**WATER SECTOR GUIDANCE**

**CHANGE PROPOSAL FORM**

Please complete the form below to submit a change proposal to the Water Adoption Panel.

|  |
| --- |
| **Name of Proposed Change:**Clarifying Responsibility for incoming water quality in Level of Service SLPM – S4/1 (Source of Water Delivery Date) |
| **Section 1 - Proposed Change**1. *Please outline the details (including any relevant supporting documentation) of the proposed change.*

The former Self-Lay Code of Practice made it clear that should the cause of any sampling water quality failures be traced back to incoming water quality issues that water company carries responsibility for additional disinfection and sampling. This does not look to have been carried over into the water adoption arrangements and should (as has already happened) such situations arise it needs to be clear that it is for the water company to resolve and to also cover, through Redress, any additional expense a SLP (who then cannot commission their new mains as envisaged) incurs.1. *Has the proposed change been considered previously (including during any prior consultation process)? If so, please provide details.*

No – it does not appear to have been picked up at the new arrangement drafting stage.1. *Does the proposed change need to be considered by a specific date? If so, please explain why?*

Whilst this responsibility clarification is urgently required by SLPs implementation just needs to be progressed in a timely way.1. *Does the proposed change raise any health and safety issues? If so, please provide details.*

No specific health and safety issues relate to this change proposal.1. *Please provide any further information relevant to the change proposal.*

The matter of clarifying responsibility should incoming water quality fail to meet a company standard arises in a number of places through the water adoption documents. But because it links with a need to compensate through Redress provisions it is though best to tie it to a failure against Level of Service SLPM – S4/1 (Source of Water Delivery Date). This is because the water being supplied to a SLP is not of the required quality for them to use so the company has not actually delivered a (usable) source of water. |
| **Section 2 - Scope of the Proposed Change**1. *Which section(s) of the Water Sector Guidance and Model Adoption Agreement does the proposed change concern? Please provide specific references to the relevant documentation.*

Specifically Level of Service SLPM – S4/1 (Source of Water Delivery Date) but also:-Procedures – in Stage 4 where text says “Confirm availability of Source of Water for Testing including operational information on Existing Main (such as restriction to flow rate, or unusual pressures).  If water is not available at the anticipated location or date, confirm an alternative Source of Water for Testing”; and,Guidance – in Section 4.1.3 where it states “a key innovation of the new arrangements is the commitment of Water Companies to provide a Source of Water for testing purposes within an agreed period or within a minimum of 42 days of the initial application”; and,Guidance definitions – where a) ‘Delivery Date’ is “the date specified in Schedule 1 of the WAA for the provision of a viable Source of Water connection for Testing, being not less than twenty-eight (28) calendar days from the Day the Water Company receives the signed WAA, or if that date is not a Day, on the next Day”; and,b) ‘Source of Water Connection’ is “a source of water made available to the SLP for the purpose of Testing”.1. *What consequential amendments to the Water Sector Guidance and Model Adoption Agreement would be required as a result of the proposed change? Please provide specific references.*

The proposal is for SLPM – S4/1 to be reworded and the other reference sections to be appropriately aligned.The current wording for this metric is:-“The agreed date when the Water Company will provide the Source of Water for testing purposes, contractually binding in the Water Adoption Agreement”.The proposed wording for this metric is:-“The agreed date when the Water Company will provide the Source of Water for testing purposes **with a supply that satisfies water quality requirements**, contractually binding in the Water Adoption Agreement *(i.e. with the addition of the wording in red)*.This then requires changes to be made (again with the additions in red) to:-Guidance – in Section 4.1.3 where it states “a key innovation of the new arrangements is the commitment of Water Companies to provide a Source of Water for testing purposes **with a supply that satisfies water quality requirements** within an agreed period or within a minimum of 42 days of the initial application”; and,Guidance definitions – where a) ‘Delivery Date’ is “the date specified in Schedule 1 of the WAA for the provision of a viable Source of Water connection **with a supply that satisfies water quality requirements** for Testing, being not less than twenty-eight (28) calendar days from the Day the Water Company receives the signed WAA, or if that date is not a Day, on the next Day”; and,b) ‘Source of Water Connection’ is “a source of water **which satisfies water quality requirements** made available to the SLP for the purpose of Testing”. |
| **Section 3 - Rationale for the proposed change** 1. *What is the nature and effect of the current position/existing arrangements?*

By omission of clearly defining responsibilities for the incoming water supply satisfying quality requirements creates ambiguity and leaves SLPs having to argue on a scheme by scheme basis for the water company to come forward and take responsibility for a matter that is solely in their domain.1. *What is the nature and effect of the proposed change?*

Given that the matter being raised is always going to fall on a water company to resolve the impact should be minimal. However, when incoming water quality issues arise, SLPs do routinely experience frustrations and delays whilst they seek to get companies to take responsibility for resolving the situation so the proposal should lessen such occurrences.1. *Why is the proposed change necessary?*

Because the situation is not currently covered in the various water adoption documentation.1. *What is the desired outcome of the proposed change?*

Changes to the water adoption documentation which clarify responsibilities for resolving incoming water quality issues and to compensate (through Redress) SLPs when their work gets delayed by matters which are outside of their control. |
| **Section 4 – Impact on the Principles and Objectives of the Code** 1. Outline, how and why the proposed change maintains consistency with the principles and objectives of the Code for Adoption Agreements, and any relevant statutory or regulatory requirements?

Within the Code Principles the change is:-Customer Focused – specifically it clarifies responsibility for delivering the services Customers need, in the timescales they require.Fair and Proportionate – specifically it does not compromise arrangements and is proportionate in relation to the costs and risks faced by the Water Company on the one hand and the Customer on the other. It is also fair and reasonable in terms of who holds the balance of risk.Clear and complete – as it is aimed at addressing a matter that is not adequately covered. |
| **Section 5 – Impact on Customers and Water Companies** 1. *What is the impact of the proposed change (be it positive and/or negative) on Customers?*

By clarifying responsibilities it will make it easier for customers to get incoming water quality issues resolved without lengthy discussions about who is responsible for dealing with such matters.1. *Is there any evidence of customer concern relating to the proposed change? If so, please provide details.*

SLPs who have recently experienced incoming water quality issues have raised that this situation is not adequately covered in the water adoption documents.1. What is the impact of the proposed change (be it positive and/or negative) on Water Companies?

It should make no change to water companies other than highlighting that incoming water quality is a matter for them to resolve so they should respond quicker than SLPs currently experience, especially when satisfying SLPM – S4/1 becomes conditional on supplying water of the required quality.1. Estimate how much notice Customers and Water Companies may reasonably require to be able to meet any new requirements arising from the proposed change.

Given that the proposal relates to clarifying, rather than changing, responsibilities it should require no notice. However it does impact on a metric so that may require companies to modify the data they collect.1. *What is the suggested implementation date of the proposed change?*

Because of the data collection impact, and that companies report their data monthly, implementation should take no longer than the next month end date which is 1 month after change approval. |
| **Section 6 – Stakeholder Engagement** 1. Please outline any informal/formal consultation undertaken with relevant stakeholders likely to be affected by the proposed change, including details of any responses provided by stakeholders.
 |
| **Section 7 – Applicant’s Details** |
| Name: Martyn Speight on behalf of SLP members of Fair Water Connections |
| Company: Fair Water Connections |
| Company Registration Number: N/A |
| Company Address: N/A – communication via email |
| Telephone: 07889187717 |
| Email: martyn.speight@fwconnections.org |
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