MINUTES of the Customer Challenge Group



Held over Microsoft Teams On 31 March, 9am – 2pm

Present:

Sukhvinder Kaur-Stubbs	Chair of Customer Challenge Group	SK-S
Nisha Arora	Financial Conduct Authority	NA
David Brindle	Ambient Support	DB
Jeremy Crook OBE	Action for Race Equality	JC
Peter Daw	Greater London Authority	PD
Dr Charlotte Duke	London Economics	CD
Baroness Grey-Thompson DBE, DL	ukactive	BGT
Councillor Adam Jogee	Haringey Local Authority	AJ
Kay Lacey	Pang Valley Flood Forum	KL
Sarah Powell	Environment Agency	SP
Tiger de Souza MBE	National Trust	TDS
Councillor Dr Pete Sudbury	Oxfordshire County Council	PS
Doug Taylor	CCW	DT
Monica Wilson	HM Treasury	MW

Thames Water:

Triarrice Trateri		
Cathryn Ross	Strategy and Regulation Affair Director	CR
George Mayhew	Corporate Affairs Director	GM
Jonathan Read	Director of Regulatory Policy and Investigations	JR
Nevil Muncaster	Strategic Resources Director	NM
Lesley Tait	Water Resources Engagement Manager	LT
Richard Aylard	Sustainability Director	RA
Alex Nickson	Water Resources and Growth Lead	AN
Jennifer Genevieve	Head of Regulatory Engagement & Policy	JG
Mariana Simpson	Stakeholder Relationship Engagement Manager	MS

External attendees:

Mike Woolgar	Chair of London Flooding IEG	MW
--------------	------------------------------	----

Agenda Item No.		<u>Action</u>
1.	Apologies / Declaration of interests	
	Apologies were noted for latter part of the meeting. There were no additional declarations of interest recorded.	
2.	Minutes and Matters arising	

3. Approach to trade offs

SS provided initial thoughts on the Approach to trade-offs paper provided ahead of the meeting. CR set out the context explaining that TW will not be able to do everything in AMP8 and assuming that bills will not be increasing, the overall amount of revenue which TW can spend will not be dissimilar from the current period. Given the cost of running the business it will leave a relatively narrow amount of money to deliver improvements. CR was keen for the CCG to help TW to explore how TW should engage with its customers to inform the trade-offs decisions based on the CCG's insights and expertise, noting some of the key issues which TW needs to address.

The discussion focused on various approaches (e.g. Citizens assembly / jury, potential learning some innovative ideas from local authorities, GLA's engagement on longer term plans and via clear comms to capture wider audience); assumptions over future bills and efficiencies; and the reasons for customer engagement – will it genuinely drive the priorities and inform business decisions rather than trying to validate choices already made.

The CCG were keen to understand whether there is a trade-off between the priorities or how much / less of each can TW deliver and whether some trade-offs can be done over time. It was noted that it is important for customers to understand statutory requirements vs the areas where there were choices. It was suggested that developing potential scenarios would help to drive meaningful conversations.

CR outlined the timeline for identifying the potential scope and customer engagement over summer.

It was suggested both sub groups on customer engagement and longer term planning will engage on the topics, recognising the importance of correct sequencing.

Action: PD to connect CR with GLA Engagement director

4. CCG priorities / forward plan

SS shared an updated list of priorities with newly proposed subgroups. The membership and leads of each sub group have been noted.

The discussion focused on the process, timing, priorities, and dependencies across the subgroups. It was suggested that the CCG's report should include sections on each subgroup. There was recognition across the group that coordination across the sub groups will be very important.

The Chair will reflect on the discussion with the subgroup leads and through reviewing the forward programme with the TW team over next couple of weeks. It was noted that outputs of the CCG sub groups need to be owned by the full group.

The importance of tracking CCG issues / actions over time will be important and it was agreed to have a live log of issues.

Action: MS to share the existing version of What Customer Want document. (Complete – see Matters arising from CCG 31 March 2022)

Action: MS to share the link to the CCG issues / actions log (Complete – see Matters arising from CCG 31 March 2022)

5. WRMP and WRSE

NM provided an overview of Water Resource Planning, explaining the challenge, the strategic planning framework and the strategic resource options which will ensure a secure water supply, followed by an overview of WRSE and the South East plan as well noting future engagement and consultation alongside future CCG discussions. As a part of the presentation NM explained the inter-regional collaboration, timeline for regional plan development, current assumptions and a summary of the draft emerging plan.

The discussion focused on water recycling and its connection to microplastics, assumptions and plan for decision making for the proposed SROs. The CCG was keen to understand the timelines and customer engagement activities on a regional and company level. Further discussion focused on concerns over the independence of the governance structure, current planning assumptions and other options / contributing factors (e.g. demand management / reducing leakage), WRSE consultation, customer research and the need to increase consumers' understanding of the value of water from trusted source.

Action: TW to share customer research regarding potential changes to sources of drinking water. (Complete – see Matters arising from CCG 31 March 2022)

Action: TW to share information regarding Growth forecasts (Complete – see Matters arising from CCG 31 March 2022)

Action: TW to share WRSE best value criteria and metrics (Complete – see Matters arising from CCG 31 March 2022)

Action: TW to share information on the Strategic resource options (SROs) (Complete – see Matters arising from CCG 31 March 2022)

6. Reducing river pollution

RA provided an overview of TW ambition to reduce river pollutions covering causes of pollution, Spills (untreated discharges, compliance with permits, eliminating pollution incidents, progress against the plan, building resilience and working in partnership). The slides built on pre-reading material shared ahead of the meeting.

The discussion focused on incident causes and event monitoring; TW's ambition to eliminate spills and the prioritisation of sensitive catchments by 2050; the importance of building capability and capacity of employees; collaboration and incentives with developers. Further discussion focused on trade-offs, the future DWMP and collaboration with customers to tackle misconnections.

7. London Flooding independent review

AN introduced the session by setting up the context for the London flooding during summer 2021. AN covered the volume of rain, TW's internal review which followed the flooding and the decisions to set up an independent review which MW is leading. AN also provided an overview of the sewer flooding resilience programme and Community Flood Action Plan programme.

The discussion focused on weather forecast channels and the prediction and process for identifying impacted customers including sewer flood history which will provide evidence for PR24

MW introduced the Independent Expert Group (IEG) and explained the IEG's scope including the timeline, communications and engagement completed so far. MW stepped through the work

	completed as part of the Stage 1 and Stage 2 of the review noting that the Stage 1 report has already been published on the London flooding review website.	
	The discussion focused on the current overall management of surface water; the importance of overall co-ordination for residents going forward to avoid duplication, and the understanding of communications— should residents be prepared for repeating events.	
	The Chair followed up the meeting with key summary points via email.	
8.	AOB	
	Next meeting 21 April at Witney STW.	