



# T2AT

Supporting Document F-2: Efficiency of Spend

## Notice

### Position Statement

- This document has been produced as the part of the process set out by RAPID for the development of the Strategic Resource Options (SROs). This is a regulatory gated process allowing there to be control and appropriate scrutiny on the activities that are undertaken by the water companies to investigate and develop efficient solutions on behalf of customers to meet future drought resilience challenges.
- This report forms part of suite of documents that make up the 'Gate 2 submission.' That submission details all the work undertaken by Thames Water and Affinity Water in the ongoing development of the proposed SROs. The intention of this stage is to provide RAPID with an update on the concept design, feasibility, cost estimates and programme for the schemes, allowing decisions to be made on their progress and future funding requirements.
- Should a scheme be selected and confirmed in the companies' final Water Resources Management Plan, in most cases it would need to enter a separate process to gain permission to build and run the final solution. That could be through either the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 or the Planning Act 2008 development consent order process. Both options require the designs to be fully appraised and in most cases an environmental statement to be produced. Where required that statement sets out the likely environmental impacts and what mitigation is required.
- Community and stakeholder engagement is crucial to the development of the SROs. Some high level activity has been undertaken to date. Much more detailed community engagement and formal consultation is required on all the schemes at the appropriate point. Before applying for permission Thames Water and Affinity Water will need to demonstrate that they have presented information about the proposals to the community, gathered feedback and considered the views of stakeholders. We will have regard to that feedback and, where possible, make changes to the designs as a result.
- The SROs are at a very early stage of development, despite some options having been considered for several years. The details set out in the Gate 2 documents are still at a formative stage and consideration should be given to that when reviewing the proposals. They are for the purposes of allocating further funding not seeking permission.

### Disclaimer

This document has been written in line with the requirements of the RAPID Gate 2 Guidance and to comply with the regulatory process pursuant to Thames Water's and Affinity Water's statutory duties. The information presented relates to material or data which is still in the course of completion. Should the solution presented in this document be taken forward, Thames Water and Affinity Water will be subject to the statutory duties pursuant to the necessary consenting process, including environmental assessment and consultation as required. This document should be read with those duties in mind.

## Contents

<b>Notice</b>	<b>1-2</b>
<b>Figures and Tables</b>	<b>1-3</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1-4</b>
1.1 Context and Purpose of document	1-4
1.2 Structure and content of this document	1-4
<b>2. Cost Efficiency for Gate 2</b>	<b>2-4</b>
2.1 Introduction	2-4
2.2 Cost breakdown for Gate 2 work	2-4
2.3 Efficiency of Gate 2 spend	2-9
2.3.1 Procurement Efficiency	2-11
<b>3. Proposed cost forecast for Gate 3 Checkpoint</b>	<b>3-15</b>

## Figures and Tables

Table 2.1: Deflationary factors used for actual cost calculations .....	2-5
Table 2.2: Gate 2 Efficiency of Spend Summary (as per RAPID template) .....	2-6
Table 2.3: Gate 2, Estimated cost Breakdown of additional work on BRI option.....	2-7
Table 2.4: Feasibility Assessment and Concept Design, breakdown of Gate 2 costs .....	2-8
Table 2.5: Mapping of Efficiency initiatives to Gate 2 Work Packages.....	2-10
Table 2.6: Procurement approach followed for technical workstreams .....	2-12
Table 3.1: T2AT Forecast Costs to Gate 3 Checkpoint 1 .....	3-15

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Context and Purpose of document

1.1 The Gate 2 submission for T2AT consists of a wide range of technical supporting documents, in order to provide RAPID with the evidence required to assess the robustness and completeness of the analysis completed to Gate 2.

1.2 This document is Supporting Document F-2, Cost Efficiency report.

1.3 It provides an assessment of the efficiency of the costs incurred up to Gate 2 and an estimate of the costs to deliver Gate 3. It should be noted that this information is based upon the current project scope and known issues only, as required to meet the requirements set out by RAPID for Gate 2. Therefore, it should be treated as indicative and will be subject to change as the project progresses.

### 1.2 Structure and content of this document

1.4 This document is structured as follows:

- Section 2 provides details of the costs required to enable the efficient delivery of the Gate 2 activities
- Section 3 details the proposed costs for the next phase of the project (i.e. to RAPID Gate 3). It should be read in conjunction with Supporting Document F-1 – Project Delivery Plan, which details the scope and programme for the next phase of the project.

## 2. Cost Efficiency for Gate 2

### 2.1 Introduction

2.1 This section is split into two parts: The first documents the magnitude of the costs to Gate 2 and the second explains the efficiency of those costs.

### 2.2 Cost breakdown for Gate 2 work

2.2 The costs between Gate 1 and Gate 2 are presented in the format specified by RAPID in Table 2.2 below. For accurate comparison with the Final Determination allowance, as requested by RAPID, actual costs are deflated back to a 2017/18 cost base using Thames Water's Internal Business Plan (IBP) deflationary factors, based upon the CPIH (November 2019 dataset) index and the timing of delivery of each costed activity (see Table 2.1 below).

2.3 As standard for Thames Water, and as applied at Gate 1, where applicable company overhead has been charged to the elements of the company's spend with the overhead allocated in proportion to the workstream costs.

Table 2.1: Deflationary factors used for actual cost calculations

AMP7	Deflation Factors *
Year 1 (2020/21)	0.9469
Year 2 (2021/22)	0.9283
Year 3 (2022/23)	0.9102

\* from actual costs back to 2017/18 cost base

- 2.4 Overall, the costs to Gate 2 are £1.81M, which is £60k (3%) below the RAPID Final Determination allowance for this SRO.
- 2.5 The cost allowances to produce the Gate 2 submission were provided in Ofwat’s Final Determination documentation<sup>1</sup>. Overall, as shown in Table 2.2, the forecast spend to Gate 2 represents an underspend of approximately £50k under the funded Development Allowance, allowing for the underspend at Gate 1. The underspend is achieved even with the additional work that has had to be done on the additional solution that was identified in the emerging draft WRSE regional plan, as discussed within the main Gate 2 document (the BRI option). This work was required to achieve the required level of technical detail at Gate 2 and ensure consistency between the options.
- 2.6 We estimate that the cost of the additional work required for Gate 2, due to the extension of the agreed Gate 1 scope to include a second solution, to be approximately £380k (17/18 prices). A breakdown of these costs is provided in Table 2.3. Overall, if these additional costs are excluded, our costs to Gate 2 would be £1.44M, well below the development allowance, showing an efficiency of 23%.

<sup>1</sup> PR19-final-determinations-Strategic-regional-water-resource-solutions-appendix.pdf (ofwat.gov.uk)

Table 2.2: Gate 2 Efficiency of Spend Summary (as per RAPID template)

Category	Activity	Expenditure (£, 2017-2018 prices)	% of Total Expenditure	Description of Activity	RAPID Guidance
Programme & Project Management	Planning, management, governance and assurance of the project	162,254	8.9%	Programme Manager, Project controls and programming support, Assurance, Project Director and Executive governance	Detail costs for all activities associated with programme management and governance, day-to-day project management (including costs for any external project managers utilised), and assurance.
Feasibility Assessment and Concept Design	All engineering design and feasibility investigations	694,227	38.0%	Engineering design, geotechnical review, client technical direction, cost and carbon estimating	Detail all costs for activities associated with undertaking a feasibility assessment and initial concept design.
Option benefits development and appraisal	Analysis of potential benefits from the scheme	49,650	2.7%	Water resources modelling, DO assessment, long-term utilisation analysis, WRSE investment modelling (sensitivity), cost-benefit analysis and NCA	Detail costs for all activities associated with development of the options benefits and impacts (water resource, carbon, and wider best value, plus direct costs associated with the appraisal of the option against sub-options or alternatives). Relevant assessments should be consistent with the water resources planning guidelines for 2024.
Environmental Assessment	Appraisal of environmental impacts and initial mitigation strategies, including engagement with environmental regulators	355,431	19.5%	EA and NE costs, water quality modelling, WFD, desk-based assessments of high risk environmental issues, initial HRA, licensing strategy	Detail costs for any environmental assessments, such as Strategic Environmental Assessments, Habitat Risks Assessments, and other activities such as considering in-combination effects and assessing environmental risk. Include regulator costs for the Environment Agency and Natural England.
Data Collection, Sampling, and Pilot Trials	All field based sampling and data collection	362,167	19.8%	Aquatic ecological surveys, water quality survey and algal surveys	Detail costs for any activities related to data collection, sampling, and pilot trials, such as drinking water quality sampling and considerations and monitoring,
Procurement Strategy	Consideration of options for procurement of scheme	85,246	4.7%	Strategic review of procurement routes, client governance, external advisory services and steering group on commercial matters	Detail costs for any activities associated with developing the procurement strategy, including assessment for potential direct procurement for customers' delivery.
Planning Strategy	Consideration of options to consent the scheme	40,153	2.2%	Strategic planning review and DCO strategy, land access and acquisition advice	Detail costs for all activities associated with planning strategy and the pre-planning application activity plan, such as land referencing, field surveys, environmental permitting plans.
Stakeholder Engagement	All engagement activity and customer preference studies	34,096	1.9%	Customer research and preference studies, stakeholder lead for both partner companies, PR support for engagement process, support to WRSE engagement processes	Detail costs for all activities associated with customer and stakeholder engagement related to the solution.
Legal	Legal advice, as required	41,709	2.3%	Legal advice on various issues and policies, including document review	Detail costs associated with any legal activities related to the solution.
Other					Detail costs associated with any other activities relevant to solution development for gate 2 that are not covered in the above categories.
<b>Total</b>		<b>£1,824,934</b>	<b>100%</b>		
<b>Gate 2 Allowance</b>		<b>£1,870,000</b>	-		<i>Including Gate 1 underspend</i>
<b>Gate Underspend</b>		<b>-£45,066</b>	<b>-2.41%</b>		

Table 2.3: Gate 2, Estimated cost Breakdown of additional work on BRI option

Category	Work package reference	Expenditure (£, 2017-2018 prices)	% of Total Expenditure	Description of Activity
Programme & Project Management	WP10; WP19, CE01; WP22	£60,000	16%	Project management of new tasks, governance, additional technical and external assurance for additional documents / analysis completed
Feasibility Assessment and Concept Design	WP7, CE02	£230,000	61%	Engineering concept design for T2AT Beckton solution
Option benefits development and appraisal				
Environmental Assessment	WP12, CE04 WP14, CE01	£70,000	18%	Additional WFD assessment Additional environmental appraisal (and associated documentation) for T2AT Beckton solution
Data Collection, Sampling, and Pilot Trials				
Procurement Strategy				
Planning Strategy				
Stakeholder Engagement				
Legal	WP18	£20,000	5%	Estimated additional costs for additional legal review of Gate 2 documents and planning strategy
Other				
<b>Total</b>		<b>£380,000</b>	<b>100%</b>	

2.7 In accordance with RAPID requirements, a more detailed breakdown is provided for any cost item that exceeds £500k. For this SRO at Gate 2, this applies to Feasibility Assessment and Concept Design. The breakdown of spend in this WBS is shown in Table 2.4 below.

Table 2.4: Feasibility Assessment and Concept Design, breakdown of Gate 2 costs

Activity	Spend	% total	Justification or need
Technical studies - options refinement	£102,465	15%	Options refinement to screen Gate 1 shortlisted options and develop working solution for leading two solutions
Technical studies - carbon	£7,992	1%	Analysis of carbon footprint and future mitigation opportunities to inform risks to targets for net zero carbon emissions
Technical studies - concept design (pipelines)	£90,806	13%	To update scheme to reflect latest constraints and information, to confirm costs, to inform environmental impact appraisal. Based upon combined costs for both solutions (BRI and LTR).
Technical studies - concept design (process)	£50,936	7%	
Technical studies - concept design (civils)	£131,689	19%	
Technical studies - concept design (M&E)	£91,924	13%	
Technical studies – geotechnical review	£35,262	5%	To update scheme to reflect latest geotechnical constraints and information, to confirm costs, to inform environmental impact appraisal
Technical support - costing and ECI	£19,733	3%	To ensure cost estimates reflect latest design, remain aligned with options within WRMP24 and reflect latest available information <sup>2</sup> .
Technical support - technical management and reporting	£148,709	21%	Oversight and management of all design tasks and technical analysis, to ensure delivery to required levels of safety, quality, time and cost
Partner company technical guidance	£14,710	2%	Governance and oversight from partner companies to ensure adherence to technical design standards and requirements
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£694,227</b>	<b>100%</b>	

<sup>2</sup> Note: there has been limited input from contractors during this phase, with focus on early contractor involvement (ECI) planned for next phase of works

### 2.3 Efficiency of Gate 2 spend

2.8 The efficiency of the spend to Gate 2 has been assured through the application of a series of control mechanisms throughout the procurement, delivery and reporting of the required technical services. These control mechanisms include:

- The approach(es) taken to procurement – both in terms of how we specified work and how we procured it between the project partners
- Cross-SRO working and integration with WRSE regional modelling
- Control and governance of change

2.9 Efficiency to Gate 2 has been derived using the following specific approaches:

- The work undertaken is aligned to RAPID's requirements. Only work packages and scope that is directly required to deliver the Gate 2 submission or to avoid programme risks for Gate 3 have been applied. This results in a very targeted scope of work.
- Shared methodologies continued to be developed for Gate 2, across numerous SROs. Shared methodology and application reduces technical work effort (standard approaches, templates, outputs etc); no need to assure bespoke methodologies across all SROs, driving consistency with other SROs for Gate 2 submission. For Gate 2, good examples include a study into generic decarbonisation opportunities across SROs, aligned and consistency approaches to options appraisal, a standard methodology for in-combination environmental assessment for the SEA work package, a benefits assessment methodology common across SESRO and T2AT, common water quality modelling methodology and approach across all River Thames SROs and common use of the WRSE Regional System Simulation (RSS) model for Deployable Output analysis across Thames SROs.
- Integrated use of the WRSE modelling team and models. The WRSE Investment Model has been used to help explore the sensitivity of the need and timing of this specific SRO. Use of WRSE data and models helps reduce technical work effort and time required to assess options for Gate 2.
- Implementation of common procurement principles. Standardised rules for the procurement of services on behalf of multiple project partners has helped to provide best value for money. This has been delivered through the continued application of the Gate 1 prioritised hierarchy of standard procurement approaches, helping to drive competition and efficiency into external procurement by whichever project partner was best placed to procure each work package. This also allows shared governance over the procurement of technical services across the project partners, which drives accountable efficiency into the process.
- Use of competitive procurement and qualitative benchmarking. Many of the key external support services has been procured using competitive approaches, with the majority going via framework mini-bid processes. Where direct award was

used, for example due to the highly specialised nature of the work required, qualitative benchmarking and challenge using professional judgement against similar previous work packages ensured efficiency.

- Procurement of work packages across multiple SROs. Several work packages have been procured on behalf of multiple SROs, to drive efficiency into both procurement and delivery (economies of scale for contractors, fewer contracts to let and manage and fewer consultancy interfaces). Examples include environmental and water quality surveys, water quality modelling, algal experimentation, River Thames licensing strategy, commercial and procurement support and 2<sup>nd</sup> line technical assurance for environmental deliverables, which were procured across multiple SROs. Work packages for Project Management, Planning and land strategy and 3<sup>rd</sup> line external assurance were procured centrally for SESRO and T2AT combined.
- Rigorous application of Project Management controls. Robust control implemented by the Project Manager and overseen by the Programme Management Board (PMB) helps prevent ‘scope creep’ and cost escalation. All contract extensions were approved by PMB prior to implementation. This has been particularly required on the larger and more complex work packages, where the scope is often ‘emergent’ as work is undertaken and hence the risk of scope creep is greatest.

2.10 These efficiency measures are mapped to the principle work packages procured for Gate 2 in Table 2.5 below.

Table 2.5: Mapping of Efficiency initiatives to Gate 2 Work Packages

Key work package	Scope aligned to Gate 2 needs	Shared methodologies	Integrated with WRSE	Common procurement principles	Competitive procurement	Qualitative benchmarking	Multi-SRO procurement	Robust change control
WP1 – water quality modelling	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	✓
WP3 – ecological monitoring	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	
WP4 – water quality monitoring	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	
WP6 – options appraisal	✓	✓		✓		✓		
WP7 – engineering support	✓			✓	✓			✓
WP8 – water resources modelling	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
WP9 – planning and land strategy	✓			✓		✓	✓	

Key work package	Scope aligned to Gate 2 needs	Shared methodologies	Integrated with WRSE	Common procurement principles	Competitive procurement	Qualitative benchmarking	Multi-SRO procurement	Robust change control
WP10 – project management	✓			✓		✓	✓	
WP11 – customer research / engagement	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
WP12 – aquatic environmental support	✓			✓		✓	✓	✓
WP14 – terrestrial environmental support	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
WP17 – commercial and procurement	✓			✓	✓		✓	
WP18 – legal support	✓			✓	✓		✓	
WP19 – external Board assurance	✓			✓	✓		✓	
WP22 – external technical assurance	✓			✓	✓		✓	
External stakeholder costs – EA, NE	✓			✓		✓	✓	

### 2.3.1 Procurement Efficiency

2.11 We have applied three key principles to ensure efficient procurement of the support services required for the Gate 1 submission:

- Agreement of a standardised procurement process across SROs, to help drive efficiency;
- Application of competitive procurement approaches, wherever possible, to help drive competition into the procurement of support services and ensure efficiency of total spend;
- Procurement across SROs, for aligned work packages, to help drive efficiency across common tasks.

2.12 The common procurement principles developed for Gate 1 were applied for this latest phase of the SRO project, to create efficiency in factors such as the development of procurement documents of technical specifications, approval and assessment of tenders.

2.13 In accordance with these guidelines, where possible, competitive procurement approaches have been adopted to ensure best value for money across the workstreams. Due to timescale constraints, formal OJEU or subsequent UK e-

notification procurement on behalf of partner companies was not possible in most instances, but mini-tender on existing company frameworks have been utilised where possible. The key external support work packages procured for this SRO, and the procurement approach followed, are detailed in Table 2.6 below. The purchasing partner was selected on the basis of which organisation was best placed to most competitively procure the required work.

- 2.14 As far as practical and efficient to do so, procurement activity has sought to distribute evenly the value of packages between the partner companies to maintain a broadly equal spend profile at the end of each gate. However, it has also been acknowledged that other factors needed to be considered in selecting a company framework such as number and capability of suppliers.

Table 2.6: Procurement approach followed for technical workstreams

Work package ref.	Purchasing partner	Procurement approach followed	Comments
<b>WP1 – water quality modelling</b>	Thames Water	Competitive mini-tender under existing TW f/w (FA1300, Lot 1)	Work procured on behalf of all Thames SROs to help drive efficiency in delivery and reporting.
<b>WP3 – ecological monitoring</b>	Thames Water	Direct award to existing framework supplier (FA1300, Lot 3), hence staff rates used had previously been through a competitive tender process to win place on framework. Efficient procurement across multiple SROs covering wide survey area (Severn, Thames and Lee Valley) to benefit multiple projects.	Desire to achieve technical continuity with Gate 1 team (maintain consistency in survey locations, methodologies and permissions)
<b>WP4 – water quality monitoring</b>	Thames Water		
<b>WP6 – options appraisal</b>	Affinity Water	Direct award to existing framework supplier (AFW professional service f/w), hence staff rates used had previously been through a competitive tender process to win place on framework.	Desire to achieve technical continuity with Gate 1 team, reduce downtime for mobilisation of new supplier and retain knowledge
<b>WP7 – engineering support</b>	Affinity Water	Competitive mini-tender under existing AFW professional service f/w	
<b>WP8 – water resources modelling</b>	Thames Water	Direct award to existing framework supplier (FA1300, Lot 3), hence staff rates used had previously been through a competitive tender process to win place on framework.	Desire to achieve technical continuity with Gate 1 (and WRSE) modelling team; highly specialised services
<b>WP9 – planning and land strategy</b>	Thames Water	Direct award to existing framework supplier (Providers of Planning Studies Services & planning reports for Major Projects f/w), hence staff rates used had	Desire to achieve technical continuity with Gate 1 advisory team and familiarity with

Work package ref.	Purchasing partner	Procurement approach followed	Comments
		previously been through a competitive tender process to win place on framework.	previous land referencing and compensation analysis
<b>WP10 – project management</b>	Affinity Water	Extension to Gate 1 competitive mini-tender process via existing professional services framework. Procurement of single Programme Manager across multiple SROs (SESRO and T2AT) to ensure efficient delivery.	Need to engage Assistant PM for Gate 2 works, to ensure coordination across both SESRO and T2AT, but <2 FTE total to ensure efficient delivery
<b>WP11 – customer research / engagement</b>	Affinity Water	Competitive tender, 4 tenderers; Procurement on behalf of all WRSE Companies to ensure consistency and efficiency in delivery of work package	Costs subsequently assigned pro-rata across all WRSE Companies and associated SROs
<b>WP12 – aquatic environmental support</b>	Thames Water	Direct award to existing framework supplier (FA1300, Lot 3), hence staff rates used had previously been through a competitive tender process to win place on framework.	Desire to achieve technical continuity with Gate 1 team, reduce downtime for mobilisation of new supplier and retain knowledge; services procured across SESRO and T2AT services to gain efficiency in delivery
<b>WP14 – terrestrial environmental support</b>	Affinity Water	Competitive mini-tender under existing AFW professional service f/w), 2 tenderers.	
<b>WP17 – commercial and procurement</b>	Thames Water	Competitive mini-tender under existing TW f/w (FA1300, Lot 1), 2 tenderers	Work procured on behalf of 3 No. Thames SROs to help drive efficiency in delivery and reporting.
<b>WP18 – legal support</b>	Thames Water	Competitive tender to appoint Combined External Legal Team (CELT) across Thames Water; work packages direct awarded under this f/w	CELT deliver work packages on a 'best person for the job' to ensure quality of product; work packages generally let across multiple SROs
<b>WP19 – external Board assurance</b>	Thames Water	Competitive mini-tender under existing TW f/w (FA1300, Lot 1), 5 tenderers	Work procured jointly on behalf of SESRO and T2AT, to help drive efficiency in delivery and reporting.
<b>WP22 – external technical assurance</b>	Thames Water	Competitive mini-tender under existing TW f/w (FA1300, Lots 1 and 3)	Work procured jointly on behalf of SESRO, T2AT, T2ST and London Reuse, to help drive efficiency in delivery and reporting.

2.15 As noted previously, a number of these work packages have been procured on behalf of multiple SROs, to drive efficiency into both the procurement process

(fewer contracts to let and manage) and also into the management and delivery of the associated services (fewer consultancy interfaces). This has included:

- Environmental and water quality surveys and water quality modelling, with resultant savings on programme management, survey logistics, technical oversight, liaison with regulators and reporting.
- Programme Management, with resultant efficiency saving on aspects such as PMB reporting, meetings, team management, cost reporting and schedule management.
- Planning and land strategy, with resultant efficiency savings on reporting and project management.
- Assurance, with resultant efficiency savings on reporting and project management.
- External legal advice, with resultant efficiency savings on workshops and reporting.
- Commercial strategy, with resultant efficiency savings on workshops, management, coordination and consistency between partners and reporting.

### 3. Proposed cost forecast for Gate 3 Checkpoint

- 3.1 Due to scheme uncertainties post deferral, the T2AT forecast costs have been provided up until the Gate 3 Checkpoint only and are based upon an initial appraisal of the work breakdown structure for Phase 3 of the project. An update to the cost forecast for T2AT’s Gate 3 activity will be confirmed to RAPID on submission to Gate 3 Checkpoint 1. The project costs are based upon a combination of benchmarking to similar work undertaken during previous phases and expert judgement. Input has been sought from the supply chain on the estimated costs of the main technical work packages, but the costs are not, at this stage, based upon detailed supplier proposals or the outcome of a tender process.
- 3.2 The forecast should therefore be treated as an estimate. It will be reviewed and refined on a monthly basis, throughout Gate 2 update, as work package scope and costs are agreed with suppliers. Governance by the PMB will ensure adherence to RAPID Final Determination allowances.
- 3.3 The forecast costs are based upon an assumption that the formal partnering arrangements remain as they are for Gate 2. It is expected that these will be reviewed ahead of Gate 3 Checkpoint 1 and any proposed changes discussed and agreed with RAPID.
- 3.4 The forecast costs are shown in Table 3.1 below, categorised in accordance with the Gate 2 cost breakdown for consistency.

Table 3.1: T2AT Forecast Costs to Gate 3 Checkpoint 1

Category	Expected Activity Summary	Expenditure (£, 17-18 prices)	% of Total Expenditure
<b>Programme &amp; Project Management</b>	Project management; governance, direction and guidance from within partner companies; procurement support; assurance	519,275	25%
<b>Feasibility Assessment and Concept Design</b>	Further options appraisal for key residual uncertainties to de-risk future delivery, particularly choice of WTW site; ongoing targeted design development; input into engagement	470,750	22%
<b>Option benefits development and appraisal</b>	Cost benefit appraisal for full scheme; cost-benefit analysis on key options / decisions	12,897	1%
<b>Environmental Assessment</b>	Specify targeted baseline survey; Inputs into options appraisal; inputs into engagements	200,937	10%
<b>Data Collection, Sampling, and Pilot Trials</b>	Extension of G2 monitoring on R.Thames; initial targeted environmental survey(s); site surveys including boreholes, if possible	414,894	20%

Category	Expected Activity Summary	Expenditure (£, 17-18 prices)	% of Total Expenditure
<b>Procurement Strategy</b>	Initial VfM assessment and development of draft procurement plan; initial engagement with Ofwat	60,137	3%
<b>Planning Strategy</b>	Survey planning permissions; initial engagement with PINS (if required); safeguarding routes / sites if possible particularly WTW site	152,216	7%
<b>Stakeholder Engagement</b>	Costs for non-stat. engagements, third party / Regulator costs; ongoing technical engagement with regulators; ongoing negotiation and engagement with landowners	120,052	6%
<b>Legal</b>	Review of documents; survey licences; legal counsel	157,130	7%
<b>Other</b>		0	0%
<b>Total</b>		<b>2,108,289</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Gate 3 Allowance</b>		3,815,000	-
<b>Forecast Gate Underspend</b>	<i>Forecast position at Gate 3 Checkpoint 1</i>	<b>1,706,711</b>	<b>45%</b>

**Affinity Water** 

