IAP Response

Ref B2.WSH.OC.A24

Unplanned Outages

1 April 2019

1. WSH.OC.A24 Unplanned Outages

Nature of Adjustment (Summarise how you have responded to this action)

Since submitting our 2018 APR we have been working hard to improve our data relating to this measure. We have also engaged with industry workshops seeking to clarify the detail of the definition. We now believe that we have achieved Green for all of the sub-components. This has been reviewed by our Reporter. The following table sets out the progress we have made against each sub-component and explains why we believe that we will be fully compliant when we report against this measure in our 2019 APR

	2017/18				April 2019		
	Component	**Compliant (R/A/G)**	**Reason for any non-compliant components**	**Confidence Grade**	**Compliant (R/A/G)**	**Reason for any non-compliant components**	**Confidence Grade**
1	**Peak Week Production Capacity** (PWPC)		We have not previously measured weekly available production capacity in this way. A new methodology is being developed.	C5		The company had no defined process in 2017/18. This is now developed and implemented, with a methodology to derive PWPC, which is compliant with guidance. PWPCs for each treatment works asset and compared to peak capacity from Water Resource Plan, 4 to 5% difference as a total across all works indicating reasonableness of the outputs. Further giving confidence to the approach and the derived figures. The company is working towards a confidence rating of A2 by 2020 with further refinement of sub-set asset data over next 12 months.	A3
1a	PWPC Annual review		The review for 2017/18 has been by expert knowledge to manually assess data, utilising accredited systems - QDB, WRMP and SAP as	C5		Due to weather conditions in summer 2018 peak output was required to meet demand and this	A3

	2017/18				April 2019		
	Component	**Compliant (R/A/G)**	**Reason for any non-compliant components**	**Confidence Grade**	**Compliant (R/A/G)**	**Reason for any non-compliant components**	**Confidence Grade**
			identified in the methodology. Target Completion: December 2018.			effectively was the five year physical test. The model will be reviewed each year and a Governance process is in place for any changes to sub-asset data – data provider, area manager, and head of service sign off will be required. This modelling provides the PWPC figures and is the basis for deriving the impact of outage of individual assets at a site. The reporting for 2018/19 will be by expert knowledge, using the new manually assessed data, utilising accredited systems: • SAP data (works and asset maintenance register) • Daily reporting of inlet and output from works compared to PWPC – using the confirmed PWPC figure as per element 1. • Manual event logging • Water Quality systems SAMS • Telemetry PRISM	
1 b	PWPC by site		The review for 2017/18 has been undertaken by expert knowledge to manually assess data, utilising accredited systems QDB,	C5		Commentary as above.	A3

	2017/18				April 2019		
	Component	**Compliant (R/A/G)**	**Reason for any non-compliant components**	**Confidence Grade**	**Compliant (R/A/G)**	**Reason for any non-compliant components**	**Confidence Grade**
			WRMP and SAP as identified in the methodology. We are currently developing processes to identify the specific asset capabilities and to produce look up tables to determine PWPC by/per site. Target Completion: December 2018 .				
1c	PWPC by water resource zone PWPC		We have historically used the Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP) to identify our Water Treatment Works capacity for asset strategy and operational purposes. We are currently developing processes to identify the specific process capabilities. Target Completion: December 2018.	B4		Commentary as above.	A3
2	**Asset failure / unplanned outage**		We utilise SAP and IMS data as outlined in the methodology. Whilst this identifies asset failure, tracking the duration and	B4		DCWW utilised multiple data sets to determine unplanned outage. The 'Amber' for 2017/18 moved to green for compliance this year.	B3

	2017/18				April 2019		
	Component	**Compliant (R/A/G)**	**Reason for any non-compliant components**	**Confidence Grade**	**Compliant (R/A/G)**	**Reason for any non-compliant components**	**Confidence Grade**
			impact currently requires some manual process of determination. We are working towards full compliance with the guidance by the start of the next AMP period.			The data used is • SAP data (works and asset maintenance register) • Daily reporting of inlet and output from works compared to PWPC – using the confirmed PWPC figure as per element 1. • Manual event logging • Water Quality systems SAMS • Telemetry PRISM The data from these sources is aligned (largely through manual checks and controls currently) to determine what was an outage, what was less than 24hrs, what is a legitimate exclusion, or where PWPC is not needed due to demand (economic or selective outage). There is further work planned for 2019/20 to improve the automation of this through a programme to roll out across the company. This will improve the confidence grade. Whilst this identifies asset failure, tracking the duration and impact currently requires a manual process of determination.	
2a	Source Data		SAP data – reviews and manual	B4		Commentary above.	B3

	2017/18				April 2019		
	Component	**Compliant (R/A/G)**	**Reason for any non-compliant components**	**Confidence Grade**	**Compliant (R/A/G)**	**Reason for any non-compliant components**	**Confidence Grade**
			filtering of events IMS – Requires referencing multiple reporting sources and manual filtering.				
3	**Planned Outages**		Guidance is consistent with our methodology.	B4		DCWW methodology is compliant with the guidance. SAP data includes all events. Sub sets of the data are derived to categories such as the type and duration. Then manual identification of any planned capital maintenance or routine maintenance. Capital programme for the year is known and this is used to verify this data. The system for approval of capital works requires detailed planning and notifications. A confidence grade of A3 is targeted with the implementation of the automated system in the future.	B3
3a	Source data – programme of works		Planned outages fall into three main categories. 1. Seasonal 2. < 24 Hrs 3. Water Quality related Expert knowledge has been used to manually assess IMS and QDB documents and reports.	B4		See commentary for 3 above. Planned outages fall into three main categories. 1. Seasonal 2. < 24 Hrs 3. Water Quality related The reporting process for 2018/19 is by, expert knowledge to manually	B3

	2017/18				April 2019		
	Component	**Compliant (R/A/G)**	**Reason for any non-compliant components**	**Confidence Grade**	**Compliant (R/A/G)**	**Reason for any non-compliant components**	**Confidence Grade**
						assess SAP, PRISM, IMS and QDB related documents and reports.	
4	**Duration**		Where we do not have telemetry data the duration of events, including start and end times are currently assessed manually. We are working towards full compliance with the guidance by the start of the next AMP period.	B4		The events to be reported in the review for 2018/19 will be by a manual assessment of data, identified in the methodology. The Amber assessment in 2017/18 will be green for 2018/19. SAP reports identify start and end times. End time is based on current guidance. Most outages are repaired and commissioned back into supply within 24 hours. If Ofwat accept proposed amendment (see DCWW response to the Ofwat APR consultation) then may need to review this.	B3
4a	Start time		See 4 above.	B4		Events were assessed following the guidance outlined (To the nearest whole day).	B3
4 b	End time		See 4 above.	B4		The events reported in the review for 2018/19 will be by a manual assessment of data, as identified in the methodology.	B3
4c	Rounding		Events are assessed in line with the guidance outlined (to the nearest whole day)	B2		Events will be assessed in line with the guidance outlined (to the nearest whole day).	B2
5	Reduction in capacity		Data is held in the works	C3		PWPC look up tables created from the model described in 1, these are	A3

	2017/18				April 2019		
	Component	**Compliant (R/A/G)**	**Reason for any non-compliant components**	**Confidence Grade**	**Compliant (R/A/G)**	**Reason for any non-compliant components**	**Confidence Grade**
			Operations manuals and WRMP. A manual assessment is used to determine any reduction in capacity. We are working towards full compliance with the guidance by the start of the next AMP period.			used to calculate the reduction in capacity, as outlined.	
5a	Reduced capacity		See 5 above.	C3		As outlined above in 1 and 1a commentary.	A3
5 b	Total outage		See 5 above.	C3		As outlined above in 1 and 1a commentary.	A3
6	**Exclusions**		Compliant with guidance	B2		Exclusions fall into two main categories. 1. < 24 Hrs 2. Water Quality related The reporting process for 2018/19 will be by, expert knowledge to manually assess SAP, PRISM, IMS and SAMS related documents and reports to identify these events. The data sources are robust corporate systems used in reporting Management information.	A2
6a	Outside normal water quality band		Guidance is consistent with existing methodology and operating procedures including, mitigation of water quality events by	B2		DCWW methodology is consistent with guidance, operating procedures and mitigation of water quality events by some manual assessment of the data and triggers.	A2

	2017/18				April 2019		
	Component	**Compliant (R/A/G)**	**Reason for any non-compliant components**	**Confidence Grade**	**Compliant (R/A/G)**	**Reason for any non-compliant components**	**Confidence Grade**
			some manual assessment of data.				
6 b	Evidence of water quality events		Water quality events are logged and tracked through existing company procedures, Customer contacts, IMS, and sample data held on the QDB system. Assessment and reporting is an established process undertaken by Water quality teams.	B2		Water quality events are logged and tracked through existing company reporting procedures, (Customer contacts, IMS, and sample data held on the SAMS system). Assessment and reporting is an established process by Water quality teams.	A2