How do you record issue of the quotation vs target?
	How are Schedule 13 Water Industry Act exclusions incorporated into metric W12 and double counting is avoided (i.e. confirm they are included in W12, not W11)?
	How is performance vs agreed dates incorporated into the metric?
	How are extensions agreed and recorded?
W13 - Self lay signed agreement - % of written acknowledgements of receipt issued within target period (5 days)	How are signed agreements submitted to the Company? How do you ensure all routes are captured/monitored?
	How do you record receipt of the signed agreement?
	How do you record the clock-start or finish and compare to the target?
	Are there any assumptions that underpin this metric?
W14 & W14a - Provision of supply of water for pressure/bacti testing of self lay main - % of supplies provided within target period (21 days)	What assumptions, if any, do you make about this metric?
	What exceptions are deemed allowable?
	How do you record the clock-start and finish for (i) and compare to the target?
	Extensions allowable where there are engineering difficulties/ requirements for offsite reinforcement/ Schedule 13 Water Industry Act constraints or where developer requests it? How are these longer periods recorded?
	Are requirements and performances the same/similar for DLO, Framework Contractors, SLOs?
W15 - Provision of permanent supply of water for self lay mains - % of supplies made available within the target period (14 days)	What assumptions, if any, do you make about this metric?
	What evidence triggers the start of the period?
	How is the provision of a permanent water supply connection recorded vs target following satisfactory pressure and bacteriological testing?
	How is the performance calculated?
	Are requirements and performances the same/similar for DLO, Framework Contractors, SLOs?

Water UK – Developer Services Audit Questions - Sewerage Metrics

Metric	Audit question
S16 - Pre-development enquiry - % of reports issued within target period (21 days)	How are enquiries/applications submitted to the Company? How do you ensure all routes are captured/monitored?
	What assumptions do you make about the composition of a pre-development report?
	What are the requirements for a 'full' application? Do you require advance payment?
	How do you record receipt of the 'full' application?
	How do you record the clock-start or finish for complete applications and compare to the target?
	How do you record the clock-start or finish for incomplete applications and compare to the target?
	How do your systems cope with reporting response durations on a calendar day basis
	Where information is missing from the application and the developer is notified, who subsequently provides the information, do you record the application a second time and reset the clock?
	In order to process each enquiry, is modelling/network availability assurance required from the affected network? Are there exceptions where network impact assessment is not required?
	Do you set internal targets for network modelling? If so, what are they and do you monitor them as part of this metric?
	Do you receive combined water and sewerage applications? If so how do you record receipt of these?
	Are there any assumptions that underpin this metric?
	What are the typical causes for missing the response deadline?
	Is the agreed 21 day response time appropriate for all types of enquiry/application or is there scope to offer different
Is overall performance internally monitored	
S17 & S17a - Sewer requisition design - % of written acknowledgements of an application issued within the target period (5 days)	What assumptions, if any, do you make about this metric?
	How do you record receipt of the application?
	How do you record the clock-start or finish and compare to the target?
	Where information is missing from the application and the developer is notified who subsequently provides the information, do you record the written acknowledgement on a second time?
	What format is your written acknowledgement? Does this have any implication for performance against the target (e.g. email dispatch, letter/postal collection time/arrangements, failure of the PO)
S18 - Sewer requisition design - % of requisition letters issued within target period (target agreed between undertaker and customer)	What assumptions, if any, do you make about this metric?
	How are targets agreed between the company and the developer?
	When does the clock start following agreement of the target?
	Are agreed targets extended?
	What are the requirements for a 'full' application?
	How do you record receipt of the 'full' application?
	How do you record the clock-start or finish for and compare to the target?

Metric	Audit question
<p>S19 & S19a - Sewer requisition construction - % of sewer requisitions constructed and commissioned within the target period (180 days)</p>	<p>How do you record the 'relevant day'?</p> <p>The relevant day is when an undertaking under s99 of the Water Industry Act 1991 signed by the developer and a valid security have been received.</p>
	<p>What are your conditions to satisfy the 'relevant day'? How are these recorded?</p>
	<p>What is considered to be 'valid security'?</p>
	<p>How do you record completion of construction and commissioning of the sewer?</p> <p>The construction and commissioning of the new sewer is completed when the sewer is commissioned and able to receive flows.</p>
	<p>This service level is applied separately in respect of each individual phase on a development site where appropriate.</p> <p>In these circumstances, how are the dates for each phase identified and reported?</p>
<p>S20 & S20a - Adoption and developer delivered diversion technical vetting - % of written acknowledgements issued within the target period (14 days)</p>	<p>What assumptions, if any, do you make about this metric?</p>
	<p>How do you record receipt of the application?</p>
	<p>How do you record the clock-start or finish and compare to the target?</p>
	<p>What are your requirements for technical vetting?</p>
	<p>Where information is missing from the application and the developer is notified who subsequently provides the information, do you record the written acknowledgement on a second time?</p>
	<p>What format is your written acknowledgement? Does this have any implication for performance against the target (e.g. email dispatch, letter/postal collection time/arrangements, failure of the PO)</p>
<p>S21 & S21a - Adoption and developer delivered diversion technical vetting - % of approval or rejection letters issued within the target period (28 days)</p>	<p>What assumptions, if any, do you make about this metric?</p>
	<p>How do you record receipt of the application?</p>
	<p>How do you record issue of approval or rejection letters vs target?</p>
	<p>What are your requirements for a 'full' application?</p>
	<p>What is the format / transmission of the approval and rejection letters (e.g. email, letter in the post)? How are these recorded as complete – e.g. email sent, post collected from the company's office?</p>
	<p>How are extensions agreed and recorded?</p>
<p>S22 - Adoption legal agreement - % of draft adoption agreements issued within the target period (14 days)</p>	<p>What assumptions, if any, do you make about this metric?</p>
	<p>What comprises 'technical approval'? How is this recorded?</p>
	<p>What is the format / transmission of draft agreement (e.g. email, letter in the post)? How are these recorded as complete – e.g. email sent, post collected from the company's office?</p>
	<p>How is performance vs target recorded?</p>
<p>S23 - S106 sewer connection approval - % of approval letters issued within target period (21 days)</p> <p>A technical approval or rejection will be issued within a period of 21 days commencing either (i) on the day after receipt of a full application, or (ii) if the application is incomplete</p>	<p>What assumptions, if any, do you make about this metric? Reporting should include: All new housing development connections Domestic housing extension connections Connections to sewer made to replace septic tank drainage</p> <p>Excluded are: Highway drainage connections Correction of misconnections</p> <p>What if any variations to this are applied?</p>
	<p>How do you record receipt of the application?</p>
	<p>An application is full when all the required information and any required payment have been received.</p>
	<p>What are your requirements for a 'full' application?</p>

Metric	Audit question
and/or no payment has been received with the application, on the day after all the required information and payment have been received.	How do you record issue of approval letters vs target?
	Where information is missing and the developer is notified, confirm this is recorded as a rejection under metric S24.
	What is the format / transmission of the approval letters (e.g. email, letter in the post)? How are these recorded as complete – e.g. email sent, post collected from the company's office?
S24 - S106 sewer connection approval - % of rejection letters issued within target period (21 days)	How do you record issue of rejection letters vs target?
	A rejection specifies the reasons for the rejection and the steps required to rectify any issues identified. Confirm company procedures ensure this.
	What are the most common causes of rejection?
	What is the format / transmission of the approval letters (e.g. email, letter in the post)? How are these recorded as complete – e.g. email sent, post collected from the company's office?

Appendix 2

Metric definitions

WATER METRICS	
W1.1 PERF	<p style="text-align: center;">Pre-development enquiry – reports issued within target [21 days (Non-statutory)]</p> <p>A pre-development report will be issued to the developer within a period of 21 days commencing either (i) on the day after receipt of a full application, or (ii) if an incomplete application and/or no payment has been received with the application, on the day after all the required information and payment have been received.</p> <p>An application is full when all the required information and any required payment have been received.</p> <p>The report provided to the applicant should confirm if the development can be supplied with water and if any reinforcement work will be required to supply the site together with identifying any existing assets crossing the site which may require diverting or protecting.</p> <p>Where reinforcement is required to supply the site, the company should provide an indicative capital cost or range of costs for these works, to comply with the target standard.</p> <p>If the company requires to undertake network modelling to assess network capacity to identify the point(s) of connection this should be completed within the 21 days.</p> <p>For combined water and sewerage enquiries, count as one enquiry for water and one for sewerage and report compliance for each function accordingly. If a combined enquiry is received and the water element is responded to within the target time but the sewerage response is made later and out of target, compliance would be 100% for water and 0% for sewerage.</p>
W2.1 PERF	<p style="text-align: center;">s45 applications – written acknowledgements within target [5 days (Non-statutory)]</p> <p>A written acknowledgement of the application will be issued within a period of 5 days commencing on the day after receipt of the application confirming either that the application is complete or, if not, requesting the missing information and/or any required payment.</p> <p>This service level applies to applications for service pipe connections under s45 and for applications under s55 (non-domestic supply connections).</p> <p>NB. Report on per application not per plot basis.</p>
W2.1a INF	<p style="text-align: center;">s45 applications - refused/returned/questioned [None]</p> <p>A written acknowledgement of the application will be issued within a period of 5 days commencing on the day after receipt of the application confirming either that the application is complete or, if not, requesting the missing information and/or any required payment.</p> <p>This service level applies to applications for service pipe connections under s45 and for applications under s55 (non-domestic supply connections).</p>
W3.1 PERF	<p style="text-align: center;">s45 quotations - within target [28 days (Non-statutory)]</p> <p>A quotation will be issued within a period of 28 days commencing on the day after receipt of the full application.</p> <p>An application is full when all the required information and any required payment have been received.</p> <p>This service level applies to applications for service pipe connections under s45 and for applications under s55 (non-domestic supply connections).</p> <p>This service level is applied in respect of each individual plot irrespective of whether the application is for service pipe connection(s) only or is made jointly with a requisition application.</p> <p>NB. Report on per plot basis not per application.</p>

WATER METRICS	
W4.1 PERF	<p style="text-align: center;">s45 service pipe connections - within target [21 days (Statutory)]</p> <p>The service pipe connection will be completed within a period of 21 days commencing on the relevant day. The relevant day is the day after all the required conditions are satisfied (typically all the conditions are satisfied when the trench and service pipe inspection has been approved).</p> <p>Timescales can be extended by agreement with the customer due to third party constraints (Schedule 13 Water Industry Act 1991 /traffic management legislation / third party land). However, lack of resources by the water company to undertake the work is not a valid reason for an extension.</p> <p>Agreement to an extension must be confirmed in writing (letter or email) as soon as practicable after the agreement is made.</p> <p>Report percentage compliance based on number of plots served. One quotation may contain 10 dwellings to be served, so 10 should be reported if individually metered. For multi-occupancy developments with a bulk meter, report based on number of meter connections quoted.</p>
W4.1a INF	<p style="text-align: center;">s45 service pipe connections - within extended target [None]</p> <p>The service pipe connection will be completed within a period of 21 days commencing on the relevant day. The relevant day is the day after all the required conditions are satisfied (typically all the conditions are satisfied when the trench and service pipe inspection has been approved).</p> <p>Timescales can be extended by agreement with the customer due to third party constraints (Schedule 13 Water Industry Act 1991 /traffic management legislation / third party land). However, lack of resources by the water company to undertake the work is not a valid reason for an extension.</p> <p>Agreement to an extension must be confirmed in writing (letter or email) as soon as practicable after the agreement is made.</p> <p>Report percentage compliance based on number of plots served. One quotation may contain 10 dwellings to be served, so 10 should be reported if individually metered. For multi-occupancy developments with a bulk meter, report based on number of meter connections quoted.</p>
W5.1 PERF	<p style="text-align: center;">Mains design <500 plots - written acknowledgement within target [5 days (Non-statutory)]</p> <p>A written acknowledgement of the application will be issued within a period of 5 days commencing on the day after the day of receipt of the application confirming either that the application is complete or, if not, requesting the missing information and/or any required payment.</p>
W5.1a INF	<p style="text-align: center;">Mains design <500 plots - forms refused/returned/questioned None</p> <p>A written acknowledgement of the application will be issued within a period of 5 days commencing on the day after the day of receipt of the application confirming either that the application is complete or, if not, requesting the missing information and/or any required payment.</p>
W6.1 PERF	<p style="text-align: center;">Mains design <500 plots - quotations within target [28 days (Non-statutory)]</p> <p>A quotation will be issued within a period of 28 days commencing on the day after receipt of a full application.</p> <p>An application is full when all the required information and any required payment have been received.</p> <p>A quotation includes the terms and conditions, the design and the amounts to be paid by the developer under each statutory payment option and any non-statutory payment option.</p> <p>Land difficulties include Schedule 13 Water Industry Act 1991 constraints.</p>

WATER METRICS	
W7.1 PERF	<p style="text-align: center;">Mains design >500 plots - quotations within target [42 days (Non-statutory)]</p> <p>A quotation will be issued either (i) within a period of 42 days commencing on the day after receipt of a full application, or (ii) no later than on the date agreed with the developer.</p> <p>An application is full when all the required information and any required payment have been received.</p> <p>A date as referred to in (ii) above may be agreed in order to deal with sites with specific difficulties such as geotechnical conditions; a water course; mains pressure (if the site is higher than the reservoir on a gravity fed system); offsite reinforcement that may require more than simply laying or upsizing of a main, e.g. booster pump; highways, e.g. major trunk road/motorways and where a site meeting with a highway authority is specifically required to scope out when/where the works may be carried out and the cost of traffic management; environmental issues especially in respect of SSSI or other designated sites; sites of archaeological interest; third party and Crown Estate land; protected undertakers, e.g. other utilities and network rail; Schedule 13 Water Industry Act 1991 constraints.</p> <p>Lack of resources by the water company to undertake the work is not a valid reason for an extension.</p> <p>Agreement to an extension must be confirmed in writing (letter or email) as soon as practicable after the agreement is made.</p> <p>A quotation includes the terms and conditions, the design, details of any required network reinforcement and the amounts to be paid by the developer under each statutory payment option and any non-statutory payment option.</p> <p>If an indicative self lay asset value payment estimate is given to the customer as part of the written response, compliance against the target standard should be judged against this target and not a self lay target as that would require all terms to be supplied – which includes supply of a draft legal agreement.</p>
W7.1a INF	<p style="text-align: center;">Mains designs >500 plots - as % of total mainlaying jobs [None]</p> <p>A metric to show larger or complex mains schemes intended to be delivered by companies as a percentage of all mains schemes. Note self lay schemes are excluded.</p>
W7.1b INF	<p style="text-align: center;">Mains designs >500 plots - % where extension agreed [None]</p> <p>Number of completed mains designs over 500 plots (excluding self lay) where an extension beyond the 42 days has been agreed.</p>
W8.1 PERF	<p style="text-align: center;">Mains construction within target [90 days (Statutory)]</p> <p>The construction and commissioning of the water main will be completed either (i) within a period of 90 days commencing on the relevant day, or (ii) no later than on the date agreed with the developer. Any agreement must be confirmed in writing with the developer by letter or email.</p> <p>The construction and commissioning of the new water main is completed when the new water main is under pressure from the company's network.</p> <p>The relevant day is when an undertaking under s42 of the Water Industry Act 1991 signed by the developer and a valid security have been received.</p> <p>This service level is applied separately in respect of each individual phase on a development site.</p>
W8.1a INF	<p style="text-align: center;">Mains construction within extended target - as % of all mainlaying jobs [None]</p> <p>Mains construction – mainlaying schemes that are commissioned within an agreed extended target period as a percentage of all commissioned mainlaying schemes.</p>
W9.1 PERF	<p style="text-align: center;">Self-lay application – written acknowledgements within target [5 days (Non-statutory)]</p> <p>A written acknowledgement of the application will be issued within a period of 5 days commencing on the day after receipt of the application confirming either that the application is complete or, if not, requesting the missing information.</p>

WATER METRICS	
W9.1a INF	Self-lay applications - refused / returned/ questioned [5 days] A written acknowledgement of the application will be issued within a period of 5 days commencing on the day after receipt of the application confirming either that the application is complete or, if not, requesting the missing information.
W10.1 PERF	Self-lay new connection - quotations within target [28 days (Non-statutory)] Written terms will be issued within a period of 28 days commencing on the day after receipt of the full application. An application is full when all the required information and any required payment have been received. NB. Report on a per plot basis.
W11.1 PERF	Self-lay <500 plots - written terms (quotations) within target [28 days (Non-statutory)] Written terms will be issued within a period of 28 days commencing on the day after receipt of a full application. An application is full when all the required information and any required payment have been received. Terms includes the design or design approval, the amount of the asset payment and any amount to be paid by the Self lay organisation (SLO) or developer. A draft self lay agreement is issued with the quotation. The exclusions above apply where the water company is constrained by these issues. Where they apply, an application should be reported under Metric 12.
W12.1 PERF	Self-lay design >500 plots - written terms (quotations) within target [42 days (Non-statutory)] Written terms will be issued within a period of 42 days commencing on the day after receipt of a full application. An application is full when all the required information and any required payment have been received. Land difficulties include constraints under S13 of the Water Industry Act 1991. Terms include the design or design approval, the details of any required network reinforcement or associated infrastructure, and the amount of the asset payment and any amount to be paid by the self lay organisation (SLO) or developer. A draft self lay agreement is issued with the terms. The target period may be extended by agreement with the SLO. However a lack of resources by the water company is not a valid reason for an extension.
W12.1a INF	Self-lay design >500 plots - % of written terms (quotations) extended by agreement [None] Self lay design >500 plots or where offsite reinforcements, engineering or land difficulties apply – % of self lay written terms (quotations) that are extended by agreement.
W13.1 PERF	Self-lay signed agreement - written acknowledgement of receipt [5 days (Non-statutory)] A written acknowledgement will be issued to the SLO/developer within a period of 5 days commencing on the day after receipt of the signed agreement.
W14.1 PERF	Water provision for testing self-lay mains - within target [21 days (Non-statutory)] Provide a source of supply for pressure and bacteriological testing within either (i) 21 days commencing on the day after receipt of request or (ii) such longer period as may be agreed with the self lay organisation (SLO) where there are engineering difficulties/requirement for offsite reinforcement/Schedule 13 Water Industry Act 1991 constraints or where the SLO requests an extended period.

WATER METRICS	
W14.1a INF	<p style="text-align: center;">Water provision for testing self-lay mains - within extended target [None]</p> <p>Provision of supply of water for pressure/bacteriological testing of self lay mains – percentage of supplies made available where the target period has been extended by agreement.</p>
W15.1 PERF	<p style="text-align: center;">Provision of permanent supply for self-lay mains – within target [14 days (Non-statutory)]</p> <p>Provide a permanent supply connection within 14 days following satisfactory pressure and bacteriological testing of the self laid mains.</p>

SEWERAGE METRICS	
S 1.1 PERF	<p style="text-align: center;">Pre-development enquiry – reports issued within target [21 days non statutory]</p> <p>A pre-development report will be issued to the developer within a period of 21 days commencing either (i) on the day after receipt of a full application, or (ii) if an incomplete application and/or no payment has been received with the application, on the day after all the required information and payment have been received. An application is full when all the required information and any required payment have been received.</p> <p>The report provided to the applicant should identify current capacity to accommodate flows within the network and receiving sewage treatment works and should include details of the anticipated point(s) of connection together with any necessary network reinforcement to service the site.</p> <p>It should also identify any existing assets crossing the site which may require diverting or protecting.</p> <p>If the company requires to undertake network modelling to assess network capacity to identify the point(s) of connection this should be completed within the 21 days.</p> <p>For combined water and sewerage enquiries, count as one enquiry for water and one for sewerage and report compliance for each function accordingly. If a combined enquiry is received and the water element is responded to within the target time but the sewerage response is made later and out of target, compliance would be 100% for water and 0% for sewerage.</p>
S2.1 PERF	<p style="text-align: center;">Sewer requisition - written acknowledgement of applications within target [5 days (Non-statutory)]</p> <p>A written acknowledgement of the application will be issued within a period of 5 days commencing on the day after receipt of the application confirming either that the application is complete or, if not, requesting the missing information and/or any payment.</p>
S2.1a INF	<p style="text-align: center;">Sewer requisition - applications refused/returned/questioned [5 days (Non-statutory)]</p> <p>A written acknowledgement of the application will be issued within a period of 5 days commencing on the day after receipt of the application confirming either that the application is complete or, if not, requesting the missing information and/or any payment.</p>
S3.1 PERF	<p style="text-align: center;">Sewer requisition design – offers issued within target [Period agreed between undertaker and customer (Non-statutory)]</p> <p>A requisition offer will be issued no later than on the date agreed with the developer following receipt of a full application.</p> <p>An application is full when all the required information and payment have been received.</p> <p>A requisition offer includes the terms and conditions, the design, details of any required network reinforcement and the required amounts to be paid by the developer under each statutory payment option and any non-statutory payment option.</p> <p>NB. There is no standard performance measure for this metric. The period for completion is subject to agreement between the sewerage undertaker and developer.</p>

SEWERAGE METRICS	
S4.1 PERF	<p style="text-align: center;">Sewer requisition – constructed and commissioned within agreed extension [180 days (Statutory)]</p> <p>The construction and commissioning of the sewer will be completed either (i) within a period of 180 days commencing on the relevant day, or (ii) no later than on the date agreed with the developer.</p> <p>The construction and commissioning of the new sewer is completed when the sewer is commissioned and able to receive flows.</p> <p>The relevant day is when an undertaking under s99 of the Water Industry Act 1991 signed by the developer and a valid security have been received.</p> <p>This service level is applied separately in respect of each individual phase on a development site where appropriate.</p>
S4.1a INF	<p style="text-align: center;">Sewer requisition – constructed and commissioned - extensions agreed [None]</p> <p>Sewer requisition construction – percentage of requisitioned sewers constructed and commissioned where an extension of time has been agreed.</p>
S5.1 PERF	<p style="text-align: center;">Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions– acknowledgements within target [14 days (Non-statutory)]</p> <p>A written acknowledgement of the application will be issued within a period of 14 days commencing on the day after receipt of the application confirming either that the application is complete or, if not, requesting the missing information and/or any payment.</p>
S5.1a INF	<p style="text-align: center;">Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions – applications refused/returned/questioned [14 days (Non-statutory)]</p> <p>A written acknowledgement of the application will be issued within a period of 14 days commencing on the day after receipt of the application confirming either that the application is complete or, if not, requesting the missing information and/or any payment.</p>
S6.1 PERF	<p style="text-align: center;">Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions – approval or rejection letters within target [28 days (Non-statutory)]</p> <p>A technical approval or rejection will be issued within a period of 28 days commencing either (i) on the day after receipt of a full application, or (ii) if an incomplete application is received, on the day after all the required information is received.</p> <p>An application is full when all the required information has been received. An extension can be agreed for significant deviations from Sewers for Adoption guidance.</p> <p>A rejection specifies the reasons for the rejection and the steps required to rectify any issues identified.</p>
S6.1a INF	<p style="text-align: center;">Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions – extensions agreed [None]</p> <p>Adoption and developer delivered diversion technical vetting – percentage of applications where an extension of period has been agreed for determination.</p>
S7.1 PERF	<p style="text-align: center;">Adoption legal agreement – draft agreements issued within target [14 days (Non-statutory)]</p> <p>A draft adoption agreement will be issued to the developer within a period of 14 days commencing either (i) on the day after the technical approval, or (ii) if all the information necessary to prepare the draft adoption agreement and/or any payment has not been received on the day after the technical approval, on the day after all the required information and payment have been received.</p>

SEWERAGE METRICS	
S8.1 PERF	<p style="text-align: center;">s106 sewer connection - approval letters issued within target [21 days (Statutory)]</p> <p>A technical approval or rejection will be issued within a period of 21 days commencing either (i) on the day after receipt of a full application, or (ii) if the application is incomplete and/or no payment has been received with the application, on the day after all the required information and payment have been received.</p> <p>An application is full when all the required information and any required payment have been received.</p> <p>A rejection specifies the reasons for the rejection and the steps required to rectify any issues identified.</p> <p>Reporting should include: All new housing development connections Domestic housing extension connections Connections to sewer made to replace septic tank drainage</p> <p>Excluded are: Highway drainage connections Correction of misconnections</p>
S9.1 PERF	<p style="text-align: center;">s106 sewer connection - rejection letters issued within target [21 days (Statutory)]</p> <p>A technical approval or rejection will be issued within a period of 21 days commencing either (i) on the day after receipt of a full application, or (ii) if the application is incomplete and/or no payment has been received with the application, on the day after all the required information and payment have been received.</p> <p>An application is full when all the required information and any required payment have been received.</p> <p>A rejection specifies the reasons for the rejection and the steps required to rectify any issues identified.</p> <p>Reporting should include: All new housing development connections Domestic housing extension connections Connections to sewer made to replace septic tank drainage</p> <p>Excluded are: Highway drainage connections Correction of misconnections</p>