



Water Resources Management Plan 2024

Section 6 – Allowing for Risk & Uncertainty,
and Baseline Supply-Demand Balance

Contents

Background and Introduction	6
Key Guidance and Methodology Documents	8
Changes Between WRMP19 and WRMP24.....	10
Adaptive Planning.....	10
Requirement to Determine a ‘1 in 500-year’ Deployable Output	10
Our Calculation of Target Headroom	12
Uncertain Components Considered	14
Supply-side Uncertainty.....	16
S6 – Accuracy of Supply-side Data	17
S8 – Uncertainty of Impact of Climate Change on Source Yields	20
Demand-side Uncertainty.....	22
Demand Uncertainty Overview.....	22
D1 – Uncertainty in Base Year Data	24
D2 – Demand Forecast Variation.....	25
Household PCC uncertainty	25
Household population uncertainty.....	26
Non-household demand	27
D3 – Impact of climate change on demand.....	27
D4 – Uncertainty of demand management measures.....	29
Coronavirus Uncertainty.....	29
Model Outputs.....	30
Bringing Uncertainties Together.....	31
Adaptive Planning – Exclusion of ‘Double Counted’ Components	31
Risk Tolerance Profile	33
Minimum Threshold	35
Final Plan Target Headroom Approach	36
Results of Baseline Target Headroom Assessment	37
London DYAA	37
SWOX DYAA.....	38
SWOX DYCP.....	40
SWA DYAA	41
SWA DYCP	42
Kennet Valley DYAA	43
Kennet Valley DYCP	44

Guildford DYAA	45
Guildford DYCP	46
Henley DYAA	47
Henley DYCP	48
Baseline Supply-Demand Balance	49
Activity Within the Baseline Scenario	50
Baseline Supply-Demand Balance and Adaptive Planning	50
Demand	51
Environmental Destination	51
Climate Change	52
Supply-Demand Balance Scenarios	53
London DYAA	54
SWOX DYAA	60
SWOX DYCP	65
SWA DYAA	68
SWA DYCP	72
Kennet Valley DYAA	76
Kennet Valley DYCP	80
Guildford DYAA	84
Guildford DYCP	88
Henley DYAA	92
Henley DYCP	96

Figures

Figure 6-1: An example distribution that could be used in Headroom modelling	12
Figure 6-2: Example branched supply-demand balance (Source – WRSE)	15
Figure 6-3: Variance of Climate Change Scenario DO Impacts Around the Median – London WRZ, 2070 (2060-80)	21
Figure 6-4: Variance of Climate Change Scenario DO Impacts Around the Median– SWOX WRZ, 2070 (2060-80), DYAA DO	21
Figure 6-5: Overview of the analysis of uncertainty in demand forecasts	23
Figure 6-6: Illustration of PCC model coefficient uncertainty on PCC (percentage) and sensitivity to input variables	26
Figure 6-7: Measured non-household demand forecast uncertainty	27
Figure 6-8: Impacts of Climate Change on DYAA Demand	28
Figure 6-9: Impacts of Climate Change on DYCP Demand	29
Figure 6-10: Baseline demand forecast uncertainty spread – London WRZ	30
Figure 6-11: Different ‘Types’ of Target Headroom Used Across the Planning Period	32
Figure 6-12: London DYAA Target Headroom Profiles	37

Figure 6-13: SWOX DYAA Target Headroom Profiles	39
Figure 6-14: SWOX DYCP Target Headroom Profiles	40
Figure 6-15: SWA DYAA Target Headroom Profiles	41
Figure 6-16: SWA DYCP Target Headroom Profiles	42
Figure 6-17: Kennet Valley DYAA Target Headroom Profiles	43
Figure 6-18: Kennet Valley DYCP Target Headroom Profiles	44
Figure 6-19: Guildford DYAA Target Headroom Profiles	45
Figure 6-20: Guildford DYCP Target Headroom Profiles	46
Figure 6-21: Henley DYAA Target Headroom Profiles	47
Figure 6-22: Henley DYCP Target Headroom Profiles	48
Figure 6-23: London DYAA – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050 ..	56
Figure 6-24: SDB Situation Tree - London DYAA	58
Figure 6-25: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) – London DYAA	58
Figure 6-26: Baseline Supply & Demand - Situation 4, London DYAA	59
Figure 6-27: Baseline Supply & Demand (Incl. Drought Demand Savings - Situation 4, London DYAA	59
Figure 6-28: SWOX DYAA – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050 ...	61
Figure 6-29: SDB Situation Tree - SWOX DYAA	63
Figure 6-30: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - SWOX DYAA	63
Figure 6-31: Baseline Supply & Demand - Situation 4, SWOX DYAA	64
Figure 6-32: Baseline Supply & Demand (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - Situation 4, SWOX DYAA	64
Figure 6-33: SWOX DYCP – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050 ...	66
Figure 6-34: SDB Situation Tree - SWOX DYCP	67
Figure 6-35: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - SWOX DYCP	68
Figure 6-36: Baseline Supply & Demand (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - Situation 4, SWOX DYCP	68
Figure 6-37: SWA DYAA – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050	70
Figure 6-38: SDB Situation Tree - SWA DYAA	71
Figure 6-39: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - SWA DYAA	71
Figure 6-40: Baseline Supply & Demand - Situation 4, SWA DYAA	72
Figure 6-41: SWA DYCP – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050	74
Figure 6-42: SDB Situation Tree - SWA DYCP	75
Figure 6-43: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - SWA DYCP	75
Figure 6-44: Baseline Supply & Demand - Situation 4, SWA DYCP	76
Figure 6-45: Kennet Valley DYAA – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050	78
Figure 6-46: SDB Situation Tree - Kennet Valley DYAA	79
Figure 6-47: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - Kennet Valley DYAA	79
Figure 6-48: Baseline Supply & Demand - Situation 4, Kennet Valley DYAA	80
Figure 6-49: Kennet Valley DYCP – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050	82
Figure 6-50: SDB Situation Tree - Kennet Valley DYCP Scenario	83
Figure 6-51: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - Kennet Valley DYCP	83
Figure 6-52: Baseline Supply-demand Balance for Situation 4, Kennet Valley DYCP, rdWRMP24	84
Figure 6-53: Guildford DYAA – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050	86
Figure 6-54: SDB Situation Tree - Guildford DYAA	87

Figure 6-55: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - Guildford DYAA	87
Figure 6-56: Baseline Supply & Demand - Situation 4, Guildford DYAA	88
Figure 6-57: Guildford DYCP – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050	90
Figure 6-58: SDB Situation Tree - Guildford DYCP	91
Figure 6-59: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings - Guildford DYCP	91
Figure 6-60: Baseline Supply & Demand - Situation 4, Guildford DYCP	92
Figure 6-61: Henley DYAA – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050 ...	93
Figure 6-62: SDB Situation Tree - Henley DYAA Scenario.....	94
Figure 6-63: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - Henley DYAA.....	95
Figure 6-64: Baseline Supply & Demand - Situation 4, Henley DYAA.....	95
Figure 6-65: Henley DYCP – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050 ...	97
Figure 6-66: SDB Situation Tree - Henley DYCP.....	98
Figure 6-67: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - Henley DYCP	98
Figure 6-68: Baseline Supply & Demand - Situation 4, Henley DYCP.....	99

Tables

Table 6-1: An example of pseudo-random sampling being used to determine the aggregate impact of different uncertain variables	13
Table 6-2: Example Output from Monte Carlo Sampling	13
Table 6-3: Parameters Used in Groundwater Source Uncertainty Assessment	17
Table 6-4: 1 in 500-year Annual Average surface water DO uncertainty (% of WRZ DO)	19
Table 6-5: Uncertainty around long-term changes in demand brought about by coronavirus pandemic.....	30
Table 6-6: Risk Tolerance Profile Adopted in Target Headroom Modelling	34
Table 6-7: Target Headroom as % of DI – London DYAA.....	38
Table 6-8: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties – London	38
Table 6-9: Target Headroom as a % of DI – SWOX DYAA.....	39
Table 6-10: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties – SWOX DYAA	39
Table 6-11: Target Headroom as a % of DI – SWOX DYCP.....	40
Table 6-12: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties – SWOX DYCP	41
Table 6-13: Target Headroom as a % of DI - SWA DYAA.....	41
Table 6-14: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties – SWA DYAA.....	41
Table 6-15: Target Headroom as a % of DI – SWA DYCP	42
Table 6-16: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties – SWA DYCP	42
Table 6-17: Target Headroom as a% of DI – Kennet Valley DYAA	43
Table 6-18: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties– KV DYAA.....	43
Table 6-19: Target Headroom as a % of DI - Kennet Valley DYCP.....	44
Table 6-20: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties – Kennet Valley DYCP	44
Table 6-21: Target Headroom as a % of DI - Guildford DYAA	45
Table 6-22: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties – Guildford DYAA.....	45
Table 6-23: Target Headroom as a % of DI - Guildford DYCP	46
Table 6-24: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties – Guildford DYCP	46
Table 6-25: Target Headroom as a % of DI - Henley DYAA.....	47
Table 6-26: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties – Henley DYAA.....	47
Table 6-27: Target Headroom as a % of DI - Henley DYCP.....	48
Table 6-28: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties – Henley DYCP	48
Table 6-29: Scenarios considered within situation ‘tree’ for WRMP24.....	53

Table 6-30: SDB component comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24, London DYAA	55
Table 6-31: Baseline SDB Comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 – Situation 4 London DYAA. .	60
Table 6-32: SDB component comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 - SWOX DYAA.....	60
Table 6-33: Baseline SDB Comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) – Situation 4, SWOX DYAA.....	64
Table 6-34: SDB component comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 - SWOX DYCP	65
Table 6-35: Comparison Between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (Branch 4) Baseline Supply-Demand Balance for SWOX WRZ DYCP	68
Table 6-36: SDB component comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 - SWA DYAA	69
Table 6-37: Comparison Between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (Branch 4) Supply-Demand Balance for SWA WRZ DYAA.....	72
Table 6-38: SDB component comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 - SWA DYCP	73
Table 6-39: Comparison Between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (Branch 4) Supply-Demand Balance for SWA WRZ DYCP	76
Table 6-40: SDB component comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 - Kennet Valley DYAA	77
Table 6-41: Comparison Between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (Branch 4) Supply-Demand Balance for Kennet Valley WRZ DYAA.....	80
Table 6-42: SDB component comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 - Kennet Valley DYCP	81
Table 6-43: Comparison Between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (Branch 4) Supply-Demand Balance for Kennet Valley WRZ DYCP	84
Table 6-44: SDB component comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 - Guildford DYAA.....	85
Table 6-45: Comparison Between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (Branch 4) Supply-Demand Balance for Guildford WRZ DYAA	88
Table 6-46: SDB component comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 - Guildford DYCP	89
Table 6-47: Comparison Between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (Branch 4) Supply-Demand Balance for Guildford WRZ DYCP	92
Table 6-48: SDB component comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 - Henley DYAA	93
Table 6-49: Comparison Between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (Branch 4) Supply-Demand Balance for Henley WRZ DYAA.....	96
Table 6-50: SDBcomponent comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 - Henley DYCP	96
Table 6-51: Comparison Between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (Branch 4) Supply-Demand Balance for Henley WRZ DYCP	99

Background and Introduction

In this section we present our approach to risk and uncertainty and the baseline supply-demand balance position for each of our six Water Resource Zones (WRZs). As we have taken an adaptive planning approach, we do not have a single supply-demand balance profile, and instead have nine profiles of supply-demand balance for each WRZ.

An immediate and increasing supply-demand deficit is evident in the London and SWOX WRZs. All other WRZs start in a position of surplus, with later deficits appearing in all zones under some future scenarios.

In the shorter term, increasing deficits are caused by population growth and a need for us to provide a higher level of drought resilience.

In the longer term, deficits are driven by the impacts of climate change and licence reductions required to protect the environment.

- 6.1 Uncertainties are inherent within many aspects of water resources planning. Trying to establish supply capability under '1 in 500-year' drought conditions, predicting how many people will live within our supply area and how much water they will use, and determining the impact that climate change will have on the likelihood and severity of drought events all involve significant uncertainty. It is important that these uncertainties are acknowledged and incorporated into the planning process so that we do not either carry excessive risk or become too conservative and over-invest. In water resources planning, uncertainty is generally handled through the calculation of Target Headroom, defined as, ***"The minimum buffer that water companies are required to maintain between supply and demand in order to account for current and future uncertainties in supply and demand."***¹
- 6.2 We use a statistical technique called Monte Carlo analysis to examine the uncertainty associated with different components of our supply-demand balance, and to bring these together to give an appropriate allowance which accounts for the various uncertainties that we have assessed.
- 6.3 In this process, we examine the possible range of values (termed distribution) that different elements of our supply and demand forecasts could take. We examine the uncertainty around both the supply and demand side forecasts and bring these together to understand the range of uncertainty in our plan. We then choose a single allowance (Target Headroom) to allow for an appropriate amount of this uncertainty.
- 6.4 Neither our Target Headroom allowance nor our tolerance for risk are fixed over time. Some components of our forecast have varying uncertainty over time (for instance, predicting what the population will be in 2075 is more uncertain than predicting what the population will be in 2030) and so we must account for this. We have a greater tolerance for risk in the long-term than in the short-term because we have an ability to invest and adapt in the longer-term.

¹ UKWIR, WRMP19 - Risk Based Planning Methods Guidance, 2016

- 6.5 Our approach to Target Headroom calculation has changed somewhat since WRMP19. The main changes have been brought about to fit with our improved adaptive planning approach. The use of adaptive planning involves considering different pathways of future uncertain components, and to explicitly consider different pathways while adding an extra buffer for uncertainty may be more conservative than is really necessary. As such, we have taken an approach, aligned with WRSE, which removes uncertainties from Target Headroom as we explicitly considered different scenarios of uncertain factors in our adaptive plan.
- 6.6 This section describes the approaches taken in assessing the different supply-side and demand-side uncertainties which we are faced with, before describing how different uncertainties have been brought together to develop profiles of Target Headroom. We then present our baseline supply-demand balances for all of our WRZs.

Key Guidance and Methodology Documents

- 6.7 There are several documents which detail methods that can be applied when assessing Target Headroom. There is no single prescribed methodology for Target Headroom calculation, with different methods being applicable when different planning methodologies are adopted.
- 6.8 The primary guidance documents referred to in the development of our Target Headroom profiles are:
- Environment Agency, April 2022, Water Resources Planning Guideline (WRPG): This document sets out the key requirements for the development of our Target Headroom allowances, including key inclusions, exclusions, and methodological stipulations. Section 7 is of particular note
 - Environment Agency, Supplementary Guidance Notes. There is no supplementary guidance note which details approaches to be taken in calculating Target Headroom. However, several supplementary guidance notes reference uncertainty and detail where it would/would not be appropriate to account for something in Target Headroom, including:
 - Supplementary Guidance – Stochastics: Uncertainty inherent in generation and use of stochastic datasets can be incorporated into headroom.
 - Supplementary Guidance – 1 in 500: Uncertainty associated with estimating 1 in 500-year Deployable Output (DO) can be captured within Target Headroom.
 - Supplementary Guidance – Climate Change: Climate Change uncertainty should be incorporated into Target Headroom assessment.
 - Supplementary Guidance – Outage: Outage allowance should be considered separately from Target Headroom, and care should be taken to avoid double-counting.
 - Supplementary Guidance – Leakage: Uncertainty associated with not meeting AMP7 leakage targets should not be incorporated into Target Headroom.
 - Supplementary Guidance – Adaptive Planning: Where adaptive planning techniques are applied, the application of Target Headroom should be carefully considered to ensure no omission, but also no double counting.
- 6.9 The Environment Agency's WRPG does not set out methods that should be used when assessing Target Headroom. Instead, methods are set out in UKWIR guidance documents:
- UKWIR, 2016, WRMP19 Methods – Risk-based Planning: This document describes different approaches that can be taken in water resources planning which deal with uncertainty in explicit ways. It describes how Target Headroom allowances should be incorporated when applying different risk-based planning approaches
 - UKWIR, 2002, An Improved Methodology for Assessing Headroom: This document sets out the Monte Carlo approach which is most commonly used in Target Headroom assessment

- 6.10 An important change between WRMP19 and WRMP24 has been the focus on regional groups in water resource planning. Thames Water is part of the Water Resources South East (WRSE) regional group. WRSE has developed an approach to Target Headroom calculation, with the aim of alignment between the water companies in WRSE.

Changes Between WRMP19 and WRMP24

- 6.11 There have been a number of changes that have taken place between the publication of our WRMP19 and WRMP24 which have influenced the calculation of Target Headroom. These include changes in guidance, new methods, and changes in our understanding.

Adaptive Planning

- 6.12 We, as part of WRSE, are taking an 'Adaptive Planning' approach in our Water Resources Planning for WRMP24. This adaptive approach means that we will not have a single 'Plan' for the next 50+ years, because the level of uncertainty present over that period would make a single, fixed plan highly inefficient and/or unsuitable. Instead, we will set out investment to solve short-term supply-demand balance risks, and then will have longer-term alternative pathways which will set out what investment would be most efficient under different future scenarios (e.g. the actions that we would take and investments we would make should the OxCam corridor be developed would be different should this project not go ahead). We will monitor factors such as population growth to establish which pathway we are following and invest accordingly.
- 6.13 This adaptive approach contrasts with our WRMP19, which took a multi-metric approach, but which was mainly based on solutions for single supply-demand balance profiles. Adaptive planning is used to ensure a plan which is efficient and resilient across a wide range of possible futures.
- 6.14 Our adaptive planning approach involves using supply-demand balance 'branches' (also referred to as 'pathways', 'scenarios', or 'situations'). We will initially consider a single supply-demand balance 'branch' (to reflect that we can only have a single investment plan in the short-term) but will later consider multiple supply-demand balance branches which will explore different pathways associated with key uncertain components of our supply-demand balance. This will allow us to define investments which are required in the short-term, as well as those which are low-regrets solutions across a range of uncertain futures, while deferring investments which may be suitable in more/less severe future supply-demand balance trajectories.
- 6.15 WRSE has set out an approach to Target Headroom calculation approach which aligns with the adaptive approach taken. This approach focuses on ensuring that uncertainties are not double counted when taking an adaptive approach, while also ensuring that uncertainties are not omitted.
- 6.16 Adopting the WRSE Target Headroom approach means that we have defined different 'types' of Target Headroom, which include/exclude different uncertain components.

Requirement to Determine a '1 in 500-year' Deployable Output

- 6.17 The WRPG sets out the requirement that our baseline sources should be available such that our supply system has a 0.2% annual chance of failure caused by drought. In this circumstance, 'failure' is defined as a need for emergency drought orders.
- 6.18 Water companies have historically assessed the capability of their sources subject to a 'worst historical' drought condition, i.e. the DO of a source/group of sources would have been calculated such that the yield of the source/group of sources is that which would have been feasible during the 'worst' drought on record. The benefit of a 'worst historical' assessment is that this involves the use of a measured record (i.e. a

weather/flow/groundwater level record in which we can be fully confident), but the downside is that it limits assessment of supply capability to a small number of events (and so means that potential system vulnerabilities may be omitted from consideration). Environment Agency Guidance accepts that the determination of a '1 in 500-year' DO figure involves a large amount of uncertainty and suggests that Target Headroom allowances should incorporate uncertainty around assessment of 1 in 500-year DO.

- 6.19 We have undertaken an uncertainty assessment for our 1 in 500-year DO estimate which incorporates a greater range of uncertainties than our WRMP19 assessment, reflecting the different uncertainties present in estimating a 1 in 500-year DO.

Our Calculation of Target Headroom

- 6.20 Before describing how uncertainties associated with individual components of our supply and demand forecasts have been assessed, a brief introduction to the methods used is given in this section.
- 6.21 We use the method set out in UKWIR's 2002 methodology, *An Improved Methodology for Assessing Headroom*, and have adapted this method to incorporate adaptive planning concepts. While this method was developed twenty years ago, it is still considered an acceptable method to use^{2,3}.
- 6.22 Our calculation of Target Headroom uses Monte Carlo simulation. Distributions are defined for different uncertain components of the supply-demand balance and random sampling is used to draw values from these distributions, aggregating values associated with different uncertain components to give a view of the total uncertainty.
- 6.23 Rather than being represented by deterministic values, Monte Carlo sampling allows uncertain values to be represented by probability distributions. An example of a probability distribution is shown in Figure 6-1; it shows a probability density function (pdf). A pdf tells you the probability (value on the y-axis) that a random sample from the probability distribution will equal the corresponding value on the x-axis. The data in is purely illustrative, but you could suppose the x-axis represents the volume of water produced by a single borehole in MI/d. The bar along the top (from left to right) shows there is a 5% chance that the borehole produces less than 58.9 MI/d, a 90% chance it produces between 58.9 and 141.1 MI/d and a 5% chance it produces more than 141.1 MI/d.




Figure 6-1: An example distribution that could be used in Headroom modelling

- 6.24 Monte Carlo analysis allows for consideration of many individual uncertain variables. Many variables can be defined using probability distributions that can subsequently be selected

² Environment Agency, 2023, Water Resources Planning Guideline, Section 7

³ UKWIR, 2016, Risk-based planning methods

from using pseudo-random numbers, in order to give different aggregate outcomes, allowing for the influence of different uncertainties on an overall problem to be established.

- 6.25 An example of aggregating different uncertainties together is detailed next. If we have two independent uncertainties to consider, we can consider these together to determine the aggregate uncertainty. If uncertain component 1 has a 50% value of taking the value -4 and a 50% value of taking the value +4, while uncertainty 2 has equal chances of taking the values -2, 0, 1, and 2, random sampling from these distributions using 10 iterations may give the following outputs shown in Table 6-1.

Iteration	Uncertainty 1	Uncertainty 2	Total
Iteration 1	-4	1	-3
Iteration 2	4	0	4
Iteration 3	4	-2	2
Iteration 4	4	0	4
Iteration 5	-4	1	-3
Iteration 6	-4	2	-2
Iteration 7	4	2	6
Iteration 8	-4	-2	-6
Iteration 9	-4	1	-3
Iteration 10	4	0	4

Table 6-1: An example of pseudo-random sampling being used to determine the aggregate impact of different uncertain variables

- 6.26 The distribution of values can then be explored, for example by putting them in order, Table 6-2.

	Value
Smallest	-6
	-3
	-3
	-3
	-2
	2
	4
	4
	4
	4
Largest	6

Table 6-2: Example Output from Monte Carlo Sampling

- 6.27 Interpreting these values, we could say that our sampling suggests that there is a 90% chance that the total value will be less than 4, or a 40% chance that the value is greater than 2. Typically, we would undertake hundreds or thousands of Monte Carlo iterations using a computer, in order to fully explore the impact of consideration of multiple uncertainties.
- 6.28 In water resources planning, we define distributions of uncertain components of the supply-demand balance around 'central' forecast values, and sample individual component uncertainties to investigate the probability of achieving supply-demand balance. For example, we may use deterministic forecasts to say that we have a 20 MI/d

supply-demand surplus in a given year of the planning period, but could say that, in order to be 95% sure of having a surplus, we should allow for an extra 15 MI/d Target Headroom buffer (leaving a supply-demand surplus of 5 MI/d).

- 6.29 Once calculated and a risk profile agreed, Target Headroom is added to the forecast of demand and compared with the water available for use (WAFU) to establish the baseline supply demand balance.

Uncertain Components Considered

- 6.30 The following components are considered within Target Headroom modelling:

- S4 – Bulk Imports (not relevant for Thames Water): Where there is uncertainty over the amount available for import, it is important that this is accounted for
- S5 – Gradual pollution of sources: Some sources may have yields which are at risk from pollution over time. Until it is realised, the timing and impact of pollution may not be known, and so uncertainty distributions can be used
- S6 – Accuracy of supply-side data: DO assessments involve uncertainty due to the consideration of extreme drought events. S6 uncertainty involves estimating the uncertainty that has resulted from DO assessments. With the requirement to consider ‘1 in 500-year’ DO, S6 uncertainty should incorporate uncertainty with determining ‘1 in 500-year’ drought events and the yield of sources during such events
- S8 – Uncertainty of impact of climate change on source yields: The impact that climate change will have on source yields is uncertain (e.g. some climate change projections suggest a wetter future, while others suggest a significantly drier future)
- S9 – Uncertain output from new resource developments. This component is typically included for the ‘Final Plan Target Headroom’ assessment, rather than the ‘Baseline Target Headroom’ assessment. It relates to the uncertainty associated with the outputs of new source developments (e.g. a source may be expected to have a future yield of 10 MI/d, but could yield anywhere between 8 and 12 MI/d – the +/-MI/d uncertainty could be considered within headroom)
- D1 – Accuracy of sub-component data. Consumption data on which demand forecasts are based is uncertain, leading to uncertainty in overall demand prediction. The most important source of data in this regard is distribution input (DI) flow meter measurements; errors in flow measurement give rise to uncertainty
- D2 – Demand forecast variation. Arises from the risk that actual demand will depart from the dry year demand forecast used for the supply-demand balance due to uncertainties associated with growth in household and non-household sectors and water efficiency behaviour
- D3 – Uncertainty of impact of climate change on demand. Arises from uncertainties regarding the estimates of climate change impacts on demand
- D4 – Uncertain outcome from demand management measures. This component is typically included in the ‘Final Plan Target Headroom’ assessment, rather than the ‘Baseline Target Headroom’ assessment. The volume of reductions in demand that planned demand management measures may achieve is generally uncertain, and the date by which such demand reductions are realised even more so

- 6.31 The approach of identifying individual uncertain components and combining these to assess an overall supply-demand balance uncertainty is still valid when using adaptive planning methods.
- 6.32 In 'traditional' single pathway (non-adaptive) supply-demand balances the impact of all uncertainties is considered throughout the planning period.
- 6.33 However, in adaptive planning, it might be considered double counting to include Target Headroom allowances for uncertain components which are considered within explicit 'pathways'. For example, when different future pathways of climate change impact are considered, it would be double counting to also add on an additional buffer associated with climate change uncertainty.
- 6.34 WRSE has moved to a root and branch type adaptive planning approach in the form of situation trees. A situation tree combines discrete forecasts which are combined to provide different root and branch pathways. This shown in Figure 6-2, below.




Figure 6-2: Example branched supply-demand balance (Source – WRSE)

- 6.35 Aligned with the WRSE group, we have implemented a target headroom calculation approach which excludes different uncertain components through the planning period, in order that we do not double count aspects of uncertainty.

Supply-side Uncertainty

- 6.36 This section details the distributions used to describe different uncertain components of our supply forecast. As described in the previous section, supply-side uncertainty will be combined with demand-uncertainty to give an overall Target Headroom value.
- 6.37 The components of supply-side uncertainty which are investigated as part of our headroom assessment are:
- S5 – Gradual Pollution of Sources (causing a reduction in abstraction)
 - S6 – Accuracy of supply-side data
 - S8 – Uncertainty of impact of climate change on source yields
 - S9 – Uncertain output from new resource developments (Final Plan Target Headroom only)
- 6.38 S1 (Vulnerable surface water licences), S2 (Vulnerable groundwater licences), S3 (Time-limited licences) are not included in our assessment due to exclusions set out in the WRPG. We have not included the S4 component (Bulk imports/exports) because bulk supply imports/exports make up a small proportion of our water available for use, and are subject to contractual agreements, and as such we consider that the risk posed by uncertainty around imports/exports is minimal.
- 6.39 Regarding the S5 (Gradual Pollution of Sources) component, we have reviewed the risk posed by gradual pollution to our groundwater sources and have confirmed that there are no issues to include at this stage. This is due to installation or planned installation of suitable treatment for nitrates and cryptosporidium. We have reviewed our assessment of the risk posed by gradual bromate pollution in North London at our Northern New River Well (NNRW) sources. The source of the bromate pollution is a former bromine chemicals factory at Sandridge, now redeveloped as a housing estate. The presence of bromate in the water pumped from the NNRW has meant that abstraction from these wells has had to be reduced in the past, in order to meet water quality standards. In 2005, a scavenging remediation scheme was implemented in conjunction with Affinity Water from one of their groundwater sources. This was done to assist remediation of the bromate plume in the chalk aquifer and also to manage the concentration of bromate reaching the NNRW sources. Previously, uncertainty around the DO caused by this bromate contamination focussed on whether Affinity Water's Hatfield scavenge pumping would continue to operate at a significant enough rate to support management of bromate at the NNR Wells. This type of uncertainty was considered in planning WRMP19, as well as WRMP14, on the basis that the future operation of Hatfield was uncertain beyond the end of a Remediation Notice (RN) served on the polluters by the Environment Agency. Further remediation through the Hatfield scavenge pumping (and other actions) has now been secured, reducing this risk. In addition, the trial of a reduced chemical treatment dose of the bromate contaminated groundwater abstracted at Hatfield has seen a significant and sustainable improvement in Hatfield abstraction rate to 4 MI/d. As a result, consideration of the uncertainty on the NNRW DO associated with Hatfield abstraction is no longer appropriate. It is now considered more appropriate to assess bromate data uncertainty in quantifying the bromate impact on the NNR Wells DO. By establishing conservative maximum bromate concentrations which could reasonably be expected during drought,

it has been shown that through the normal operational practice of blending NNRW groundwater with river water in the Lee Valley, there is an insignificant impact on the DO of the NNRW. The predicted reduction in DO from the NNR Wells as a result of bromate contamination would range from 0.3 MI/d to 1 MI/d over a 4-month period, which equates to only a 0.2 MI/d loss to the average DO across a simulated 12-month period. As a result of this conservative assessment, it is concluded that there is no significant data uncertainty nor loss of DO that requires incorporation within the target headroom model and so this component of supply-side uncertainty has been removed from our WRMP24 Target Headroom assessment.

- 6.40 The S9 (Uncertain output from new resource developments) component is not considered in our Baseline Target Headroom assessment. Since no new resources are considered as part of our baseline, this component does not have an impact on our baseline Target Headroom.

S6 – Accuracy of Supply-side Data

- 6.41 Uncertainty associated with data and models used in our assessment of DO leads to uncertainty in our DO estimate. This is particularly the case now that our calculations of DO are based on assessing a '1 in 500-year' DO.
- 6.42 We have not updated the assessment of DO uncertainty associated with our groundwater sources since WRMP19. For each groundwater source, the governing constraint on DO is known (e.g. a source's yield may be limited by licence, infrastructure, or hydrological yield) and this leads to different reasonable bounds of uncertainty to be considered. For example, a source with a DO which is governed by licensed quantities will have a relatively small uncertainty around its DO (the only uncertainty being around measurement of quantities), while a source with a DO which is governed by hydrogeological yield will have more considerable uncertainty due to the need to consider/measure/model what groundwater levels during extreme drought events may be, and then derive a yield during drought dependent on groundwater levels that are seen. Table 6-3 shows the parameters used to define distributions of DO uncertainty associated with groundwater sources with different yield constraints.

Constraint	Distribution Used	Min (if Triangular) / Standard Deviation (if Normal) - %	Mode (if Triangular) / Mean (if Normal) - %	Max (if triangular) - %
Infrastructure	Triangular	-2	0	1
Licence	Normal	0	0.3	
Hydrogeological Yield	Triangular	-2	0	10

Table 6-3: Parameters Used in Groundwater Source Uncertainty Assessment

- 6.43 We include an allowance for uncertainty associated with the yield of the North London Artificial Recharge Scheme (NLARS). This scheme abstracts water from a number of boreholes in the Lee Valley and discharges to the raw water system including from some boreholes to the New River and in some cases directly to reservoir. The nature of the scheme is to abstract water from the confined aquifer where output will decrease over time. Improved information on borehole performance, together with better information about the aquifer state of storage allowed an updated view of NLARS output at AR16.

There remains a risk around what the scheme may actually be capable of during a drought thus two further scenarios of the output from NLARS have been evaluated to assess the risk around NLARS. The impact of the modified output from NLARS for the two alternative scenarios was evaluated by inputting this data into WARMS2 and comparing with the value of DO before the change. The risk is assessed to be in the range 15-17 MI/d, and so an allowance for NLARS uncertainty is made by defining a triangular distribution with a minimum of 0 MI/d, a most likely value of 15 MI/d, and a maximum of 17 MI/d.

- 6.44 For our surface water sources, we have updated the methods used to assess DO uncertainty, because we felt that our existing estimates were inadequate for capturing '1 in 500-year' DO uncertainty.
- 6.45 In WRMP19, we included an allowance of +/-2% (using a triangular distribution with a minimum of -2%, a mode of 0%, and a maximum of 2%) for surface water DO uncertainty within our Target Headroom modelling. Considering the scale of uncertainty which we have observed when assessing 1 in 200-year DO for WRMP19 and now 1 in 500-year DO for WRMP24, we consider that +/-2% for surface water DO uncertainty is insufficient to capture the risk of overestimating or underestimating the DO contribution of our surface water abstractions.
- 6.46 We have assessed the influence of different uncertainties which feed into our DO assessments, using a consistent framework across all of our surface water sources. The factors that we have considered in our assessment are:
 - The representativeness of the historical record, and the associated uncertainty of using a '1 in X year' DO. This component serves as a proxy for considering uncertainty associated with 'stochastic' weather records
 - The use of hydrological models
 - Uncertainty associated with quantifying hydrological extremes
 - Uncertainty associated with operational risks, including:
 - Requirements to stop abstraction due to poor water quality
 - Requirements to stop abstraction due to other operational constraints not considered in DO assessments (e.g. low levels)
 - The potential that emergency restrictions may be imposed earlier (or later) than assumed in DO assessments
- 6.47 All of these uncertain factors have been considered as being independent of one another.
- 6.48 The first three elements noted have uncertainty assessments which are based on analysis of measured and/or modelled datasets. Uncertainty associated with operational risks (factors which impact our operations, but which are not captured in either our DO or outage assessments) are based on expert judgement.
- 6.49 For each of the surface water sources considered, each of these components has been considered in the context of what impacts WRZ DO as some zones have a DO which is governed by long-duration drawdown of reservoirs, while other zones have a surface water DO which is driven by extreme low flows (e.g. run-of-river sources without bankside

storage). We have undertaken assessments for the uncertainty associated with assessments of DO from the following sources:

- London WRZ - Lower Thames abstractions, feeding Lower Thames reservoirs
- London WRZ - River Lee abstractions, feeding Lee Valley reservoirs
- SWOX WRZ – Farmoor abstraction, feeding Farmoor reservoirs
- Kennet Valley WRZ – Fobney run-of-river abstraction
- Guildford WRZ – Shalford run-of-river abstraction

- 6.50 The results of this assessment are reported as cumulative distribution functions (CDFs), which are then resampled from in our overall Target Headroom assessment (in a similar way to outputs from our demand uncertainty assessment).
- 6.51 Results from this assessment (Table 6-4) show that we have considered the risk that we may have overestimated (negative contribution to Target Headroom – negative value in Table) or underestimated (positive contribution to Target Headroom – positive value in Table) DO.
- 6.52 Between dWRMP and rdWRMP, the supply-side uncertainty associated with the Kennet Valley WRZ changed to a notable degree (Table 6-4). As is discussed in Appendix I (Deployable Output), we reassessed the Deployable Output of the Kennet Valley WRZ between dWRMP and rdWRMP and when we applied our methods for determining the associated supply-side uncertainty, the risk that we have underestimated Deployable Output appears to be significantly less than the risk that we have overestimated it.

	5 th Percentile	25 th %ile	Median	75 th %ile	95 th %ile
London -Thames	-11.8	-2.7	2.7	4.7	17.8
London – Lee	-1.2	-0.1	0.1	0.3	1.2
SWOX – Farmoor	-6.1	-0.1	1.7	4.3	23.6
KV – Fobney	-39.2	-39.2	-26.2	-13.6	0.3
Guildford - Shalford	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.7

Table 6-4: 1 in 500-year Annual Average surface water DO uncertainty (% of WRZ DO)

- 6.53 These results suggest that the previous allowance of +/-2% of source DOs was insufficient for considering 1 in 500-year DO uncertainty.
- 6.54 We have assessed the uncertainty around '1 in 100-year' and '1 in 200-year' DO estimates, as well as '1 in 500-year' DO estimates. Our planned Level of Service (for Level 4 restrictions) is initially 1 in 100-year, transitioning to 1 in 200-year in the early 2030s, and then transitioning to 1 in 500-year resilience by 2040. As such, our Target Headroom profiles account for 1 in 100-year DO uncertainty initially, then 1 in 200-year in the 2030s, and 1 in 500-year from 2040 onwards.
- 6.55 The enhanced assessment that we have undertaken to establish the risk around surface water DO has encompassed more aspects than our previous assessments. This has given us a greater level of confidence that our assessments have covered a reasonable range of unknown factors. In turn, this has led us to increase our risk tolerance, due to a reduced presence of 'unknown unknowns'.

S8 – Uncertainty of Impact of Climate Change on Source Yields

- 6.56 Climate change is expected to lead to changes in patterns and frequencies of drought and other extreme weather events. While the general expected pattern is that summers will be drier and hotter and winters wetter and warmer, the degree and scale of these impacts, and the impact on the likelihood of extreme drought events, is very uncertain.
- 6.57 Climate change will impact our drought risk both through temperature impacts (hotter temperatures leading to higher potential evapotranspiration, drying out soils) and precipitation impacts (changes in rainfall patterns).
- 6.58 The latest climate change projections for the United Kingdom, from the Met Office, known as UKCP18, have been used in our assessment of supply-side climate change impacts.
- 6.59 This section does not describe all work that has been done to assess the impact of climate change on our supplies (see Appendix U for a full description), and instead focuses on how these results have been used in assessing the uncertainty around the 'central' impact of climate change.
- 6.60 Our climate change modelling has involved perturbation of samples of the stochastic climate record, running our hydrological and hydrogeological models using these perturbed records, using flows and groundwater yields from these model runs as inputs to our water resources models, and using water resources model outputs to determine the impact of climate change perturbations on '1 in 500-year' DO for each WRZ.
- 6.61 We have assessed the uncertainty around '1 in 100-year' and '1 in 200-year' Climate Change DO Impact estimates, as well as '1 in 500-year' Climate Change DO Impact estimates. Our planned Level of Service (for Level 4 restrictions) is initially 1 in 100-year, transitioning to 1 in 200-year in the early 2030s, and then transitioning to 1 in 500-year resilience by 2040. As such, our Target Headroom profiles account for 1 in 100-year CC DO Impact uncertainty initially, then 1 in 200-year in the 2030s, and 1 in 500-year from 2040 onwards.
- 6.62 Detailed modelling has been undertaken for the 28 spatially coherent projections which form part of the UKCP18 dataset, using the RCP8.5 emissions scenario, for the 2060-80 timeslice. Appendix U details further work which has been undertaken to investigate the climate change impacts suggested by the probabilistic projections for our London WRZ, including different emissions scenarios (RCP2.6, RCP4.5, RCP6.0, and RCP8.5) and at different points in time (2030, 2050, 2070, and 2090).
- 6.63 In our supply forecast, we have taken the median climate change impact from our modelling results as our central impact of climate change on DO, and as described later in the chapter have considered other climate change projections in our adaptive plan.
- 6.64 Our uncertainty assessment looks at the variance around the median climate change impact that is present in the rest of the model results. Our Target Headroom modelling includes the 28 individual CC scenario outputs for the year 2070. We have considered that each of these scenarios is equally likely to occur. Results in Figure 6-3 (London) and Figure 6-4 (SWOX) show that, for London, climate change could have up to 230 MI/d more impact than our median impact suggests, or a 270 MI/d less severe impact; for SWOX the results show that results could be anywhere from 20 MI/d less severe than the median impact to 12 MI/d more severe.

- 6.65 In each Monte Carlo iteration, for each WRZ, one of the 28 climate change scenarios is selected at random and the variance of the impact of that climate change scenario on DO around the central climate change DO impact is used. This impact is scaled through the planning period using the same scaling approach as is used to scale the central impact of climate change.




Figure 6-3: Variance of Climate Change Scenario DO Impacts Around the Median – London WRZ, 2070 (2060-80)




Figure 6-4: Variance of Climate Change Scenario DO Impacts Around the Median– SWOX WRZ, 2070 (2060-80), DYAA DO

Demand-side Uncertainty

- 6.66 The demand-related headroom components identified in the methodology are as follows:
- D1 – Uncertainty in base year data
 - D2 – Demand forecast variation
 - D3 – Uncertainty of climate change on demand
 - D4 – Uncertainty of demand management measures
- 6.67 We have undertaken analysis of demand uncertainty using Monte Carlo simulation to understand the uncertainty around the deterministic demand forecast. We describe this briefly in the “Demand uncertainty overview” section below, before examining the individual components D1 to D4.
- 6.68 The approach we have used is consistent with the current UKWIR guidance⁴ which is recommended by the Environment Agency’s WRP.

Demand Uncertainty Overview

- 6.69 Specialist software is used to calculate the uncertainty associated with the demand forecasts that are described in Section 3: Current and future demand for water. The demand forecasts produce a single value for demand for each year of the forecast period. Underpinning the demand forecast is a series of values which are considered the best estimate. Like any estimate, there is scope for uncertainty and analysis of these uncertainties is used to produce the demand uncertainty, that is then used in the calculation of Target Headroom. Monte Carlo simulation is used to understand how the uncertainties from input variables translate into uncertainty in the overall demand forecast. An overview of this is shown in Figure 6-5.
- 6.70 Each demand component shown in orange is assigned a probability distribution according to the information available. Most of the uncertainty ranges around these components have been estimated based on studies where possible, and expert judgment where little information is available. Where judgment has been used output values have been examined to ensure that the uncertainty range is reasonable.
- 6.71 Traditionally, we have not considered uncertainties around leakage because the outturn value is, to a degree, within our management control to deliver. This does not mean there is no uncertainty. Weather, particularly cold winters, can cause metal pipes to contract and fracture, therefore increasing leakage. Furthermore, we have more than 30,000km of buried water network and, whilst we invest considerable effort in understanding and modelling how it deteriorates over time, it is not an exact science.

⁴ UKWIR, WRMP 2019 Methods – Risk Based Planning, Appendix D7, (16/WR/02/11), 2016.




Figure 6-5: Overview of the analysis of uncertainty in demand forecasts

- 6.72 Uncertainty distributions for the following outputs are not included for demand components shown in blue in Figure 6-5.
- 6.73 Leakage – For standard leakage management activities we consider the uncertainty in terms of the cost it will take for us to meet or out-perform our leakage target in each year through a mix of activities including finding and fixing leaks as they break out and replacing our old iron pipes with new plastic pipes. We do not include uncertainties in this “base” leakage in Headroom.
- 6.74 Operational use and demand from our properties – This component reflects the water we use in operational activity such as flushing mains for water quality reasons or water used at our sites or offices for sanitation purposes. As with leakage, the outturn value for this component is, to a large degree, within our management control to deliver. Therefore, the same logic applies around the inclusion of uncertainty in future forecasts. Note that these values are not actually forecast and are assumed to be constant at base year values over the planning period. As such the uncertainty around this output is part of the base year measurement uncertainty described in D1 – Uncertainty in Base Year Data. Additionally, the total volume of this category is approximately 1% of total DI and therefore any reasonable uncertainty estimates around forecast values would be unlikely to have a material impact on the results of this analysis.
- 6.75 Water taken illegally or unbilled – These values are not actually forecast and are assumed to be constant at base year values over the planning period. As such the uncertainty around this output is part of the base year measurement uncertainty. Additionally, the total volume of this category is approximately 1% of total DI and therefore any reasonable

uncertainty estimates around forecast values would be unlikely to have a material impact on the results of this analysis.

D1 – Uncertainty in Base Year Data

- 6.76 The actual DI supplied in the base year is used as base data to support the forecast of demand for the 80-year planning period. DI is measured by meters, typically located at the outlet of a water treatment works. These meters are subject to a statutory verification programme, but there is still uncertainty about the results they record. This uncertainty is reflected in the calculation of the water balance as part of the annual performance report to Ofwat.
- 6.77 Here we have used the same uncertainty distribution for base year DI used as part of the water balance calculation. Base year DI is a random variable with a normal distribution where the mean is equal to the deterministic estimate of base year DI and the standard deviation is equal to 1.02%⁵.
- 6.78 Uncertainty is also estimated around the uplift from the base year recorded value of DI to reflect the planning scenario in use⁶. This uplift reflects the weather and operational circumstance of the base year may have been more (or less) favourable than would be expected to be the case in a year typical of the planning scenario, i.e. a dry year. For example, in London the recorded DI in the rdWRMP24 base year was 1,955.5 Ml/d. The weather in the base year was assessed to have suppressed demand below what it would have been in dry year conditions. An uplift of 20.5 Ml/d was applied to convert DI to the value expected if conditions in the base year had been equal to dry year conditions.
- 6.79 There is uncertainty about the accuracy of the recording of conditions in the base year, the assessment of conditions in the dry year and the impact of those conditions on DI. Therefore, we apply an uncertainty to the value of the uplift used. Because it is impossible to validate the accuracy of the uplift directly⁷ we use expert judgement to set the uncertainty distribution used to reflect uncertainty around the uplift.
- 6.80 The value of the uplift in the deterministic forecast is our best estimate and therefore we believe is also the most likely value. We do not have any reason to believe that the distribution is likely to be skewed and therefore we have used a normal distribution to characterise the uncertainty around the uplift. We chose to set standard deviation for the distribution at 5% of the value of the deterministic uplift value. This resulted in a distribution which best matched the expectation of a number of experts.
- 6.81 The impact of the uncertainty around base year estimates is then set to the sum of both uncertainty distributions less the deterministic value of the base year DI in dry year conditions⁸.

⁵ This is based on a 95% confidence interval for reported DI being +/- 2% and 95% confidence interval for a normal distribution being +/- 1.96 standard deviations. The 2% divided by 1.96 equals a standard deviation of 1.02%.

⁶ E.g. Dry Year Annual Average basis for London.

⁷ There is no opportunity to actually replicate the base year circumstances (population, customer water use behaviour, etc.) in dry year weather conditions.

⁸ Because of the properties of normal distributions this results in a normal distribution with a mean of zero and a standard error of the square route of the sum of the squared standard errors of the original distributions. For example, standard error of the distribution of the impact of uncertainty around the base year estimate is equal to the square root of the sum of 1.02% of the measured DI squared and 5% of the deterministic uplift value squared.

D2 – Demand Forecast Variation

6.82 The sources of demand forecast variation considered in the Demand Uncertainty Model are as shown in the list below. Each is discussed in a separate section which follows below:

- Household per capita consumption (PCC)
- Household population
- Non-household demand

Household PCC uncertainty

6.83 Household PCC is the average volume of water used by each person in a household. Typically, it is reported in units of litres per head per day (l/h/d). PCC is a measure of customers' water use behaviour. In this section the PCC discussed is the baseline⁹ value, meaning that it is the value prior to any demand management activity we might deliver to influence the value.

6.84 PCC uncertainty is calculated by using the household demand forecasting model produced by Artesia Consulting¹⁰. The demand forecasting model uses a multiple linear regression approach, which produces standard errors around each of the input values that indicate uncertainties and can be used to simulate confidence intervals around the central PCC forecast. The uncertainties related to the Artesia final model are illustrated in Figure 6-6, which shows that uncertainty in model coefficients alone translates to a PCC uncertainty range of +/- 3.4%. It also shows that the number of adults and size of property are the key variables. This approach and the setup of the model are explained further in Section 3: Current and future demand for water (Household water use) and Appendix F: Household water demand modelling (Section 20 - uncertainties). This Section 20 discusses uncertainties where base year, model coefficients, property types and population uncertainties are combined to show impacts on WRZ consumption in MI/d.

⁹ For example, progressive metering or water efficiency Smarter Home Visits.

¹⁰ Section 3: Current and future demand for water (Household water use) and Appendix F: Household water demand modelling (Section 20 - uncertainties).




Figure 6-6: Illustration of PCC model coefficient uncertainty on PCC (percentage) and sensitivity to input variables

6.85 An 80% confidence interval for forecasts of household PCC produced by applying the household demand forecasting model are used as inputs to the demand uncertainty model. The limits of this confidence interval along with the expected value used in the deterministic demand forecast are used to characterise a PERT probability density function for household PCC for each year of the planning problem.

Household population uncertainty

6.86 The household population we serve is a key factor in forecasting demand. Population is the result of a myriad of uncertain components including, birth rates, death rates and net migration. Each of these components is influenced by a range of underlying factors such as macro-economic growth. As such it is easy to see why there is uncertainty in the forecast of population.

6.87 As discussed in Section 3 for this round of planning we have procured multiple growth forecasts. Given this we consider we have a range of forecasts which adequately reflect the uncertainty around likely future growth, and we have used these in our uncertainty analysis. We use three forecasts in the calculation of the uncertainty; the maximum, minimum and plan-based scenarios. The maximum scenario is the forecast which has the highest growth in households in the final year of the forecast, 2100. Conversely, the minimum scenario uses the forecast which has the smallest increase in the number of households in the final year of the forecast. The plan-based forecast is used as the most likely forecast due to the emphasis placed on this forecast within the WRP.

- 6.88 While preparing the uncertainty distributions it was noted that the plan-based forecasts are in the short-term high growth, in some cases exceeding growth predicted in the maximum scenario.

Non-household demand

- 6.89 Unmeasured non-household demand is a comparatively small component of total non-household demand, approximately 3%. We believe that measured and unmeasured non-household demand for water will tend to be well correlated as both are primarily driven by regional macro-economic factors. Therefore, we have assumed that the uncertainty distribution for measured non-household demand can be applied proportionately to unmeasured non-household demand.
- 6.90 The deterministic forecast for non-household demand was produced by Artesia Consulting. As part of that work, using the same methodology and varying future macro-economic projections, they also produced lower and upper forecasts for measured non-household demand in each year.
- 6.91 We have fitted a triangular probability density function using the deterministic forecast as the most likely value and the upper and lower forecasts as minimum and maximum parameters. Figure 6-7 shows the values used to fit uncertainty distributions.




Figure 6-7: Measured non-household demand forecast uncertainty

D3 – Impact of climate change on demand

- 6.92 HR Wallingford carried out a study¹¹ to estimate the likely impacts of climate change upon household demand. Climate change effects are only considered for domestic water use.

¹¹ HR Wallingford, EX6828 Thames Water Climate Change Impacts and Water Resource Planning. Thames Water Climate Change Impacts on Demand for the 2030s, 2012

More information regarding the effects of climate change on demand can be found in Section 3: Current and future demand for water. The climate change ranges are summarised in Figure 6-8 for DYAA and Figure 6-9 for DYCP.

- 6.93 No allowance has been included for non-household demand based on the findings on the UKWIR report 13/CL/04/12 “Impact of climate change on water demand” which stated:

‘It was concluded that, except in the case of agriculture and horticulture in South East Water area, there is inadequate consistent evidence to justify making any allowance for climate change impacts on non-household demand.’

- 6.94 The low, mid and upper scenarios presented in these figures are 10th percentile, 50th percentile and 90th percentile forecasts for the impact of climate change on demand. We have used these data points to fit a normal probability density function for each year in the planning period.




Figure 6-8: Impacts of Climate Change on DYAA Demand




Figure 6-9: Impacts of Climate Change on DYCP Demand

D4 – Uncertainty of demand management measures

6.95 Only a small amount of demand management is present within baseline target headroom which relates to planned demand activity for AMP7. This component is, therefore, not included in our baseline Target Headroom assessment. We have incorporated uncertainty associated with long-term impacts on demand from the coronavirus pandemic.

Coronavirus Uncertainty

6.96 The long-term impacts of changes brought about by the Coronavirus pandemic are currently highly uncertain. Artesia consulting reported within their study “Understanding changes in household water consumption associated with Covid-19” that to understand how domestic water use patterns will change as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic will:

“require long-term monitoring with both qualitative and quantitative data to know whether the changes in dynamics reflected during this lockdown reflect only a temporary disruption, or represent a longer-term change to the patterns and rhythms of the everyday practices that underpin and influence domestic and garden water use.”

6.97 We have not included any additional demand for water within our deterministic demand forecasts, but we do consider it appropriate to include an allowance within demand uncertainty. Therefore, we have used a triangular distribution with the parameters shown in Table 6-5.

WRZ	Unit	Upper estimate	Most likely	Lower estimate
London	%	102	100	98
All Thames Valley WRZs	%	102	100	98

Table 6-5: Uncertainty around long-term changes in demand brought about by coronavirus pandemic

Model Outputs

- 6.98 For Baseline Headroom both base uncertainty (D1) and population uncertainty (part of D2) are key components. Most uncertainty in future DI is due to uncertainty in population forecasts; over 40% of the variance in DI in 2044 is due to the population forecast alone.
- 6.99 The output from the model, which is then used in the headroom model, is a table with a demand value for each 5th percentile. A graphical representation of the output can be seen in Figure 6-10. Results from the baseline model run are used as input into the headroom model to form an initial view of Target Headroom for the baseline forecasts.




Figure 6-10: Baseline demand forecast uncertainty spread – London WRZ

Bringing Uncertainties Together

- 6.100 As described above, we have defined distributions associated with different uncertain components of our supply-demand balance according to evidence and/or expert judgement.
- 6.101 We use all of the component-level uncertainties as inputs to our holistic Target Headroom assessment.
- 6.102 In some cases, we use individual component-level uncertainty distributions as direct inputs to our Target Headroom model (e.g. we define a discrete distribution associated with supply-side climate change uncertainty inputs). In other cases, we use cumulative distribution functions (CDFs) as inputs to our Target Headroom models, and use software functionality which allows us to sample from a probability distribution function that underlies a given CDF.
- 6.103 Our Monte Carlo Target Headroom modelling samples values from the different input distributions and adds uncertainties together to derive samples of total uncertainty.
- 6.104 We then look at all of the total sampled uncertainty values that have been calculated and take the 'Xth' percentile of all values calculated, with the value 'X' depending on our risk tolerance.

Adaptive Planning – Exclusion of 'Double Counted' Components

- 6.105 WRSE's Regional Plan (and so Thames Water's WRMP24) is a fully adaptive plan. This is in contrast to our WRMP19, which took a multi-metric approach, but which was mainly based on solutions for single supply-demand balance profiles. Adaptive planning is used to ensure a plan which is efficient and resilient across a wide range of possible futures. The explicit consideration of uncertain components within an adaptive plan would mean that accounting for all uncertain components within Target Headroom would result in double counting (e.g. a 'standard' Target Headroom calculation would include an allowance for population growth uncertainty – it may be considered double counting to include a buffer to account for population growth uncertainty if an adaptive planning framework is applied which considers different pathways for future population growth).
- 6.106 WRSE has written a document which details the approach that it requests companies adopt when determining Target Headroom profiles.
- 6.107 The key facet of the WRSE approach is the submission of multiple target headroom profiles, which are used to avoid double counting uncertainties within an adaptive planning framework.
- 6.108 The WRSE plan will start with a single 'root' branch, in which required actions to ensure a supply-demand balance which conforms with requirements set out in the WRPG will be set out (e.g. the demand forecast will be based on Local Authority Plan forecasts). At this stage, a 'Full' Target Headroom profile is appropriate, because no uncertain components have been explicitly considered (i.e. the supply-demand balance profile at this point is a 'central' profile).
- 6.109 The WRSE plan will then branch on different uncertain components, first into three branches, and then each of the three branches will be split into three further branches, leading to a total of nine branches in the long-term. WRSE may consider different timing

for branches within programme appraisal. The uncertain supply-demand balance components which are branched on are:

- Population Growth, i.e. the regional plan considers a wide range of plausible future demand forecasts
- Environmental Destination (DO impact of future sustainability reductions)
- Climate Change

6.110 These uncertain factors were chosen as they are the largest time-variant uncertain components of the supply-demand balance.

6.111 The WRSE Target Headroom approach sets out that it would be considered to be double counting to account for uncertainty within Target Headroom for any component which has been branched upon in the adaptive plan. As such, different ‘types’ of Target Headroom have been calculated, and when branches are made the Target Headroom profile used in determining the supply-demand balance is altered.




Figure 6-11: Different ‘Types’ of Target Headroom Used Across the Planning Period

6.112 WRSE described the forms of Target Headroom as:

- Full – Target Headroom considering all uncertainties, to be used in the ‘root’ branch
- EDG – Target Headroom, excluding any uncertainty associated with Environmental Destination or Growth projections, to be used after the first branch point
- EDGC – Target Headroom, excluding any uncertainty associated with Environmental Destination, Growth, or Climate Change projections, to be used after the second branch point

6.113 We have not included uncertainty associated with vulnerable licences within Target Headroom (excluded, as per WRPG), and have not assessed the change in supply-side uncertainty associated with reduced DO under future Environmental Destination scenarios. As such, only the removal of growth and climate change have been considered in our modified Target Headroom profiles. In this document, the Target Headroom profiles are thus described as:

- TH – Full Target Headroom, incorporating all uncertain components
- THEG – Target Headroom, **E**xcluding uncertainty associated with population **G**rowth
- THEGC – Target Headroom, **E**xcluding uncertainty associated with population **G**rowth and **C**limate change

- 6.114 We will always branch on demand uncertainty before climate change uncertainty, because growth uncertainty will be manifested (and observable) on a shorter timescale than climate change (i.e. in 2030 or 2035 we will be able to see whether population growth has followed the ‘Local Plan’ forecasts, but we will not be able to determine whether we are on course for climate to change to have severe or benign impacts.
- 6.115 The calculation of TH involves all supply-side and demand-side uncertainties that have been outlined in the preceding sections.
- 6.116 The calculation of THEG involves all supply-side uncertainties; demand-side uncertainty profiles are used which exclude uncertainty associated with growth.
- 6.117 The calculation of THEGC involves all supply-side uncertainties apart from uncertainty associated with climate change impacts. Demand-side uncertainty profiles which exclude uncertainty associated with both climate-change impacts and growth are used.
- 6.118 In our supply-demand balances, we have adopted a THEG profile from the beginning of the planning period, rather than using a ‘Full’ Target Headroom assessment from the beginning of the planning period. When we measure demand uncertainty around our main, local authority plan-based demand forecast, it has a negative skewing effect on Target Headroom. Including this negative skew does not seem in the spirit of planning for a local authority plan-based demand forecast. If we were to measure demand uncertainty as being centred on the plan-based forecast, we would account for additional uncertainty on top of what is a relatively high demand forecast, which seems excessive. As such, we have excluded growth uncertainty from our Target Headroom profiles throughout the planning period.

Risk Tolerance Profile

- 6.119 Our Target Headroom model gives annual outputs, subject to a given risk tolerance. For example, if we are willing to accept 20% risk in a given year, we could end up with a Target Headroom in a given WRZ of 20 MI/d, while if we were willing to accept 30% risk, we may end up with 10 MI/d. A lower risk tolerance implies a greater buffer being necessary between supply and demand.
- 6.120 WRSE research¹² conducted in 2021 concluded that, “For customers, a resilient plan is one that reduces future uncertainty by building capacity into the water system to deal with future disruption. Insurance associated with overbuilding infrastructure is not a key concern, with a typical view that it is ‘better to be safe than sorry’.” From this, we have taken that customers want us to plan for uncertainty, that we should allow a significant buffer for this uncertainty, and that customers are not concerned about excess buffers in

¹² https://ehq-production-europe.s3.eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/c221322f362c9380346c34bdda9fd294014df1c6/original/1620041787/71229bcac59bbceb6728b1900400f5df_WRSE_Customer_Preferences_Summary_Report_eftec___ICS_March_2021_FINAL.pdf

the short-term, with the view among many participants being that “we will use the infrastructure eventually”.

6.121 The key features of the risk profile that we deemed appropriate were:

- Initially, a relatively low risk tolerance should be taken. It would, however, be reasonable to take more risk than at WRMP19 due to the increased appreciation of supply-side risks that has been included
- This low risk tolerance should be maintained until 1 in 200-year resilience is relatively secure
- It would be inappropriate to suggest significant investment be made on the basis of future uncertainties, and so a higher degree of risk tolerance is appropriate further into the future

6.122 These factors align with the guidance set out in the WRPg:

“You should consider the appropriate level of risk for your plan. If target headroom is too large it may drive unnecessary expenditure. If it is too small, you may not be able to meet your planned level of service. You should accept a higher level of risk further into the future. This is because as time progresses the uncertainties will reduce and you have time to adapt to any changes.”

6.123 This approach to setting risk tolerance aligns with the requirements of the WRPg, ensures resilience in the short-term, and ensures that high-regret solution development is avoided. As such, this risk tolerance approach is aligned with our customers’ views, which are (as set out in Appendix T):

- A resilient plan is one that reduces future uncertainty by building capacity into the water system to deal with future disruption.
- Overbuilding water resources infrastructure is not seen as an issue, with many customers feeling that we will use infrastructure which is developed eventually.
- Customers support plans and investments that will safeguard service levels and the environment for future generations.
- There is a strong expectation that the plan will deliver beyond the minimum statutory requirements.
- Overall customers support investment in new water supply schemes where they can be shown to deliver benefits for the future.

6.124 The risk tolerance profile adopted is shown in Table 6-6. Linear interpolation is used between these dates. Beyond 2050, a constant risk tolerance of 40% is used.

Year	2019/20	2024/25	2029/30	2034/35	2039/40	2044/45	2049/50
WRMP19	5	10	15	20	25	29	29
WRMP24	15	15	15	19	29	35	40

Table 6-6: Risk Tolerance Profile Adopted in Target Headroom Modelling

6.125 The initial risk tolerance adopted is 15%; this is higher than WRMP19 due to the greater range of supply-side risks that have been considered. This initial value is maintained for

longer than was the case for WRMP19, in order to provide a high degree of confidence that we will meet a 1 in 200-year Level of Service in the relatively near term.

- 6.126 The risk tolerance is then increased rapidly between the early 2030s and 2040 (15% to 30%), in order than the selection of a large option to deliver 1 in 500-year resilience is not driven by an excessive Target Headroom forecast. The value is then further reduced in the long-term to reflect an increased risk tolerance and ability for investments to adapt to long-term uncertainties.

Minimum Threshold

- 6.127 We have applied a de-minimis of 3% of rdWRMP24 base-year DI for Target Headroom, in order to ensure that a minimum buffer between supply and demand will exist at all points in our plan. However, we have applied a lower de-minimis of 1.5% beyond 2050 in the Kennet Valley WRZ, due to the heavy skew in the 1 in 500-year Deployable Output uncertainty (Table 6-4) for the Fobney source. The implication of this skew is that it is significantly more likely that we have overestimated the Deployable Output of this source than it is likely that we have underestimated it.

Final Plan Target Headroom Approach

- 6.128 In the dWRMP24, we outlined an approach to the calculation of Final Plan Target Headroom. In producing our WRMP24 (Section 11) we have outlined a monitoring programme which will ensure that our customers' supplies are resilient by monitoring the success of the implementation of our plan and responding if appropriate. Additionally, we received representations, notably from Ofwat, which suggested that we should not include an overly conservative buffer for target headroom in the long term. As such, our consideration is that, rather than make an explicit allowance for target headroom associated with the introduction of new options, monitoring the success of our plan and responding if necessary is a more efficient and effective approach. As such, we have not generally made an allowance for "Final Plan" target headroom above the "Baseline" target headroom allowance with one exception.
- 6.129 As described in Section 3, between the publication of our rdWRMP24 and our final WRMP24 we published our Annual Review 2024. In the Annual Review 2024, at the company level we reported a lower level of household consumption than was forecast for the AR24 year in the rdWRMP24 and we reported a higher level of non-household consumption that was forecast for AR24 in the rdWRMP24. Overall, the decrease in household consumption outweighed the increase in non-household consumption, and so we saw a lower level of total consumption compared to our forecast (around 40 MI/d in the London WRZ and around 10 MI/d in the SWOX WRZ). In line with the WRPg, we have incorporated this change in consumption into our demand forecast. The change in household consumption was particularly prevalent in London, driven by a change in per capita consumption (PCC). The level of PCC change seen was significant and we consider there to be a level of risk that we may see an increase from this level as, for example, cost of living pressures subside. Additionally, we have seen greater challenges than anticipated in returning the Gateway desalination plant to supply in summer 2024, highlighting a supply-demand balance risk. To account for these two risks, we have included additional headroom allowances. We have included 20 MI/d in London and 5 MI/d in SWOX DYAA for the period 2025-30, both calculated as approximately half of the consumption drop seen), and 10 MI/d in London and 2.5 MI/d in SWOX DYAA from 2031-39 in order to ensure that we can be more confident that our supply-demand balance is resilient.

Results of Baseline Target Headroom Assessment

6.130 In this section, the Target Headroom profiles produced for each of our WRZs for each planning scenario are set out. When reviewing these figures, please bear in mind that 'THEG' profiles are used in our Baseline Supply-demand Balance until 2035, with 'THEGC' profiles used from then on. For each WRZ, for each planning scenario, an estimate has been made of the relative contribution of different uncertain components to overall Target Headroom. Please note that the figures and tables below exclude the Final Plan allowance referenced above.

London DYAA




Figure 6-12: London DYAA Target Headroom Profiles

6.131 The Table below shows Target Headroom as a percentage of DI across the planning period. Early in the planning horizon it is 8-10% of DI and that this reduces over time, to c.5% of DI in the longer term.

6.132 The London WRZ's water resources are complex and reliant on hydrologically constrained abstractions from the River Thames and River Lee. We have seen in the 2022 drought event that there can be issues in abstracting from the River Thames caused by a number of different factors. These risks exist alongside other uncertainties and issues, for example risks around climate change's impacts on our supplies or customer demand. Furthermore, the current resilience level (1 in 100-year resilience to severe restrictions) in the London WRZ is a lower level than many other UK water companies (many of whom have 1 in 200-year level resilience), and so it is important to ensure that there is a prudent buffer to protect supplies. The risk profile for London is considered reasonable and aligns with the Water Resources Planning Guideline and priorities of our customers because it ensures a reasonable buffer in the shorter term, during which time we have a limited ability to respond with new supply options (larger options having lead times of 8-15 years), and so this buffer safeguards service levels. Our AMP8 investment programme to improve

resilience against Level 4 severe water use restrictions from 1 in 100 years on average to closer to 1 in 200 years is almost entirely based on demand management reductions, which in itself is a relatively high-risk option. In the longer term, the reduced target headroom allowance means that we are not planning for large investments on the basis of a large uncertainty allowance; in the longer term our adaptive plan ensures that we will be able to respond to challenges and uncertainties as they arise.

WRZ	Target Headroom as a % of DI					
	AR22	AR25	AR30	AR40	AR50	AR75
London DYAA	8%	9%	10%	6%	4%	5%

Table 6-7: Target Headroom as % of DI – London DYAA

- 6.133 Compared to WRMP19, we are initially including a larger Target Headroom allowance, driven by the inclusion of a greater range of ‘base year’ risks on the supply side. As is usual, our Target Headroom grows over the first few years of the planning period, reflecting uncertainty around forecast demand and a low tolerance for risk in the short-term. We maintain a low tolerance (and so relatively high Target Headroom allowance) for risk until our 1 in 200-year resilience will be secure, in the early 2030s. We then reduce our Target Headroom allowance during the 2030s in order that we do not drive investment due to long-term uncertainty.
- 6.134 In the long-term, our Target Headroom allowance is reduced compared to WRMP19, reflecting an increased risk tolerance due to the adaptive approach that we are taking.
- 6.135 Table 6-8 shows that base-year supply-side uncertainty is the main component of Target Headroom throughout the planning period.

TH Element	2025	2030	2040	2050
Base-year Supply-Side	60%	57%	66%	80%
Climate Change Supply-Side	15%	20%	N/A	N/A
Demand-Side	25%	23%	34%	20%

Table 6-8: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties – London

SWOX DYAA




Figure 6-13: SWOX DYAA Target Headroom Profiles

- 6.136 Table 6-9 shows Target Headroom as a percentage of DI across the planning period. This table shows that the resultant Target Headroom profile for the SWOX WRZ early in the planning horizon is relatively high, at 8-9% of DI. This reduces over time, to less than 5% of DI in the longer term.
- 6.137 The SWOX WRZ's water resources are reliant on hydrologically constrained abstractions from the River Thames. Predicting river flows in the River Thames at Farmoor during extreme drought events involves a high degree of uncertainty, and we have also seen climate change impacts have significant impacts on demand recently. The risk profile for SWOX is considered reasonable and aligns with the Water Resources Planning Guideline and priorities of our customers because it ensures a reasonable buffer in the shorter term, during which time we have a limited ability to respond with new supply options, and so this buffer safeguards service levels. In the longer term, the reduced target headroom allowance means that we are not planning for large investments on the basis of a large uncertainty allowance; in the longer term our adaptive plan ensures that we will be able to respond to challenges and uncertainties as they arise.

	Target Headroom as a % of DI					
	AR22	AR25	AR30	AR40	AR50	AR75
SWOX DYAA	9%	9%	8%	5%	3%	4%

Table 6-9: Target Headroom as a % of DI – SWOX DYAA

- 6.138 As with London, our SWOX DYAA Target Headroom allowance is initially larger than at WRMP19, reflecting the inclusion of a greater range of base-year risks. In the longer-term, our SWOX DYAA Target Headroom allowance is approximately the same as that used in WRMP19.
- 6.139 Table 6-10 shows that base-year supply-side uncertainty (i.e. uncertainty associated with DO assessment) is the main source of uncertainty for SWOX.

TH Element	2025	2030	2040	2050
Base-year Supply-Side	74%	72%	67%	85%
Climate Change Supply-Side	7%	9%	N/A	N/A
Demand-Side	19%	19%	33%	15%

Table 6-10: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties – SWOX DYAA

SWOX DYCP




Figure 6-14: SWOX DYCP Target Headroom Profiles

- 6.140 Table 6-11 shows that the resultant Target Headroom profile for the SWOX WRZ early in the planning horizon is 8-9% of DI and this reduces over time, to c.5% of DI in the longer term.
- 6.141 The SWOX WRZ's water resources are reliant on hydrologically constrained abstractions from the River Thames. Predicting river flows in the River Thames at Farmoor during extreme drought events involves a high degree of uncertainty, and we have also seen climate change impacts have significant impacts on demand recently. The risk profile for SWOX is considered reasonable and aligns with the WRPG and priorities of our customers because it ensures a reasonable buffer in the shorter term, during which time we have a limited ability to respond with new supply options, and so this buffer safeguards service levels. In the longer term, the reduced target headroom allowance means that we are not planning for large investments on the basis of a large uncertainty allowance; in the longer term our adaptive plan ensures that we will be able to respond to challenges and uncertainties as they arise.

	Target Headroom as a % of DI					
	AR22	AR25	AR30	AR40	AR50	AR75
SWOX DYCP	9%	9%	8%	6%	5%	5%

Table 6-11: Target Headroom as a % of DI – SWOX DYCP

- 6.142 In the short-term, our SWOX DYCP Target Headroom profile is higher than that which was used in WRMP19. Between dWRMP and rdWRMP we amended our SWOX peak DO calculation approach and this has resulted in the DYCP headroom allowance being very close to the DYAA headroom allowance.
- 6.143 Table 6-12 shows that base year supply-side uncertainty is the main contributor towards SWOX's DYCP Target Headroom in the early part of the planning period, with supply-side and demand-side uncertainty contributing in the longer-term.

TH Element	2025	2030	2040	2050
Base-year Supply-Side	65%	64%	53%	58%
Climate Change Supply-Side	5%	7%	N/A	N/A
Demand-Side	30%	29%	47%	42%

Table 6-12: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties – SWOX DYCP

SWA DYAA




Figure 6-15: SWA DYAA Target Headroom Profiles

6.144 Table 6-13 shows Target Headroom as a percentage of DI. This table shows that the Target Headroom profile for the SWA DYAA scenario is set at, or close to, the de-minimis level of 3% of DI across the planning horizon. This is reasonable because the sources in this zone are primarily constrained by licence (resulting in lower levels of uncertainty).

	Target Headroom as a % of DI					
	AR22	AR25	AR30	AR40	AR50	AR75
SWA DYAA	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%

Table 6-13: Target Headroom as a % of DI - SWA DYAA

6.145 The uncertainty profile for the SWA DYAA planning scenario is broadly similar to that used at WRMP19. The influence of climate change on the SWA WRZ is relatively small, and so the THEG and THEGC profiles are very close.

6.146 Table 6-14 shows that demand uncertainty is the main contributor towards SWA's DYAA Target Headroom profile.

TH Element	2025	2030	2040	2050
Base-year supply-Side	26%	26%	23%	25%
Climate Change Supply-Side	1%	1%	N/A	N/A
Demand-Side	73%	72%	77%	75%

Table 6-14: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties – SWA DYAA

SWA DYCP




Figure 6-16: SWA DYCP Target Headroom Profiles

6.147 Table 6-15 shows Target Headroom as a percentage of DI. This shows that Target Headroom levels are at a reasonably low level, of 3-5% of DI across the planning period. Having a slightly higher headroom allowance earlier in the planning horizon is reasonable and aligns with the views of our customers and the WRPG because it ensures that service levels are safeguarded. Planning for a lower allowance in the longer term also aligns with the requirements of the Water Resources Planning Guideline as, in the longer term, we can adapt to circumstances which arise, according to our adaptive plan, and so do not need to plan longer-term investment now.

	Target Headroom as a % of DI					
	AR22	AR25	AR30	AR40	AR50	AR75
SWA DYCP	4%	5%	5%	4%	3%	3%

Table 6-15: Target Headroom as a % of DI – SWA DYCP

6.148 The SWA DYCP Target Headroom profile is initially slightly greater than was used at WRMP19. In the long-term, our Target Headroom allowance is smaller than was used at WRMP19.

6.149 Table 6-16 shows that demand uncertainty is the main contributor towards SWA's DYCP Target Headroom.

TH Element	2025	2030	2040	2050
Base-year Supply-Side	29%	29%	28%	32%
Climate Change Supply-Side	1%	1%	N/A	N/A
Demand-Side	70%	70%	72%	68%

Table 6-16: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties – SWA DYCP

Kennet Valley DYAA



Figure 6-17: Kennet Valley DYAA Target Headroom Profiles

6.150 The Table below shows Target Headroom as a percentage of DI. The Target Headroom profile for the Kennet Valley DYAA scenario is set at, or close to, the de-minimis level of 3% across the planning horizon until dropping to 1.5% beyond 2050. This drop is because the analysis presented earlier indicates that there is a greater risk of having under-predicted the Fobney source's Deployable Output (which makes up around half of the WRZ's supplies) than having over-predicted it. Given the skewed risk in this scenario, allowing a smaller buffer across the planning period is reasonable and does not imply risk to customers' supplies.

	Target Headroom as a % of DI					
	AR22	AR25	AR30	AR40	AR50	AR75
Kennet Valley DYAA	3%	3%	3%	3%	1.5%	1.5%

Table 6-17: Target Headroom as a% of DI – Kennet Valley DYAA

6.151 The Kennet Valley DYAA Target Headroom profile is less than that used in WRMP19. Between dWRMP and rdWRMP, we reassessed the Kennet Valley zone's DO and the resulting uncertainty profile indicates that there is greater risk of having under-estimated the DO than having over-estimated it, and as such the Target Headroom allowance is relatively low.

6.152 Table 6-18 shows that climate change uncertainty and demand-side uncertainty are the factors which dominate initially, and when climate change uncertainty is discounted through adaptive planning, demand uncertainty is the only factor left to consider.

TH Element	2025	2030	2040	2050
Base-year Supply-Side	0%	0%	0%	0%
Climate Change Supply-Side	62%	71%	N/A	N/A
Demand-Side	38%	29%	100%	100%

Table 6-18: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties– KV DYAA

Kennet Valley DYCP




Figure 6-18: Kennet Valley DYCP Target Headroom Profiles

6.153 Table 6-19 shows Target Headroom as a percentage of DI. This Table shows that the Target Headroom profile for the Kennet Valley DYCP scenario begins at c.5-8% of DI, reducing to less than 5% of DI in the longer term. The increased headroom allowance in the shorter term ensures that levels of service are protected, while a reduced allowance in the longer term is reasonable as we will be able to adapt to different circumstances as they emerge.

	Target Headroom as a % of DI					
	AR22	AR25	AR30	AR40	AR50	AR75
Kennet Valley DYCP	5%	7%	7%	3%	3%	3%

Table 6-19: Target Headroom as a % of DI - Kennet Valley DYCP

6.154 The Target Headroom profile adopted for the Kennet Valley DYCP scenario is broadly similar to that used at WRMP19, but with a lower allowance in the longer-term.

6.155 Table 6-20 shows that base-year supply-side uncertainty plays only a very small role in contributing towards target headroom. Climate change and demand uncertainty are initially both significant contributors, but when climate change uncertainty is discounted (due to adaptive planning), demand-side uncertainty dominates.

TH Element	2025	2030	2040	2050
Base-year Supply-Side	18%	15%	0%	0%
Climate Change Supply-Side	47%	55%	N/A	N/A
Demand-Side	35%	30%	100%	100%

Table 6-20: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties – Kennet Valley DYCP

Guildford DYAA




Figure 6-19: Guildford DYAA Target Headroom Profiles

6.156 Table 6-21 below shows Target Headroom as a percentage of DI. This table shows that the Target Headroom profile for the Guildford DYAA scenario is set at, or close to, the de-minimis level of 3% of DI across the planning horizon. This is reasonable because the sources in this zone are primarily constrained by licence (resulting in lower levels of uncertainty).

	Target Headroom as a % of DI					
	AR22	AR25	AR30	AR40	AR50	AR75
Guildford DYAA	3%	4%	3%	3%	3%	3%

Table 6-21: Target Headroom as a % of DI - Guildford DYAA

6.157 The DYAA Target Headroom profile adopted for Guildford WRZ is broadly similar to that used in WRMP19.

6.158 Table 6-22 shows that demand-side uncertainty is the largest contributor towards Guildford's DYAA Target Headroom profiles.

TH Element	2025	2030	2040	2050
Base-year Supply-Side	35%	34%	30%	40%
Climate Change Supply-Side	0%	0%	N/A	N/A
Demand-Side	65%	66%	70%	60%

Table 6-22: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties – Guildford DYAA

Guildford DYCP




Figure 6-20: Guildford DYCP Target Headroom Profiles

6.159 The Table below shows that Target Headroom levels are at a reasonably low level, of 4-6% of DI across the planning period. Having a slightly higher headroom allowance earlier in the planning horizon is reasonable and aligns with the views of our customers and the WRPG because it ensures that service levels are safeguarded, for example ensuring resilience against increasing demands under increasingly frequent hot conditions. Planning for a lower allowance in the longer term also aligns with the requirements of the WRPG as, in the longer term, we can adapt to circumstances which arise, according to our adaptive plan, and so do not need to plan longer-term investment now.

	Target Headroom as a % of DI					
	AR22	AR25	AR30	AR40	AR50	AR75
Guildford DYCP	6%	6%	6%	4%	4%	4%

Table 6-23: Target Headroom as a % of DI - Guildford DYCP

6.160 The DYCP Target Headroom profile adopted for Guildford WRZ is broadly similar to that used in WRMP19, but with a higher allowance made in the shorter-term.

6.161 Table 6-24 shows that demand-side uncertainty is the largest contributor towards Guildford's DYCP Target Headroom profiles.

TH Element	2025	2030	2040	2050
Base-year Supply-Side	20%	20%	17%	19%
Climate Change Supply-Side	0%	0%	N/A	N/A
Demand-Side	80%	80%	83%	81%

Table 6-24: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties – Guildford DYCP

Henley DYAA




Figure 6-21: Henley DYAA Target Headroom Profiles

6.162 Table 6-25 shows that the Target Headroom profile for the Henley DYAA scenario is set at, or close to, the de-minimis level of 3% of DI across the planning horizon. This is reasonable because the sources in this zone are primarily constrained by licence (resulting in lower levels of uncertainty).

	Target Headroom as a % of DI					
	AR22	AR25	AR30	AR40	AR50	AR75
Henley DYAA	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%

Table 6-25: Target Headroom as a % of DI - Henley DYAA

6.163 The Henley DYAA Target Headroom profile adopted is broadly similar to the profile used at WRMP19.

6.164 Table 6-26 shows that demand-side uncertainty is the largest contributor towards Henley's DYAA Target Headroom profiles.

TH Element	2025	2030	2040	2050
Base-year Supply-Side	31%	24%	26%	37%
Climate Change Supply-Side	0%	0%	N/A	N/A
Demand-Side	69%	76%	74%	63%

Table 6-26: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties – Henley DYAA

Henley DYCP




Figure 6-22: Henley DYCP Target Headroom Profiles

6.165 Table 6-27 shows that Target Headroom levels are at a reasonably low level, of 3-6% of DI across the planning period. Having a slightly higher headroom allowance earlier in the planning horizon is reasonable and aligns with the views of our customers and the WRPG because it ensures that service levels are safeguarded. Planning for a lower allowance in the longer term also aligns with the requirements of the WRPG as, in the longer term, we can adapt to circumstances which arise, according to our adaptive plan, and so do not need to plan longer-term investment now.

	Target Headroom as a % of DI					
	AR22	AR25	AR30	AR40	AR50	AR75
Henley DYCP	5%	5%	6%	4%	3%	3%

Table 6-27: Target Headroom as a % of DI - Henley DYCP

6.166 The Henley DYCP Target Headroom profile adopted is broadly similar to the profile used at WRMP19, though with an increased allowance in the short-term.

6.167 Table 6-28 shows that demand-side uncertainty is the largest contributor towards Henley's DYCP Target Headroom profiles.

TH Element	2025	2030	2040	2050
Base-year Supply-Side	16%	14%	14%	17%
Climate Change Supply-Side	0%	0%	N/A	N/A
Demand-Side	84%	86%	86%	83%

Table 6-28: Contribution of Different TH Uncertainties – Henley DYCP

Baseline Supply-Demand Balance

6.168 The baseline supply-demand balance position is defined as:

The resulting supply-demand balance assuming no activity beyond the immediate AMP period other than that required to maintain leakage, or that required by law

- 6.169 By comparing the profile(s) of unrestricted demand (Section 3: Current and Future Demand for Water) against the available supply (Section 4: Current and future water supply), plus an allowance for uncertainty as outlined earlier in this section, and accounting for future sustainability reductions (Section 5), supply-demand balance(s) are created.
- 6.170 A supply-demand balance highlights whether there is a “planning problem” (problem in the sense of a question for which a solution is needed), i.e. a forecast deficit in any zone before significant intervention from the company. We test this for both the dry year annual average (DYAA) and average day peak week (ADPW, also referred to as Dry Year Critical Period, DYCP). It is possible that deficits may exist under one/both/neither condition(s); our plan must provide a solution to ensure supply-demand balance in both scenarios.
- 6.171 In this section we present baseline supply-demand balances for each of our WRZs. A full breakdown of the components of the forecast can be found in the Water Resources Management Plan tables.
- 6.172 Within the baseline presented in this section, we have assumed a Level of Service that changes over time, aligned with our expected Levels of Service. Our baseline includes a period (2025-2032) during which we would not impose emergency drought orders more often than once every one hundred years; there then follows a period during which we would not impose emergency drought orders more often than once every two hundred years (2033-2039), and then a period when we would not impose emergency drought orders more often than once every five hundred years. This is in contrast to the WRMP Tables, in which the baseline supply-demand balance is presented assuming 1 in 500-year drought conditions.
- 6.173 Where there is an upwards step change in the resilience level in our plan, there will be a step down in the supply-demand balance. The reason for this is that we can reliably supply more water in less severe drought events, and vice versa. As we increase the level of resilience that we are aiming for, we will be able to rely on a smaller supply of water from our existing resources.
- 6.174 Our baseline in London and SWOX is presented slightly differently to WRMP19. In WRMP19 we assumed that Temporary Use Bans (TUBs) and Non-Essential Use Bans (NEUBs, also known as DD11 Drought Orders) were part of our baseline. These are now excluded from the baseline as shown in the Water Resources Management Plan tables. In this section we have presented a set of baseline supply-demand balances excluding TUBs, NEUBs and media campaigns, and a set of supply-demand balances which include these actions, to reflect the fact that we will certainly include these demand management actions within our WRMP.
- 6.175 We have excluded transfers to companies within the WRSE region from our baseline supply-demand balance, regardless of whether a contract exists for that transfer. The

reason for this is that the WRSE plan has optimised transfers between WRSE companies. Transfers to those companies outside WRSE have been included within our baseline.

Activity Within the Baseline Scenario

6.176 It is assumed that water resource activity included in our plan for the period 2020-2025 is delivered as has been set out in Section 3: Current and Future Demand for Water. Baseline activity beyond 2025 is restricted to the following levels:

- Leakage levels are assumed to be maintained
- Optant metering programme (optant meters being those which are voluntarily requested by customers)
- Some ongoing water efficiency improvements, which will reduce consumption, as described in Section 3: Current and Future Demand for Water

Baseline Supply-Demand Balance and Adaptive Planning

6.177 In WRMP19, we formed single supply-demand balance profiles, using deterministic forecasts for supply, demand and target headroom. In WRMP24, we are adopting an adaptive planning approach, reflecting the highly uncertain exogenous factors which we need to plan for, and so will instead set out multiple supply-demand balance profiles.

6.178 The key uncertainties within our WRMP are:

- Population growth, and so the demand forecast
- The volume of sustainability reductions, set out in our 'Environmental Destination' scenarios
- The impact that climate change will have on our available supplies

6.179 These exogenous uncertainties are the factors that we will consider when building supply-demand balance scenarios. Our plan will be one which provides an efficient solution to a very uncertain future, while acknowledging that there are particular scenarios which guidance tells us that we should consider with more focus.

6.180 The scenarios considered and branch points adopted are consistent across the WRSE regional group.

6.181 Our plan starts with a single supply-demand balance 'branch'. It starts off with a single branch, because we need to have a single plan for actions which need to be undertaken in AMP8. After AMP8, if appropriate to do so, we can consider having different investment programmes which are suitable for different future scenarios. For example, if we saw that population growth was following a low trajectory during AMP8, we may make different investments during AMP9 (2030-35) than if we saw that population growth was following a high trajectory. We have considered the magnitude of difference between different forecasts of uncertain factors over time, as well as the time at which we may be able to observe whether a more or less severe trajectory is being followed, as well as considering our allowances for uncertainty and the lead times associated with interventions, when considering when our supply-demand balance profiles should branch.

Demand

- 6.182 The WRPG sets out that we should consider Local Authority plans of population and properties when developing our demand forecast. As such, our early and central supply-demand balances will use the Local Authority Plan demand forecasts.
- 6.183 Ofwat has released guidance regarding adaptive planning¹³ which sets out that we should consider an ONS18 principal population forecast as a plausible low population forecast. As such, we have considered the demand forecast based on this population forecast within the lower branches of our supply-demand balance trees.
- 6.184 The OxCam growth corridor is an important factor which we should consider in our water resources planning. Developments associated with the OxCam corridor are not yet built into Local Authority plans, but would pose a material risk to our supply-demand balance should they materialise, particularly in our SWOX and SWA WRZs. As such, we have considered OxCam demand forecasts within the upper branches of our supply-demand balance trees.
- 6.185 Analysis of demand forecasts shows a material divergence between low and high population forecasts in the relatively short-term; observation of population growth is also relatively simple. As such, we will impose an adaptive plan ‘decision point’ as early as possible, in 2030, and will ‘branch’ our supply-demand balances to consider different demand forecasts in 2035. The separation between ‘decision point’ and ‘supply-demand balance branch point’ avoids skewing investments towards more challenging branches.

Environmental Destination

- 6.186 As is set out in Section 5, we have developed several scenarios of future licence reductions, known as ‘Environmental Destination’ scenarios, which may need to be implemented to protect and enhance ecology. We have developed three scenarios, High, Medium, and Low.
- 6.187 The process that has been used to set out our Environmental Ambition for the “High” scenario works to achieve Environment Agency EFI targets. This is in alignment with the Environment Agency’s advice and guidance and with the approach taken by the WRSE Regional Group, which is that use of the National Framework scenarios (which meet the EFI in all catchments, but which use different approaches and assumptions in calculation of the EFI under climate change) is required to demonstrate compliance with current statutory and regulatory requirements in the future.
- 6.188 The usual process for confirming licence reductions is to undertake detailed investigation and solution development, in order to check licence reduction proposals against policy tests. In some cases, licence reduction proposals identified through EFI compliance can be deferred, or alternative solutions to ensure environmental protection can be found. As such, our consideration is that there is a degree of uncertainty over the extent of licence reductions which may be required in the future, and so we have adopted different scenarios of abstraction reduction within our adaptive plan. While there is a degree of uncertainty, guidance and advice from our regulators has led us to place most weight on the “High” scenario for our long-term planning, as this scenario ensures compliance with current statutory and regulatory requirements and applies the precautionary approach in

¹³ Ofwat, 2022, PR24 and beyond: Final guidance on long-term delivery strategies, https://www.ofwat.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/PR24-and-beyond-Final-guidance-on-long-term-delivery-strategies_Pr24.pdf

identifying licence reductions which may be required. As such, the "High" scenario is adopted in our preferred programme for the long term.

- 6.189 While there is material divergence between 'High' and 'Low' Environmental Destination scenarios, the Environment Agency has set out that licence reductions in these scenarios do not need to be made until 2050 at the latest, giving us time to conduct investigations and adapt our investment plans in the future.
- 6.190 We will start out by assuming a 'Low' Environmental Destination trajectory (only assuming that sustainability reductions that have been identified as being very likely will be made) and have incorporated the Environment Agency's recently introduced 'Licence Capping' policy into this 'Low' Environmental Destination scenario (ensuring that double counting is avoided). There will be a 'decision point' at 2035, and a 'supply-demand balance branch point' at 2040, where our supply-demand balances will diverge in the Environmental Destination scenario that is followed.

Climate Change

- 6.191 The impact that climate change will have on drought events is highly uncertain. Detecting which future climate trajectory we are following will not be possible in 'real-time' due to the uncertainty that exists over the impact of climate change on drought events in a given future emissions scenario, and so incorporating climate monitoring into our WRMP monitoring plan will not be feasible. We do, however, consider that it is important that we consider more and less severe future climate scenarios, to ensure that our plan is robust to a range of risks.
- 6.192 Aligned with other WRSE companies, we have conducted detailed modelling of 28 future climate projections. We have then supplemented this modelling with less detailed modelling of thousands of future climate projections. All WRSE companies are using the median result of the 28 future climate scenarios as the 'central' (or medium) climate change impact forecast within their WRMPs, the 6th climate scenario as a representative 'high' scenario (please note that it is the 6th scenario modelled, not the 6th most severe), and the 7th climate scenario as a representative 'low' scenario.
- 6.193 The 'high' (6th) scenario is not the most severe that we have modelled and is instead approximately an upper quartile position within the range of scenarios that we have modelled. For our London WRZ, which is the most impacted by climate change, the 6th climate change scenario is the 7th most severe of the 28 scenarios modelled.
- 6.194 The 'low' (7th) scenario is not the least severe climate change scenario. For our London WRZ, the 'low' scenario we are using is the fourth least severe scenario of the 28 that have been modelled.
- 6.195 The 6th and 7th climate scenarios were chosen by WRSE and were selected as scenarios which are consistently quite severe and not very severe, respectively, across the WRSE region.
- 6.196 We will start by following the 'median' climate change trajectory. There will be a 'decision point' at 2035, and a 'branch point' in 2040, at which point we will consider multiple climate change impact scenarios.
- 6.197 We would ideally have used a later branch point for climate change impact uncertainty, to reflect the difficulty and uncertainty associated with monitoring climate change impacts

and the impact of climate change on drought likelihood and severity. However, computational constraints mean that we can have a maximum of two branch points (each branch point splitting into 3, giving 9 branches in total), and so we have chosen to ‘branch’ on climate change uncertainty at the same time as Environmental Destination scenarios as this is the latest branch point available.

Supply-Demand Balance Scenarios

6.198 The scenarios associated with different uncertain factors have been combined to form a ‘tree’ of supply-demand balance. The scenarios (‘branches’) considered within the tree are shown in Table 6-29.

Branch No.	2025-30	2030-35	2035-40	2040-2100
1	Local Plan Demand Median CC Low ED	Local Plan Demand Median CC Low ED	Local Plan + OxCam Demand Median CC Low ED	Maximum Demand Forecast High CC High ED
2			Local Plan + OxCam Demand Median CC Low ED	Local Plan + OxCam Demand Median CC Medium ED
3			Local Plan + OxCam Demand Median CC Low ED	Local Plan + OxCam Demand Low CC Low ED
4		Local Plan Demand Median CC Low ED	Local Plan Demand Median CC Low ED	Local Plan Demand High CC High ED
5			Local Plan Demand Median CC Low ED	Local Plan Demand Median CC Medium ED
6			Local Plan Demand Median CC Low ED	Local Plan Demand Low CC Low ED
7		Local Plan Demand Median CC Low ED	ONS18 Demand Median CC Low ED	ONS18 Demand High CC High ED
8			ONS18 Demand Median CC Low ED	ONS18 Demand Median CC Medium ED
9			ONS18 Demand Median CC Low ED	Minimum Demand Forecast Low CC Low ED

Table 6-29: Scenarios considered within situation ‘tree’ for WRMP24

6.199 In the following sub-sections, for each WRZ and planning scenario (DYAA, DYCP), we will show:

- a) A breakdown of the components of the supply demand balance at the start of the planning period (2024-25) with a comparison to the WRMP19 “Final Plan” forecast.

- b) The relative contribution of different factors to our supply-demand balance at 2050, including the impact of different scenarios where different scenarios are considered within our adaptive plan.
 - c) Supply-demand balances over the planning period for each of the nine branches considered within our adaptive plan for each of our WRZs, and comparison with the WRMP19 baseline forecast.
 - d) In more detail, the balance of supply and demand in Branch 4, the pathway along which we describe our preferred programme.
 - e) A comparison of the WRMP24 baseline supply-demand balance against the WRMP19 baseline supply-demand balance, noting that the WRMP19 baseline supply-demand balance excludes demand management activity carried out/due to be carried out in AMP7.
- 6.200 We made relatively minor changes to elements of our supply and demand forecasts between the rdWRMP24 and final WRMP24. We have not updated Figures between rdWRMP24 and fWRMP24, but we have updated numbers in Tables.

London DYAA

- 6.201 Comparing our WRMP19 final plan forecast for 2024-25 against our WRMP24 forecast for 2024-25, see table below, whilst there is little change in the overall supply demand balance, there are changes in the components. Distribution input has not changed significantly overall, though there is less leakage than was forecast in WRMP19 but more household consumption (with a higher population and higher PCC than was planned for). Non-household consumption is forecast to be lower than was planned, and leakage is also forecast to be lower than was planned for in WRMP19, in our London WRZ.
- 6.202 In the calculation of deployable output, there have been changes in underlying source deployable outputs, as well as changes in assumptions and methods. The combined reductions in forecast deployable output from groundwater sources (those which are currently existent and those which were planned) totals 134 MI/d. Having changed our Level of Service regarding Temporary Use Ban implementation from Level 3 to Level 2 will have increased our DO (when accounting for demand savings actions to be implemented during a drought) by around 18 MI/d, and we have removed an overly conservative representation of Affinity Water's abstractions between WRMP19 and WRMP24, resulting in a c.50 MI/d DO gain. If demand savings actions were included in our DO calculation (i.e., to provide a like-for-like comparison), our DO following all changes (excluding the Essex and Suffolk transfer) would be around 2370-2410 MI/d. As such, the underlying DO estimate excluding changes in assumptions and source DO values (i.e., DO change due to the assessment of a '1 in 100-year DO' using new stochastic weather datasets, new hydrological models, and a new water resources simulation model) has increased by approximately 63-103 MI/d ($2390/2410 - 2373 + 134 - 18 - 50$), around 3-5% of DO.
- 6.203 Outage allowance in London WRZ has reduced by 26 MI/d, although some of this reduction is due to the reduction in stated source capability of the Gateway desalination plant (i.e., if we are less reliant on the source in our DO calculation, we do not need to make as large an allowance for outage).
- 6.204 Exports and imports have not changed significantly, though exports to other WRSE companies have been removed from our baseline.

- 6.205 As is discussed in Section 4 and Appendix U, we have revised our climate change impact assessment, in order to use UKCP18 climate change projections. The negative impact of climate change on our supplies from our baseline up to 2024-25 has decreased slightly.
- 6.206 Due to the uncertainties around assessment of a '1 in X-year' Deployable Output, and recognising wider hydrological and operational uncertainties (as discussed in this chapter), our target headroom requirement has increased, by 56 MI/d.
- 6.207 When all of these changes are taken together, there is a negligible impact on our overall forecast supply-demand balance position, though there are clearly significant changes in our underlying supply-demand balance components.

Component (MI/d unless stated)	WRMP19 (Yr 2024-25)	WRMP24 (Yr 2024-25)	Difference
Population (000s)	8,213	8,359	+146
Per Capita Consumption (l/h/d)	136.2	137.3	+1.1
Household Consumption	1,111	1,141	+30
Non-household Consumption	361	323	-38
Leakage	408	381	-27
Distribution Input	1,927	1,913	-14*
AMP7 supply-side scheme delivery	16.0	0.0	-16.0
Gateway Desalination Plant DO	150	50	-100
Hoddesdon Transfer Scheme DO	12.5	0	-12.5
Total Groundwater SDOs (worst historical DO)	443.7	437.9	-5.8
Temporary Use Bans moved to Level 2 (from Level 3 in WRMP19)	N/A	N/A	+18 (est)
Removal of overly conservative view of Affinity Water abstractions (done in AR20)	N/A	N/A	+50 (est)
WRZ Deployable Output after process losses and network constraints**, ****	2,373	2,268	-105
Outage Allowance	99.8	73.9	-25.9
Total Imports	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Exports	84.1	92.7	+7.6
Climate Change Impact	-59.1	-54.6	+4.5
WAFU	2,130	2,056	-74
Target Headroom	141.5	197.2	+55.7
Benefit from Demand Savings During a Drought**	Included within DO	103-141*****	
Supply-demand Balance (SDB)	61.4	55.0	-6.4

Table 6-30: SDB component comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24, London DYAA

*Note that a change in water taken unbilled and DSOU is the reason that the DI change does not equate to the sum of changes in leakage, NHH consumption and HH consumption.

**Note that the WRMP19 London DO includes benefits from demand savings during a drought, while this is excluded from the baseline DO calculation in WRMP24

*** This value will appear different to that in our WRMP tables, as the WRMP data table value is a '1 in 500-year' DO impact whereas the value in this table is a '1 in 100-year' DO impact

**** This figure includes the Didcot power station licence trade, and also excludes the Essex and Suffolk transfer (listed in exports)

*****A range is stated here, as the impact of demand savings has been calculated as being 103 MI/d for 1 in 500-year DO (included in WRMP data tables), but 141 MI/d for 1 in 100-year DO.

6.208 Please note that, between dWRMP24 and rdWRMP24 and because of a representation made by the Environment Agency, we amended our WRMP tables to ensure that we present a baseline supply-demand balance forecast consistent with the provision of a 1 in 500-year Level of Resilience throughout the planning period, as is required by the Water Resources Planning Guideline. Additionally, the supply-demand balance value stated in the Table above is inclusive of the benefits which we forecast would be delivered as a result of demand savings interventions during a drought (which are excluded from the baseline in the WRMP24 Tables, as required by guidance). As such, the value in the Table above is different to the baseline supply-demand balance value stated in our WRMP Tables. The difference is the sum of 242.25 MI/d (which is the additional amount of water we would need to be able to supply to provide a 1 in 500-year resilience, rather than our current 1 in 100-year level of service) and 109.17 MI/d (which is the amount of benefit forecast to be derived from demand restrictions during a drought in 2024-25). The baseline supply-demand balance in our WRMP Tables in 2024-25 is $55.0 - 242.25 - 109.17 = -296.5$.

6.209 Figure 6-23 shows the impact associated with each of the main components of the supply-demand balance, including supply-demand balance impacts where different scenarios are considered within our adaptive plan. This demonstrates that 1 in 500-year resilience, growth in demand, and environmental destination all pose major challenges to our London WRZ supply-demand balance in the future, and that growth and environmental destination pose major uncertainty. The supply-demand balance impact and uncertainty associated with climate change is not negligible, but is a minor factor compared to others.




Figure 6-23: London DYAA – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050

Note: demand impacts are relative to the 2024-25 baseline forecast; climate change impacts are relative to the supply forecast baseline.

- 6.210 Figure 6-24 and Figure 6-26 show that London's baseline supply-demand balance starts in a position of deficit. It is important to note that this is only due to the removal of the benefits associated with media campaigns, TUBs and NEUBs, and that when these benefits are included we see our supply-demand balance start in a position of surplus, as shown in Figure 6-25 and Figure 6-27.
- 6.211 A deficit develops in our London WRZ before 2030 due to forecast demand increasing through AMP8, though at this point the deficit is modest, with a magnitude which demand management actions alone should be able to solve.
- 6.212 In 2033, the magnitude of the deficit grows significantly as we move to a '1 in 200-year' level of resilience (this change has a c.120 MI/d impact on our supply-demand balance). The deficit at this point is quite significant (around 260 MI/d, after benefits of TUBs and NEUBs are accounted for), and we are likely to require new sources of water to ensure a supply-demand balance.
- 6.213 The variation in forecasts considered results in significant differences in the supply-demand challenge to be solved by 2040, with our least challenging and most challenging supply-demand positions being separated by more than 200 MI/d. This disparity in the need for investment by 2040 creates a significant adaptive planning problem, particularly when considering that many of our large supply options have lead times of between 8 and 15 years.
- 6.214 In 2040, our supply-demand balance is hit by the move to 1 in 500-year resilience. For our London WRZ, this impact is around 150 MI/d in all situations, which can be seen in Figure 6-26.
- 6.215 The gaps between our different supply-demand balance forecasts continue to grow as the variation between demand forecasts, climate change impact forecasts, and environmental destination scenarios grows through the planning period. In our least challenging forecast, the planning problem that is posed does not grow substantially from 2040 onwards, while in the most challenging supply-demand balance forecast the deficit grows by more than 500 MI/d between 2039 and 2060.
- 6.216 In our forecast for situation 4, our supply-demand balance once benefits from TUBs and NEUBs are accounted for is approximately -460 MI/d in 2040, with the deficit growing to 730 MI/d by 2050 and 760 MI/d by 2060. The deficit by 2075 is around 800 MI/d.
- 6.217 The significant jump downwards in most of our supply-demand balance profiles in 2050 is due to forecast licence reductions contained within our Environmental Destination forecasts.
- 6.218 The fact that Environmental Destination and Climate Change together pose a larger uncertainty than demand means that situations 1, 4, and 7 end up being those with the most severe supply-demand balance challenge to be overcome in the long-term.
- 6.219 When a like-for-like comparison is made with our forecast WRMP19 baseline supply-demand balance, as can be seen in Table 6-31, we begin the planning period in a significantly better position than our WRMP19 Baseline supply-demand balance. This is due to the significant demand management programme that is being undertaken during

AMP7. This improved position is maintained through the 2020s and 2030s. The move to 1 in 500-year resilience creates a point of difference between our WRMP19 and WRMP24 supply-demand balances, and the impact of this change is to bring our WRMP24 baseline supply-demand balance very close to our WRMP19 forecast. Over the longer-term, sustainability reductions forecast in our Environmental Destination forecast leave us with a larger supply-demand balance problem to overcome than was forecast in WRMP19, though a reduced long-term growth forecast means that this difference is not as large as the DO reductions present in our Environmental Destination forecasts.




Figure 6-24: SDB Situation Tree - London DYAA




Figure 6-25: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) – London DYAA




Figure 6-26: Baseline Supply & Demand - Situation 4, London DYAA




Figure 6-27: Baseline Supply & Demand (Inc. Drought Demand Savings - Situation 4, London DYAA

	2026	2030	2045	2075
WRMP19	-153	-195	-362	-531
WRMP24	+36	-95	-484	-798

Table 6-31: Baseline SDB Comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 – Situation 4 London DYAA.

SWOX DYAA

6.220 Comparing our WRMP19 and WRMP24 forecasts for 2024-25, the overall supply demand balance position has deteriorated slightly. We can see significant changes in its components. Distribution input has changed significantly between the two forecasts, with leakage, household consumption and non-household consumption all being higher in our WRMP24 forecast than WRMP19. Underlying source DOs have changed little, but datasets and methods used for calculating Deployable Output have changed significantly between WRMP19 and WRMP24, and this has resulted in a change to the calculated WRZ DO figure. The baseline DO figure has increased slightly, but when including the benefits of TUBs and NEUBs, WRZ DO has increased significantly. This increase in DO is likely to be a combination of more dynamic modelling of the conjunctive use system (e.g., including time-variant groundwater yields, rather than worst-case DO values), and perhaps due to 1976 having been a very severe event for SWOX (and as such, the WRMP19 “worst historical” DO perhaps being subject to a more than 1 in 100-year event). Outage allowance has reduced significantly, as a result of the removal of “generic” outages (see Appendix J, Outage, for further details). Target Headroom has increased as a result of exploration of the risks and uncertainty around our surface water sources. The overall result is that the supply-demand balance at 2024-25 is slightly worse than the value anticipated in WRMP19.

Component (Ml/d unless stated)	WRMP19 (Yr 2024-25)	WRMP24 (Yr 2024-25)	Difference
Population (000s)	1191	1139	-52
Per Capita Consumption (l/h/d)	127.2	134.4	+7.2
Household Consumption	147.1	148.6	+1.5
Non-household Consumption	49.4	53.7	+4.3
Leakage	53.6	65.0	+11.4
Distribution Input	255.0	278.9	+23.9
Total Groundwater SDOs (worst historical)	177.9	178.9	+1.0
WRZ DO after process losses and network constraints**	316.3	317.9	+1.6
Outage Allowance	17.2	6.7	-10.5
Total Imports	2.1	0.4	-1.7
Total Exports	1.0	9.5	+8.5
Climate Change Impact	-3.4	-3.9***	-0.5
WAFU	296.8	298.2	+1.4
Target Headroom	14.8	29.3	+14.5
Benefit from Demand Savings During a Drought**	Included in DO	25.9	+25.9
Supply Demand Balance (SDB)	+27.0	+15.9	-11.1

Table 6-32: SDB component comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 - SWOX DYAA

*Note that a change in water taken unbilled and DSOU is the reason that the DI change does not equate to the sum of changes in leakage, NHH consumption and HH consumption.

**Note that the WRMP19 SWOX DO includes benefits from demand savings during a drought, while this is excluded from the baseline DO calculation in WRMP24

*** This value will appear different to that in our WRMP tables, as the WRMP data table value is a '1 in 500-year' DO impact whereas the value in this table is a '1 in 100-year' DO impact

6.221 Please note that, between the dWRMP24 and rdWRMP24, and because of a representation made by the Environment Agency, we amended our WRMP tables to ensure that we present a baseline supply-demand balance forecast consistent with the provision of a 1 in 500-year Level of Resilience throughout the planning period, as is required by the Water Resources Planning Guideline. Additionally, the supply-demand balance value stated in the Table above is inclusive of the benefits which we forecast would be delivered as a result of demand savings interventions during a drought (which are excluded from the baseline in the WRMP24 Tables, as required by guidance). As such, the value in the Table above is different to the baseline supply-demand balance value stated in our WRMP Tables. The difference is the sum of 23.33 MI/d (which is the additional amount of water we would need to be able to supply to provide a 1 in 500-year resilience, rather than our current 1 in 100-year level of service) and 25.88 MI/d (which is the amount of benefit forecast to be derived from demand restrictions during a drought in 2024-25). The baseline supply-demand balance in our WRMP Tables in 2024-25 is $15.9 - 23.33 - 25.88 = -33.3$.

6.222 Figure 6-28 shows that Environmental Destination and demand are the largest uncertainties associated with SWOX's DYAA supply-demand balance, with climate change posing a smaller uncertainty and 1 in 500-year resilience posing a moderate challenge.




Figure 6-28: SWOX DYAA – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050

Note: demand impacts are relative to the 2024-25 baseline forecast; climate change impacts are relative to the supply forecast baseline

- 6.223 When media campaigns, TUBs, and NEUBs are included we see our supply-demand balance start in a position of surplus, as shown in Figure 6-30 and Figure 6-32.
- 6.224 We see a surplus in SWOX during AMP8, but a transition to deficit during the early 2030s, when we move to 1 in 200-year resilience.
- 6.225 When our supply-demand balances branch into three, we see a moderate gap of around 20 MI/d between the most and least favourable supply-demand balances.
- 6.226 When our supply-demand balances branch into 9, we see a much more significant variation between future supply-demand balance positions, particularly after 2050 when Environmental Destination DO reductions are accounted for. The gap between the most challenging and least challenging supply-demand balances is around 80 MI/d by 2050, which equates to around a quarter of the supplies in the zone at present. As was the case for London, situations 1, 4, and 7 are the most challenging in the long-term.
- 6.227 In our forecast for situation 4, we see deficits, when accounting for benefits from TUBs and NEUBs of 25 MI/d after our move to 1 in 200-year resilience, 92 MI/d after moving to 1 in 500-year resilience and enabling a licence reduction at Farmoor, 102 MI/d after all Environmental Destination DO reductions are accounted for, and 108 MI/d by the end of the planning period.
- 6.228 When compared to our WRMP19 baseline supply-demand balance our initial position, our initial supply-demand balance is initially slightly improved due to our AMP7 demand programme. A demand forecast which grows more quickly than our WRMP19 forecast means that this initial gap is closed by 2030, and as this increased growth, the Farmoor licence reduction, and 1 in 500-year resilience are accounted for we have a much greater planning problem by 2045 than was forecast in WRMP19. The size of the baseline deficit forecast continues to increase above that forecast in WRMP19 in the longer-term as significant licence reductions are accounted for.




Figure 6-29: SDB Situation Tree - SWOX DYAA




Figure 6-30: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - SWOX DYAA




Figure 6-31: Baseline Supply & Demand - Situation 4, SWOX DYAA




Figure 6-32: Baseline Supply & Demand (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - Situation 4, SWOX DYAA

	2026	2030	2045	2075
WRMP19	+9	+6	+8	+9
WRMP24	+11	-3	-96	-108

Table 6-33: Baseline SDB Comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) – Situation 4, SWOX DYAA.

SWOX DYCP

6.229 Comparing our WRMP19 final plan forecast for 2024-25 against our WRMP24 forecast for 2024-25, we can see significant changes in the components of the supply-demand balance. Distribution input has changed between the two forecasts, with leakage and non-household consumption being significantly higher in our WRMP24 forecast than WRMP19. Underlying source DOs have changed little, but datasets and methods used for calculating Deployable Output have changed significantly between WRMP19 and WRMP24, and this has resulted in a change to the calculated WRZ DO figure. The baseline DO figure has reduced, but when included the benefits of TUBs and NEUBs, WRZ DO has increased. Outage allowance has reduced significantly, as a result of calculation of a DYCP outage allowance. Target Headroom has increased as a result of exploration of the risks and uncertainty around our surface water sources. The overall result is a small improvement in our supply-demand balance position.

Component	WRMP19 (Yr 2024-25)	WRMP24 (Yr 2024-25)	Difference
Population (000s)	1,191	1,138	-53
Per Capita Consumption (l/h/d)	178.0	181.8	+3.8
Household Consumption	205.9	201.0	-4.9
Non-household Consumption	49.8	53.7	+3.9
Leakage	50.8	65.1	+14.3
Distribution Input	314.2	331.3	+17.2
Total Groundwater SDOs (worst historical)	193.4	191.5	-1.9
WRZ DO after process losses and network constraints**	370.6	339.9	-30.7
Outage Allowance	17.2	3.1	-14.1
Total Imports	5.0	0.4	-4.6
Total Exports	1.2	9.5	+8.3
Climate Change Impact	-3.8	-3.9***	-0.1
WAFU	353.3	323.9	-29.4
Target Headroom	20.5	29.1	+8.6
Benefit from Demand Savings During a Drought	Included in DO	60.4	+60.4
Supply-demand Balance (SDB)	18.7	23.9	+5.2

Table 6-34: SDB component comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 - SWOX DYCP

*Note that a change in water taken unbilled and DSOU is the reason that the DI change does not equate to the sum of changes in leakage, NHH consumption and HH consumption.

**Note that the WRMP19 SWOX DO includes benefits from demand savings during a drought, while this is excluded from the baseline DO calculation in WRMP24

*** This value will appear different to that in our WRMP tables, as the WRMP data table value is a '1 in 500-year' DO impact whereas the value in this table is a '1 in 100-year' DO impact

6.230 Please note that, between the dWRMP24 and rdWRMP24, and because of a representation made by the Environment Agency, we amended our WRMP tables to ensure that we present a baseline supply-demand balance forecast consistent with the provision of a 1 in 500-year Level of Resilience throughout the planning period, as is

required by the Water Resources Planning Guideline. Additionally, the supply-demand balance value stated in the Table above is inclusive of the benefits which we forecast would be delivered as a result of demand savings interventions during a drought (which are excluded from the baseline in the WRMP24 Tables, as required by guidance). As such, the value in the Table above is different to the baseline supply-demand balance value stated in our WRMP Tables. The difference is the sum of 24.54 MI/d (which is the additional amount of water we would need to be able to supply to provide a 1 in 500-year resilience, rather than our current 1 in 100-year level of service) and 60.43 MI/d (which is the amount of benefit forecast to be derived from demand restrictions during a drought in 2024-25). The baseline supply-demand balance in our WRMP Tables in 2024-25 is $23.9 - 24.54 - 60.43 = -61.1$.

- 6.231 Figure 6-33 shows that demand is the most important future uncertainty for the SWOX WRZ's DYCP scenario, although environmental destination and 1 in 500-year resilience also pose challenges.




Figure 6-33: SWOX DYCP – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050

Note: demand impacts are relative to the 2024-25 baseline forecast; climate change impacts are relative to the supply forecast baseline

- 6.232 Figure 6-34, Figure 6-35, and Figure 6-36 show that the SWOX DYCP scenario begins in a position of surplus.
- 6.233 Many of the futures for the SWOX DYCP scenario sit within a fairly narrow range, with the difference between the second-most challenging and second-least challenging situations being around 30 MI/d by 2050. This is because Environmental Destination licence reductions pose less of a risk to the peak supply-demand balance than the annual average.
- 6.234 When compared with the WRMP19 baseline, our reduced allowance for outage during the DYCP planning scenario and increased assessment of SWOX's DYCP DO, along with our AMP7 demand management programme, give us a significant improved supply-demand

balance at the beginning of the planning period in branch 4. Sustainability reductions and a higher demand forecast in the Local Authority plan-based demand forecast result in a more challenging supply-demand position than WRMP19 in the long-term.




Figure 6-34: SDB Situation Tree - SWOX DYCP




Figure 6-35: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - SWOX DYCP




Figure 6-36: Baseline Supply & Demand (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - Situation 4, SWOX DYCP

	2026	2030	2045	2075
WRMP19	-3	-7	-11	-18
WRMP24	+15	+1	-74	-89

Table 6-35: Comparison Between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (Branch 4) Baseline Supply-Demand Balance for SWOX WRZ DYCP

SWA DYAA

6.235 Comparing our WRMP19 final plan forecast for 2024-25 against our WRMP24 forecast for 2024-25, we can see a slight underlying improvement in the supply-demand balance performance which is enhanced by a change between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (accounting for the benefits of demand savings actions during a drought). Distribution input has increased between the two forecasts. Forecast WAFU decreased a little. Overall, this results in a deteriorated supply-demand balance position, which is enhanced when demand savings measures during a drought are accounted for.

Component (Ml/d unless stated)	WRMP19 (Yr 2024-25)	WRMP24 (Yr 2024-25)	Difference
Population (000s)	598	566	-32
Per Capita Consumption (l/h/d)	136.3	142.7	+6.4
Household Consumption	80.6	80.0	-0.4
Non-household Consumption	18.6	20.8	+2.2
Leakage	37.4	42.6	+5.2
Distribution Input	138.6	146.9	+8.3*
DO after process losses and network constraints	176.3	182.2	+5.9
Outage Allowance	9.5	15.5	+6.0
Total Imports	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Exports	2.3	4.6	+2.3
Climate Change Impact	-1.1	-0.1	-1.0
WAFU	163.4	162.0	-1.4
Target Headroom	5.2	4.5	-0.7
Benefit from Demand Savings During a Drought	0.0	14.0	+14.0
Supply-demand Balance (SDB)	19.7	24.6	+4.9

Table 6-36: SDB component comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 - SWA DYAA

*Note that a change in water taken unbilled and DSOU is the reason that the DI change does not equate to the sum of changes in leakage, NHH consumption and HH consumption.

6.236 Please note that the supply-demand balance value stated in the Table above is inclusive of the benefits which we forecast would be delivered as a result of demand savings interventions during a drought (which are excluded from the baseline in the WRMP24 Tables, as required by guidance). As such, the baseline supply-demand balance in our WRMP Tables in 2024-25 is $24.6 - 13.95 = 10.65$.

6.237 Figure 6-37 shows that the High Environmental Destination scenario poses the largest source of uncertainty for the SWA DYAA supply-demand balance. Demand uncertainty also poses a fairly significant uncertainty, while the impact of climate change is small in all scenarios due to the WRZ's supplies being dominated by drought-resilient groundwater sources.




Figure 6-37: SWA DYAA – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050

Note: demand impacts are relative to the 2024-25 baseline forecast; climate change impacts are relative to the supply forecast baseline

- 6.238 Our SWA DYAA planning scenario begins with a position of surplus which is maintained in all future situations until 2039 if TUBs and NEUBs are accounted for.
- 6.239 Prior to DO reductions associated with Environmental Destination forecasts, the gap between different situations is modest, with a gap of less than 15 MI/d between the most and least challenging situations by 2040.
- 6.240 As with other zones, the ‘High’ Environmental Destination scenario results in situations 1, 4, and 7 being the most challenging in the long-term. There is a gap of around 35 MI/d between situations 4 and 6 from 2050 onwards.
- 6.241 Compared to the WRMP19 baseline, situation 4 begins with an approximately equal supply-demand balance. Sustainability reductions in 2040 and 2050 then leave this scenario with a larger planning problem than WRMP19 in the long-term.
- 6.242 As with SWOX, the greater influence of Environmental Destination licence reductions on the DYAA scenario than DYCP and the larger benefits associated with TUBs and NEUBs in the DYCP scenario mean the DYAA planning scenario is likely to be more challenging than the DYCP scenario for SWA.




Figure 6-38: SDB Situation Tree - SWA DYAA




Figure 6-39: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - SWA DYAA




Figure 6-40: Baseline Supply & Demand - Situation 4, SWA DYAA

	2026	2030	2045	2075
WRMP19	+20	+19	+15	+13
WRMP24	+21	+8	-5	-50

Table 6-37: Comparison Between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (Branch 4) Supply-Demand Balance for SWA WRZ DYAA

SWA DYCP

6.243 Comparing our WRMP19 final plan forecast for 2024-25 against our WRMP24 forecast for 2024-25, we can see an underlying improvement in the supply-demand balance performance which is enhanced by a change between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (accounting for the benefits of demand savings actions during a drought). Distribution input has decreased slightly, due to a significant decrease in HH consumption. Forecast non-household consumption has not changed significantly. Forecast WAFU has increased substantially, as a result of a deferred sustainability reduction at Hawridge (which will be made in AMP8) and a smaller than anticipated licence reduction at Pann Mill (-1.3 Ml/d, rather than -7.3 Ml/d as anticipated in WRMP19), which offsets DO reductions at other sources (notably Taplow, -4 Ml/d, and Hampden, -2.8 Ml/d). Outage allowance has reduced as a result of calculation of a DYCP outage allowance (WRMP19 used DYAA outage allowance in the DYCP scenario), and imports have reduced as a result of a changed baseline representation (transfers being options). Overall, this results in an improved supply-demand balance position, which is further enhanced when demand savings measures during a drought are accounted for.

Component	WRMP19 (Yr 2024-25)	WRMP24 (Yr 2024-25)	Difference
Population (000s)	598	566	-32
Per Capita Consumption (l/h/d)	189.5	180.4	-9.1
Household Consumption	112.2	101.2	-11.0
Non-household Consumption	20.6	20.8	+0.2
Leakage	37.0	44.1	+7.1
Distribution Input	171.9	169.6	-2.3*
DO after process losses and network constraints	198.2	202.0	+3.8
Outage Allowance	9.5	3.3	-6.2
Total Imports	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Exports	5.3	4.6	-0.7
Climate Change Impact	-0.7	-0.1	+0.6
WAFU	182.7	194.1	+11.4
Target Headroom	7.2	8.9	+1.7
Benefit from Demand Savings During a Drought	0.0	33.9	+33.9
Supply-demand Balance (SDB)	3.6	49.5	+45.9

Table 6-38: SDB component comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 - SWA DYCP

*Note that a change in water taken unbilled and DSOU is the reason that the DI change does not equate to the sum of changes in leakage, NHH consumption and HH consumption.

6.244 Please note that the supply-demand balance value stated in the Table above is inclusive of the benefits which we forecast would be delivered as a result of demand savings interventions during a drought (which are excluded from the baseline in the WRMP24 Tables, as required by guidance). As such, the baseline supply-demand balance in our WRMP Tables in 2024-25 is $49.5 - 33.89 = 15.6$.

6.245 Figure 6-41 shows that the High Environmental Destination scenario and demand uncertainty pose significant uncertainty to the SWA DYCP supply-demand balance, while climate change impacts are minor.




Figure 6-41: SWA DYCP – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050

Note: demand impacts are relative to the 2024-25 baseline forecast; climate change impacts are relative to the supply forecast baseline

- 6.246 Our SWA DYCP planning scenario begins with a position of surplus which is maintained in all future situations until 2050 if TUBs and NEUBs are accounted for.
- 6.247 Prior to DO reductions associated with Environmental Destination forecasts, the gap between different situations is modest, with a gap of less than 15 MI/d between the most and least challenging by 2040.
- 6.248 As with other zones, the 'High' Environmental Destination scenario results in situations 1, 4, and 7 being the most challenging in the long-term. There is a gap of around 30 MI/d between situations 4 and 6 from 2050 onwards.
- 6.249 Compared to the WRMP19 baseline, situation 4 begins with an improved surplus, due to a reduced allowance for outage in the DYCP scenario. Sustainability reductions in 2040 and 2050 then leave this situation with a planning problem that is much greater than was present in WRMP19 in the long-term.




Figure 6-42: SDB Situation Tree - SWA DYCP




Figure 6-43: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - SWA DYCP




Figure 6-44: Baseline Supply & Demand - Situation 4, SWA DYCP

	2026	2030	2045	2075
WRMP19	+3	+1	-6	-12
WRMP24	+14	+3	-6	-49

Table 6-39: Comparison Between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (Branch 4) Supply-Demand Balance for SWA WRZ DYCP

Kennet Valley DYAA

6.250 Comparing our WRMP19 final plan forecast for 2024-25 against our WRMP24 forecast for 2024-25, we can see a slight underlying improvement in the supply-demand balance performance which is enhanced by a change between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (accounting for the benefits of demand savings actions during a drought). Distribution input has increased slightly, due to an increase in household consumption. Forecast WAFU has not changed significantly. Overall, this results in an improved supply-demand balance position, which is further enhanced when demand savings measures during a drought are accounted for.

Component (MI/d unless stated)	WRMP19 (Yr 2024-25)	WRMP24 (Yr 2024-25)	Difference
Population (000s)	447	434	-13
Per Capita Consumption (l/h/d)	130.5	137.6	+7.1
Household Consumption	57.3	58.7	+1.4
Non-household Consumption	18.5	18.1	-0.4
Leakage	26.2	24.7	-1.5
Distribution Input	103.5	104.7	+1.2*
DO after process losses	143.9	144.2	+0.3
Outage Allowance	2.5	2.0	-0.5
Total Imports	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Exports	0.2	0.3	+0.1
Climate Change Impact	-3.8	-5.5**	-1.7
WAFU	137.4	136.4	-1.0
Target Headroom	5.2	3.1	-1.9
Benefit from Demand Savings During a Drought	0	8.5	+8.5
Supply-demand Balance (SDB)	+28.8	+37.4	+8.6

Table 6-40: SDB component comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 - Kennet Valley DYAA

*Note that a change in water taken unbilled and DSOU is the reason that the DI change does not equate to the sum of changes in leakage, NHH consumption and HH consumption.

** This value will appear different to that in our WRMP tables, as the WRMP data table value is a '1 in 500-year' DO impact whereas the value in this table is a '1 in 100-year' DO impact

6.251 Please note that, between the dWRMP24 and rdWRMP24, and as a result of a representation made by the Environment Agency, we amended our WRMP tables to ensure that we present a baseline supply-demand balance forecast consistent with the provision of a 1 in 500-year Level of Resilience throughout the planning period, as is required by the Water Resources Planning Guideline. Additionally, the supply-demand balance value stated in the Table above is inclusive of the benefits which we forecast would be delivered as a result of demand savings interventions during a drought (which are excluded from the baseline in the WRMP24 Tables, as required by guidance). As such, the value in the Table above is different to the baseline supply-demand balance value stated in our WRMP Tables. The difference is the sum of 32.17 MI/d (which is the additional amount of water we would need to be able to supply to provide a 1 in 500-year resilience, rather than our current 1 in 100-year level of service) and 8.70 MI/d (which is the amount of benefit forecast to be derived from demand restrictions during a drought in 2024-25). As such, the baseline supply-demand balance in our WRMP Tables in 2024-25 is $37.4 - 32.17 - 8.70 = -3.5$.

6.252 Figure 6-45 shows that Environmental Destination is the largest uncertainty for the Kennet Valley DYAA scenario, with demand uncertainty and climate change posing a smaller range of uncertainty, but that 1 in 500-year resilience poses a large risk to the WRZ.




Figure 6-45: Kennet Valley DYAA – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050

Note: demand impacts are relative to the 2024-25 baseline forecast; climate change impacts are relative to the supply forecast baseline

- 6.253 The Kennet Valley DYAA scenario shows a position of surplus at the beginning of the planning period. Drops in the supply-demand balance can be seen in all future situations at 2033 and 2040, due to the moves to 1 in 200-year and 1 in 500-year resilience respectively. The Fobney run-of-river source's DO is significantly reduced in severe drought conditions.
- 6.254 Differences between demand forecasts result in a moderate variance between different forecast supply-demand balance positions by 2040, with the gap between the most and least challenging positions being around 20 MI/d by 2040.
- 6.255 Environmental Destination again results in a large gap between supply-demand balance forecasts in the long-term. The gap between situations 4 and 6 is a little over 20 MI/d by 2050. The scale of deficit in 'High' Environmental Destination scenarios is likely to result in a need for new sources in the zone.
- 6.256 When compared to the WRMP19 baseline, situation 4 has a very similar starting supply-demand balance position. The impact of considering 1 in 500-year drought reduces the zone's DO significantly compared to our WRMP19 forecast, resulting in a much larger planning problem in the long-term.
- 6.257 As with other zones, the greater influence of Environmental Destination licence reductions on the DYAA scenario than DYCP and the larger benefits associated with TUBs and NEUBs in the DYCP scenario mean the DYAA planning scenario is likely to be more challenging than the DYCP scenario for Kennet Valley.




Figure 6-46: SDB Situation Tree - Kennet Valley DYAA




Figure 6-47: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - Kennet Valley DYAA




Figure 6-48: Baseline Supply & Demand - Situation 4, Kennet Valley DYAA

	2026	2030	2045	2075
WRMP19	+28	+26	+24	+21
WRMP24	+27	+21	-34	-45

Table 6-41: Comparison Between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (Branch 4) Supply-Demand Balance for Kennet Valley WRZ DYAA

Kennet Valley DYCP

6.258 Comparing our WRMP19 final plan forecast for 2024-25 against our WRMP24 forecast for 2024-25, we can see a slight underlying improvement in the supply-demand balance performance which is enhanced by a change between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (accounting for the benefits of demand savings actions during a drought). Distribution input has decreased, due to a slight decrease in forecast leakage, and a significant decrease in HH consumption. Forecast non-household consumption has not changed significantly. Forecast Deployable Output has decreased by around 5 Ml/d, primarily due to the reassessment of the Bishops Green source's SDO WRMP19 (-5 Ml/d due to water quality issues). The forecast reduction in demand outweighs the decrease in WAFU, and as such we forecast an improved position. Accounting for demand savings measures which would be implemented during a drought shows a further improvement supply-demand balance position.

Component (Ml/d unless stated)	WRMP19 (Yr 2024-25)	WRMP24 (Yr 2024-25)	Difference
Population (000s)	447	434	-13
Per Capita Consumption (l/h/d)	181.9	170.0	-11.9
Household Consumption	80.0	72.6	-7.4
Non-household Consumption	17.3	18.1	+0.8
Leakage	25.8	25.7	-0.1
Distribution Input	124.8	119.6	-5.2*
DO after process losses	155.4	150.1	-5.3
Outage Allowance	2.5	1.0	-1.5
Total Imports	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Exports	0.2	0.4	+0.2
Climate Change Impact	-2.8	-2.1**	+0.7
WAFU	149.9	146.6	-3.3
Target Headroom	7.2	8.0	+0.8
Benefit from Demand Savings During a Drought	0.0	20.7	20.7
Supply-demand Balance (SDB)	17.9	39.7	21.8

Table 6-42: SDB component comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 - Kennet Valley DYCP

*Note that a change in water taken unbilled and DSOU of is the reason that the DI change does not equate to the sum of changes in leakage, NHH consumption and HH consumption.

** This value will appear different to that in our WRMP tables, as the WRMP data table value is a '1 in 500-year' DO impact whereas the value in this table is a '1 in 100-year' DO impact

6.259 Please note that, between the dWRMP24 and rdWRMP24, and as a result of a representation made by the Environment Agency, we amended our WRMP tables to ensure that we present a baseline supply-demand balance forecast consistent with the provision of a 1 in 500-year Level of Resilience throughout the planning period, as is required by the Water Resources Planning Guideline. Additionally, the supply-demand balance value stated in the Table above is inclusive of the benefits which we forecast would be delivered as a result of demand savings interventions during a drought (which are excluded from the baseline in the WRMP24 Tables, as required by guidance). As such, the value in the Table above is different to the baseline supply-demand balance value stated in our WRMP Tables. The difference is the sum of 19.4 Ml/d (which is the additional amount of water we would need to be able to supply to provide a 1 in 500-year resilience, rather than our current 1 in 100-year level of service) and 20.7 Ml/d (which is the amount of benefit forecast to be derived from demand restrictions during a drought in 2024-25). As such, the baseline supply-demand balance in our WRMP Tables in 2024-25 is $39.7 - 19.42 - 20.73 = -0.5$.

6.260 Figure 6-49 shows that Environmental Destination is the largest uncertainty for the Kennet Valley DYCP scenario, with demand uncertainty and climate change posing a smaller range of uncertainty. 1 in 500-year resilience also poses a major challenge.




Figure 6-49: Kennet Valley DYCP – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050

Note: demand impacts are relative to the 2024-25 baseline forecast; climate change impacts are relative to the supply forecast baseline

- 6.261 The Kennet Valley DYCP scenario shows a position of surplus at the beginning of the planning period. Drops in the supply-demand balance can be seen in all future situations at 2033 and 2040, due to the moves to 1 in 200-year and 1 in 500-year resilience, respectively. The Fobney run-of-river source's DO is significantly reduced in severe drought conditions.
- 6.262 Differences between demand forecasts result in a moderate variance between different forecast supply-demand balance positions by 2040, with the gap between the most and least challenging positions being around 20 MI/d by 2040.
- 6.263 Environmental Destination again results in a large gap between supply-demand balance forecasts in the long-term. The gap between situations 4 and 6 is over 20 MI/d by 2050.
- 6.264 When compared to the WRMP19 baseline, situation 4 has a slightly improved starting supply-demand balance position. The impact of considering 1 in 500-year drought reduces the zone's DO significantly compared to our WRMP19 forecast, resulting in a much larger planning problem in the long-term, including the appearance of deficits where our WRMP19 forecast surplus throughout the planning period.
- 6.265 As with other zones, the larger benefits associated with TUBs and NEUBs in the DYCP scenario mean the DYAA planning scenario is likely to be more challenging than the DYCP scenario for Kennet Valley.




Figure 6-50: SDB Situation Tree - Kennet Valley DYCP Scenario




Figure 6-51: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - Kennet Valley DYCP




Figure 6-52: Baseline Supply-demand Balance for Situation 4, Kennet Valley DYCP

	2026	2030	2045	2075
WRMP19	+18	+16	+12	+8
WRMP24	+18	+12	--30	--45

Table 6-43: Comparison Between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (Branch 4) Supply-Demand Balance for Kennet Valley WRZ DYCP

Guildford DYAA

6.266 Comparing our WRMP19 final plan forecast for 2024-25 against our WRMP24 forecast for 2024-25, we can see a slight underlying deterioration in the supply-demand balance performance which is offset by a change between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (accounting for the benefits of demand savings actions during a drought). Distribution input has increased, due to a significant increase in forecast leakage, offset by a significant decrease in HH and NHH consumption. Forecast Deployable Output has increased slightly primarily due to the reassessment of the Shalford source's SDO WRMP19. Accounting for demand savings measures which would be implemented during a drought shows an improved supply-demand balance position, though excluding these benefits would result in showing a deterioration in the forecast supply-demand balance.

Component (Ml/d unless stated)	WRMP19 (Yr 2024-25)	WRMP24 (Yr 2024-25)	Difference
Population (000s)	182.3	175.2	-7.1
Per Capita Consumption (l/h/d)	134.0	131.8	-2.2
Household Consumption	24.2	22.1	-2.1
Non-household Consumption	8.1	7.5	-0.6

Component (Ml/d unless stated)	WRMP19 (Yr 2024-25)	WRMP24 (Yr 2024-25)	Difference
Leakage	11.3	16.2	+4.9
Distribution Input	44.5	47.5	+3.0*
DO after process losses	65.7	67.0	+1.3
Outage Allowance	1.4	1.6	+0.2
Total Imports	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Exports	2.3	2.3**	0.0
Climate Change Impact	0.0	0.0	0.0
WAFU	62.0	63.1	+1.1
Target Headroom	2.3	1.7	-0.6
Benefit from Demand Savings During a Drought	0.0	4.0	+4.0
Supply-demand Balance (SDB)	15.3	20.2	+4.9

Table 6-44: SDB component comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 - Guildford DYAA

*Note that a change in water taken unbilled and DSOU is the reason that the DI change does not equate to the sum of changes in leakage, NHH consumption and HH consumption.

**Our WRMP24 baseline excludes transfers to other WRSE companies

6.267 Please note that the supply-demand balance value stated in the Table above is inclusive of the benefits which we forecast would be delivered as a result of demand savings interventions during a drought (which are excluded from the baseline in the WRMP24 Tables, as required by guidance). As such, the baseline supply-demand balance in our WRMP Tables in 2024-25 is $20.2 - 4.0 = 16.2$.

6.268 Figure 6-53 shows that Environmental Destination poses by far the largest uncertainty to the future supply-demand balance, with the 'High' scenario resulting in almost half of the zone's DO being lost. In comparison, demand uncertainty is a relatively minor factor. Climate change does not pose a risk to the Guildford WRZ according to our analysis.




Figure 6-53: Guildford DYAA – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050

Note: demand impacts are relative to the 2024-25 baseline forecast; climate change impacts are relative to the supply forecast baseline

- 6.269 The Guildford DYAA supply-demand balance starts in a position of surplus. There is little change in the supply-demand balance position, and little gap between different future situations, until 2040, at which point the differences in demand and Environmental Destination forecasts give a larger variance.
- 6.270 Both with and without accounting for the benefits associated with TUBs and NEUBs, deficits are only present in situations 1, 4, and 7.
- 6.271 When compared to the WRMP19 baseline, situation 4 starts in a slightly improved supply-demand balance position. This improved position is maintained until licence reductions are made under the High Environmental Destination.




Figure 6-54: SDB Situation Tree - Guildford DYAA




Figure 6-55: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - Guildford DYAA




Figure 6-56: Baseline Supply & Demand - Situation 4, Guildford DYAA

	2026	2030	2045	2075
WRMP19	+12	+11	+8	+7
WRMP24	+16	+12	+1	-19

Table 6-45: Comparison Between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (Branch 4) Supply-Demand Balance for Guildford WRZ DYAA

Guildford DYCP

6.272 Comparing our WRMP19 final plan forecast for 2024-25 against our WRMP24 forecast for 2024-25, we can see little underlying change in the supply-demand balance performance. A change between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (accounting for the benefits of demand savings actions during a drought) then enhances the position. Distribution input has decreased slightly, due to a significant increase in forecast leakage, offset by a decrease in HH and NHH consumption. Forecast Deployable Output has reduced primarily due to the anticipated late delivery of the Ladymead scheme included in our WRMP19. This is offset to an extent by a reduction in outage allowance. Accounting for demand savings measures which would be implemented during a drought shows an improved supply-demand balance position.

Component (Ml/d unless stated)	WRMP19 (Yr 2024-25)	WRMP24 (Yr 2024-25)	Difference
Population (000s)	182.3	175.2	+6.9
Per Capita Consumption (l/h/d)	196.4	195.3	-1.1
Household Consumption	34.3	32.7	-1.6
Non-household Consumption	8.1	7.5	-0.6
Leakage	11.2	17.1	+5.9
Distribution Input	61.1	59.1	-2.0*
DO after process losses	76.2	72.4	-3.8
Outage Allowance	1.4	0.4	-1.0
Total Imports	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Exports	2.3	2.3**	0.0
Climate Change Impact	0.0	0.0	0.0
WAFU	72.5	69.70	-2.8
Target Headroom	3.7	3.8	+0.1
Benefit from Demand Savings During a Drought	0.0	10.6	+10.1
Supply-demand Balance (SDB)	7.8	22.0	+14.2

Table 6-46: SDB component comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 - Guildford DYCP

*Note that a change in water taken unbilled and DSOU is the reason that the DI change does not equate to the sum of changes in leakage, NHH consumption and HH consumption.

**Our WRMP24 baseline excludes transfers to other WRSE companies

6.273 Please note that the supply-demand balance value stated in the Table above is inclusive of the benefits which we forecast would be delivered as a result of demand savings interventions during a drought (which are excluded from the baseline in the WRMP24 Tables, as required by guidance). Further, note that the WRMP tables indicate no transfer would be required from our Guildford WRZ to Affinity Water via the Ladymead export – the Table above includes an allowance for this transfer. As such, the baseline supply-demand balance in our WRMP Tables in 2024-25 is $22.0 - 2.3 - 10.6 = 9.1$.

6.274 Figure 6-57 shows that Environmental Destination poses by far the largest uncertainty to the future supply-demand balance. In comparison, demand uncertainty is a relatively minor factor. Climate change does not pose a risk to the Guildford WRZ according to our analysis.




Figure 6-57: Guildford DYCP – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050

Note: demand impacts are relative to the 2024-25 baseline forecast; climate change impacts are relative to the supply forecast baseline

- 6.275 The Guildford DYCP supply-demand balance starts in a position of surplus. There is little change in the supply-demand balance position, and little gap between different future situations, until 2040, at which point the differences in demand and Environmental Destination forecasts give a larger variance.
- 6.276 Deficits are only present in situations 1, 4, and 7 at some point during the planning horizon.
- 6.277 When compared to the WRMP19 baseline, situation 4 starts in a significantly improved supply-demand balance position, and this improved position is maintained until licence reductions under the High Environmental Destination scenario are made. This difference is mainly due to a difference in the demand forecast for the zone.




Figure 6-58: SDB Situation Tree - Guildford DYCP




Figure 6-59: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - Guildford DYCP




Figure 6-60: Baseline Supply & Demand - Situation 4, Guildford DYCP

	2026	2030	2045	2075
WRMP19	-0.4	-2	-8	-10
WRMP24	+8	+12	-0.1	-18

Table 6-47: Comparison Between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (Branch 4) Supply-Demand Balance for Guildford WRZ DYCP

Henley DYAA

6.278 When comparing the forecast starting position for 2024-25 between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (i.e., comparing the WRMP19 final plan and WRMP24 baseline, for the supply-demand balance and major components), it can be seen that the forecast supply-demand balance has worsened between WRMP19 and WRMP24. Forecast distribution input has increased slightly, due to an underlying increase in leakage. Forecast WAFU has reduced due to a DO reduction at Sheeplands WTW associated with revised assessments of pump capacity. In WRMP19 we did not account for the benefit arising from TUBs and NEUBs in Henley WRZ, but we do so in WRMP24.

Component (Ml/d unless stated)	WRMP19 (Yr 2024-25)	WRMP24 (Yr 2024-25)	Difference
Population (000s)	55.0	51.5	-3.5
Per Capita Consumption (l/h/d)	138.5	139.6	+1.1
Household Consumption	7.6	7.1	-0.5
Non-household Consumption	1.6	1.6	0
Leakage	3.6	4.5	+0.9
Distribution Input	12.9	13.7	+0.8
Deployable Output	25.7	21.6	-4.1
Outage Allowance	0.4	1.2	+0.8
Total Imports	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Exports	0.0	0.0	0.0
Climate Change Impact	0.0	0.0	0.0
WAFU	25.3	20.4	-4.9
Target Headroom	0.7	0.4	-0.3
Benefit from Demand Savings During a Drought	0.0	1.2	+1.2
Supply-demand Balance (SDB)	11.6	7.5	-4.1

Table 6-48: SDB component comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 - Henley DYAA

- 6.279 Please note that the supply-demand balance value stated in the Table above is inclusive of the benefits which we forecast would be delivered as a result of demand savings interventions during a drought (which are excluded from the baseline in the WRMP24 Tables, as required by guidance). As such, the baseline supply-demand balance in our WRMP Tables in 2024-25 is $7.5 - 1.17 = 6.3$
- 6.280 Uncertainties in the Henley WRZ are more modest than other zones, as our supplies in the zone are drought-resilient and not impacted by climate change. The High Environmental Destination scenario poses the most significant uncertainty for the zone (Figure 6-61).




Figure 6-61: Henley DYAA – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050

Note: demand impacts are relative to the 2024-25 baseline forecast; climate change impacts are relative to the supply forecast baseline

- 6.281 The Henley DYAA scenario shows that all situations which do not involve the “High” environmental destination scenario stay in surplus throughout the planning period. When demand management programmes are considered, it is very unlikely that any supply-side investment will be needed in the Henley WRZ.
- 6.282 There is a large gap between situations created at 2050 when the High Environmental Destination forecast diverges from other forecasts considered.
- 6.283 Compared to the WRMP19 baseline, situation 4 starts with a reduced surplus, due to a write-down in DO which was taken due to a long-term outage at Sheeplands WTW. This reduced surplus is maintained throughout the planning period and is increased when licence reductions are assumed to be implemented under the High Environmental Destination scenario.




Figure 6-62: SDB Situation Tree - Henley DYAA Scenario




Figure 6-63: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - Henley DYAA




Figure 6-64: Baseline Supply & Demand - Situation 4, Henley DYAA

	2026	2030	2045	2075
WRMP19	+12	+12	+12	+12
WRMP24	+6	+6	+6	-3

Table 6-49: Comparison Between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (Branch 4) Supply-Demand Balance for Henley WRZ DYAA

Henley DYCP

6.284 When comparing the forecast starting position for 2024-25 between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (i.e., comparing the WRMP19 final-plan and WRMP24 baseline, for the supply-demand balance and major components), it can be seen that the forecast supply-demand balance has worsened between WRMP19 and WRMP24. Forecast distribution input has not changed significantly, though there is an underlying increase in leakage. Forecast WAFU has reduced due to a DO reduction at Sheeplands WTW associated with revised assessments of pump capacity. In WRMP19 we did not account for the benefit arising from TUBs and NEUBs in Henley WRZ; doing so in WRMP24 means that our overall supply-demand balance is relatively close to that forecast in WRMP19.

Component (Ml/d unless stated)	WRMP19 (Yr 2024-25)	WRMP24 (Yr 2024-25)	Difference
Population (000s)	55.0	51.5	-3.5
Per Capita Consumption (l/h/d)	196.3	227.4	+31.1
Household Consumption	10.7	11.6	+0.9
Non-household Consumption	5.0	1.6	-3.4
Leakage	3.5	4.7	+1.2
Distribution Input	19.3	18.4	-0.9*
Deployable Output	25.9	21.7	-4.2
Outage Allowance	0.36	0.17	-0.19
Total Imports	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total Exports	0.0	0.0	0.0
Climate Change Impact	0.0	0.0	0.0
WAFU	25.5	21.5	-4.0
Target Headroom	0.9	1.0	+0.1
Benefit from Demand Savings During a Drought	0.0	3.2	+3.5
Supply-demand Balance (SDB)	+5.3	+5.4	+0.1

Table 6-50: SDBcomponent comparison WRMP19 and WRMP24 - Henley DYCP

*Note that a change in water taken unbilled is the reason that the DI change does not equate to the sum of changes in leakage, NHH consumption and HH consumption.

6.285 Please note that the supply-demand balance value stated in the Table above is inclusive of the benefits which we forecast would be delivered as a result of demand savings interventions during a drought (which are excluded from the baseline in the WRMP24 Tables, as required by guidance). As such, the baseline supply-demand balance in our WRMP Tables in 2024-25 is $5.4 - 3.2 = 2.2$.

6.286 Uncertainties in the Henley WRZ are more modest than other zones. The High Environmental Destination scenario poses the most significant uncertainty for the zone (Figure 6-65).




Figure 6-65: Henley DYCP – SDB Impact for Different Components and Scenarios by 2050

Note: demand impacts are relative to the 2024-25 baseline forecast; climate change impacts are relative to the supply forecast baseline

- 6.287 The Henley DYCP scenario shows that most future situations stay in surplus throughout almost all of the planning period. When demand management programmes are considered, it is very unlikely that any supply-side investment will be needed in the Henley WRZ.
- 6.288 There is a large gap between situations created at 2050 when the High Environmental Destination forecast diverges from other forecasts considered.
- 6.289 Compared to the WRMP19 baseline, situation 4 starts with a slightly reduced surplus, due to a write-down in DO which was taken due to a long-term outage at Sheeplands WTW. This reduced surplus is maintained throughout the planning period until licence reductions through the High Environmental Destination scenario are assumed to be implemented.
- 6.290 The supply-demand balance position in Henley is more challenging in the DYCP scenario than DYAA, though supply-side investment is not likely to be required to meet any deficits.




Figure 6-66: SDB Situation Tree - Henley DYCP




Figure 6-67: SDB Situation Tree (Incl. Drought Demand Savings) - Henley DYCP




Figure 6-68: Baseline Supply & Demand - Situation 4, Henley DYCP

	2025	2030	2045	2075
WRMP19	+5	+5	+5	+5
WRMP24	+2	+2	+2	-3

Table 6-51: Comparison Between WRMP19 and WRMP24 (Branch 4) Supply-Demand Balance for Henley WRZ DYCP

Changes between Draft WRMP and Revised Draft WRMP24:

- As we have updated our assessments of supply capability and demand for water using the most up to date data available, we have also updated our forecast of our baseline supply-demand balance.
- We have provided a detailed breakdown of the changes in our baseline-supply demand balance between WRMP19 and WRMP24
- As is detailed in Appendix I, we have amended our Deployable Output calculation approach for the Kennet Valley WRZ (DYAA and DYCP scenarios), and SWOX WRZ (DYCP scenario) between dWRMP and rdWRMP. We have described in this chapter how we have amended our Target Headroom approach following changes made in Deployable Output calculation.

Changes between Revised Draft WRMP24 and Final WRMP24:

- We have added additional justification for our headroom allowances, and have added tables which show our headroom allowances in each WRZ as a proportion of Distribution Input
- We have adjusted headroom allowances made in some WRZs to account for changing risks
- We have updated supply-demand balance tables according to updates made between rdWRMP24 and final WRMP24.

