

## Fair Water Connections Assessment, of (English) Water Companies Compliance Against the Ofwat Adoption Code Requirements ( Version 2 Update 23 January 2018)

As the initial set of requirements in the Ofwat Adoption Code (detailed in Section B1.8) should have been in place by 15 January 2018 Fair Water Connections has done their own assessment of (English) company compliance. The details of our assessment are given below along with examples of where we consider that best practice, against the evaluation categories, is being demonstrated.

The outcome of our analysis is that our assessment place the 15 companies analysed as follows:

FWC Adoption Code Compliance Assessment Summary				
Assessment Category	Inadequate	Requires Improvement	Good	Excellent
No of Companies	6 (40%)	4 (27%)	5 (33%)	0

### 1. Assessment Details

Water Company [1]	Website Promotes Developer Choice [4a]	Follows National Process & Provides Forms etc. [4b]	Info for contestable design provided [4c]	Min Service Standards defined [4d]	Redress scheme in place [4e]	Complaints info with named contacts provided [4f]	Totals [2]	Assessment Category [3]
United Utilities	Y	Y	P	Y	N	Y	1.5	Good
Severn Trent	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	2	Good
Thames	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	2	Good
Yorkshire	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	2	Good
South East	Y	N	N	Y	Y	&	2	Good
South West	Y	Y	P	N	N	P	3	Req Imp'nt
Northumbrian	P	Y	Y	N	N	N	3.5	Req Imp'nt
Wessex	Y	P	N	P	N	P	3.5	Req Imp'nt
Bristol	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	4	Req Imp'nt
Southern	N	P	Y	N	N	N	4.5	Inadequate
Portsmouth	Y	N	N	N	P	N	4.5	Inadequate
Affinity	Y	N	N	P	N	N	4.5	Inadequate
Anglian	Y	N	N	N	N	N	5	Inadequate
Sutton & E Surrey	Y	N	N	N	N	N	5	Inadequate
South Staffs	P	N	N	N	N	N	5.5	Inadequate
Compliance	87%	47%	40%	33%	10%	33%		

#### Notes

1. Where companies are within the same group and have common approaches to procedures and publicity material their assessment has been combined. This applies to Northumbrian with Essex and Suffolk Water; to South West with Bournemouth Water; and South Staffs with Cambridge Water.
2. Assessment is based on FWC judgment as to whether what is available through water company websites either F - fully, or P – partially, or N does not satisfy the assessment requirements. The scoring is on the basis that F = 0, P = 0.5 and N = 1.

3. Assessment category is on the basis of 'Excellent' = no full failures; 'Good' = 1 or 2 failure; 'Requires Improvement' = 3 or 4 failures; and 'Inadequate' = more than 4 failures.
4. Assessment reviews (on company websites, or material accessible from websites):
  - a. If customer choice is outlined – i.e. whether provision alternatives are described before self-lay selection;
  - b. If latest CoP is fully implemented (requires compliance against standardised to national process without use of 'local addendums' or restrictions on 'contestable' works) with ready access to forms etc. provided;
  - c. Whether sufficient information is available to support SLPs being able to do their own designs;
  - d. Minimum service standards are stated with commitment to deliver against these (i.e. not just a reference to monitoring overall performance against the complete suite of Water UK published indicators);
  - e. If any form of redress provision is mentioned;
  - f. Whether complaints get directly routed to someone who can rectify any performance failures and phone number for named contacts (for the various process stages) provided. (*Email only contacts = Partial*).

## 2. Best Practice

Best practice against the FWC assessment criteria occurs when the following are satisfied.

### A. Website promotes developer choice

This should occur before any choices are made about who is to provide the new supplies;

See – Bristol Water - <https://www.bristolwater.co.uk/developers-and-slos/new-supplies-new-mains/self-lay/>

### B. Company follows national, standardised, process and provides full access to forms, and other necessary information.

This should endorse usage of latest Code of Practice (Version 3.1) and provide supplementary schedule of permissible materials and construction arrangements (and not reference an 'addendum' or seek to restrict the nationally agreed schedule of 'contestable' works).

See – Severn Trent Forms and Local Guidance - <https://www.stwater.co.uk/building-and-developing/new-site-developments/self-lay/>

### C. Information to facilitate SLPs doing designs (to company standards) is freely available.

See – Yorkshire Water -

[https://www.yorkshirewater.com/sites/default/files/Mains%20Design%20and%20Construction%20Guidelines\\_.pdf](https://www.yorkshirewater.com/sites/default/files/Mains%20Design%20and%20Construction%20Guidelines_.pdf) [To view this link may require copying into a browser].

### D. Minimum service standards are defined by the company themselves (i.e. commitment shown to delivering to standards rather than just indicating that performance gets reported to Water UK).

See – United Utilities - <https://www.unitedutilities.com/globalassets/documents/pdf/7710a-obtaining-water-supplies-booklet-2018-web-acc.pdf> (self-lay is on Page 9 onwards).

### E. Redress scheme in place, for when service standards are not being met.

See – South East Water - <https://wholesale.southeastwater.co.uk/get-help/new-connections/complaints-procedure-redress-arrangements>

### F. Complaints procedure goes beyond getting a written response in 10 days with named contacts (to discuss work) being provided. These should be sufficient for SLPs to know who to contact and to escalate complaints so that they can be speedily addressed.

See - Thames Water - <https://developers.thameswater.co.uk/Self-lay-providers/Contact-us>

Contact for more information about this assessment

Martyn Speight, Fair Water Connections Managing Coordinator

Email: [martyn.speight@fwconnections.org](mailto:martyn.speight@fwconnections.org), Phone: 07889187717