

**Meeting:** Anglian Water Sustainability and Resilience Panel  
**Date:** Tuesday, 25 April 2018  
**Time:** 10.00 – 11.30am  
**Location:** Lancaster House, Ermine Business Park, Huntingdon

<b>Present:</b>	Present (or on call): Craig Bennett (Chair), Daniel Bean (Environment Agency), Joff Edevane (AW), Lou Gilfoyle (AW), Jeffrey Halliwell (Chair of CEF), Alex Plant (AW), Anne Ramsay (Natural England), Rob Wise (NFU) and Vicky Anning (CEF report author).
<b>Apologies:</b>	Apologies: Barry Bendall (Rivers Trust), John Giles (Environment Agency), Katherine Hardcastle (River Nene Regional Park), Phil Rothwell (RFCC).

<u>Agenda Items</u>	<u>Action</u>
<p><b>1. Discussion on Outline Business Plan</b></p> <p><b>Craig Bennett</b> reported that members of the Sustainability and Resilience Panel had been surprised by some of the content discussed at the last meeting regarding the <a href="#">outline plan</a>, which was scheduled to be published the next day. The panel felt that the plan included several elements that hadn't been mentioned previously (e.g. the strategic grid).</p>	
<p><b>Alex Plant</b> reassured panel members that catchment management was an approach that's inherent to the company's business plan. He agreed that plans for water transfers should have been fed back to panel members, alongside water resource management discussions. Alex reported that calibration of ODIs is ongoing and engagement with customers about the outline business plan was also live through the H2O Let's Go programme.</p>	
<p><b>CB</b> said it was hard for the panel to make an assessment at the moment as to whether there's the right balance in the outline business plan between catchment management approaches and structural investment.</p>	
<p><b>Rob Wise</b> was surprised by the lack of empirical background data available. He referred to a map of the Anglian area on the website, which gives some idea of investment made per area. This kind of information would be useful to help the panel make more informed decisions.</p>	
<p><b>AP</b> said the company has tried to make the Be the Boss game a more interactive way of showing trade offs to customers. More empirical</p>	

<p>evidence will be available further into calibration of ODIs and in the full business plan.</p> <p>Answering Craig's points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- With WRMP, AW have set out adaptive and principle plan trying to address issues around resilience.</li> <li>- AW is prioritising demand management part of programme (e.g. reducing leakage, reducing demand and water usage through smart meters etc.) but the scale of challenge from growth and climate change increases the level of infrastructure investment needed.</li> </ul> <p>Anglian Water (AW) was surprised by the scale of WINEP3 – in particular the initial view that everything should be done within the next AMP. This forces AW into (more expensive) hard engineering and chemical responses rather than using more natural capital enhancing approaches.</p> <p>Peter Simpson has talked to Secretary of State Michael Gove and Alex has spoken to Defra and EA over the last few days to ask for more time to implement WINEP measures. He reported there was an openness to that position. AW may be able to introduce a WINEP that is spread across AMP7 &amp; 8. This will have a better impact in terms of environmental benefits as well as a lower impact on bills.</p> <p>Alex said it would be helpful to hear views from the panel on this.</p>	
<p><b>Dan Bean</b> said the Environment Agency is in agreement with this approach. EA is supportive of approaches that look at innovation, catchment management and wider environmental enhancements, but has a statutory role that measures need to be implemented by 2027 – which does give some extra time for companies beyond AMP7. In EA's dealings with AW, they are seen as an environmentally enlightened company.</p>	
<p><b>Anne Ramsay</b> agreed with Dan that Natural England would want AW to do as much as they can to make improvements that go beyond the minimum in terms of enhancing biodiversity and undertaking more catchment management work will move in that direction. There are statutory drivers, that mean AW needs to prioritise WINEP. Natural England would like to work with the company to do that.</p> <p>Anne felt that current outline plan doesn't go far enough in terms of ambitions to enhance biodiversity.</p>	
<p><b>Jeff Halliwell</b> pointed out that all of these decisions have a substantial impact on customer bills.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) There hasn't been any consumer engagement on this, which needs to be addressed.</li> <li>2) It would be very useful if this panel was collectively supportive of AW's position to help inform future discussion with Michael Gove.</li> <li>3) Has there been any research in Ingoldisthorpe to find out what local community thought of the project there?</li> </ol>	

<p>On this last point, Lou Gilfoyle said there's nothing to stop AW from following that up.</p>	<p>LG</p>
<p><b>RW</b> fully supports the idea that DEFRA and EA should agree that WINEP can carry over into AMP8 – but with the caveat that this shouldn't necessitate a slowdown of expenditure on catchment management approaches in AMP7. NFU is delighted that WINEP places greater emphasis on catchment management.</p>	
<p><b>CB:</b> for the panel to support this approach, members would want to be confident that the company is maximising catchment management approaches in this outline plan. He feels there's quite a lot of emphasis and detail on concrete pouring and less on scaling up of catchment management approaches in the outline plan.</p>	
<p><b>AP</b> reassured members that AW had drawn on WRMP for guidelines. There's no requirement for water recycling, for example, but AW has introduced elements of water recycling to maximise benefits of catchment management over long-term period. Company would like to do more of that in next seven years.</p>	
<p><b>DB:</b> to go back to Ingoldsthorpe, he recommended the company should consult with communities upfront as to how this type of catchment management approach will benefit them. This would help to repair some of misconceptions around water company governance.</p>	
<p><b>Lou Gilfoyle</b> said that social capital and being able to demonstrate that as part and parcel of investment decisions is going to be more and more important to AW. Relationships at local catchment levels are very powerful.</p>	
<p><b>AR:</b> NE has been working nationally on natural capital indicators, including social capital side. They are keen to work with AW to provide support and advice.</p>	
<p><b>CB:</b> In terms of the panel's response to AW's outline business plan, we don't want to see lots of expensive hard engineering investment that's going to increase customer bills if we can find alternative ways that deliver better environmental outcomes and save bills too. The panel would be quite firm in supporting that.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The panel needs more detail to be really confident that AW is maximising alternative approaches to hard engineering solutions in current AMP period (e.g. Newmarket shopfront innovative approaches)</li> <li>2) We want to see empirical evidence that these alternative and innovative approaches will deliver</li> <li>3) We would like to see the plan for re-engaging communities on catchment management approaches to make sure they are on</li> </ol>	

<p>board and involved (including questions around metaldehyde)</p> <p>4) We would like to see what consumers/bill payers think – do we have rich analysis on this?</p> <p>5) We would like more information on company thinking behind performance commitments/ODIs.</p>	
<p><b>AP</b> agreed to respond to the above points. Even where there are statutory requirements, he said, we need to understand what customers think and express that to panel members and the Customer Engagement Forum (CEF).</p>	AP
<p><b>JH:</b> from point of view of CEF, if there’s no consumer engagement on a certain issue, we need to point that out. Even if customer views are against Sec of State recommendations, we need to urge company to gather customer views.</p> <p>There was some discussion around the situation regarding metaldehyde. Alex said he had raised the issue with Defra and had asked for an answer on the ban/partial ban as soon as possible so this could be factored into company business plan.</p>	
<p><b>2. Next steps</b></p> <p>Next Sustainability and Resilience Panel conference call has been moved to next Tuesday, 1 May from 10-11.30am.</p> <p><b>Joff Edevane</b> will check who can attend and feed back to the panel Members who can’t attend could submit thoughts by email to Craig/Vicky</p> <p><b>CB</b> said the call would give an opportunity for panel members to delve into the details of the outline business plan and ODIs – and to have a conversation around empirical details.</p> <p><b>JH</b> said the company have produced a really useful summary of customer engagement threads leading to each performance indicators that would be helpful for next week’s discussions. This has been circulated to panel members.</p> <p><b>AR</b> said she would be keen to talk to Chris Gerrard (AW’s Climate Change and Biodiversity Manager) about the natural capital ODI. She asked if he can join the call. Alex will follow this up.</p> <p><b>AOB</b></p> <p>All papers and slide decks from the S&amp;R Panel are saved under the ShareFile here: <a href="https://anglian-water.sharefile.com/">https://anglian-water.sharefile.com/</a></p>	<p>JE</p> <p>AP</p>