



STAKEHOLDER TRACKING

Q1 2022





- 1 Introduction (page 3)
- 2 Summary (page 4)
- 3 Sample profile (pages 5 to 6)
- 4 Satisfaction (pages 7 to 11)
- 5 NPS (pages 12 to 14)
- 6 Contact (pages 15 to 17)
- 7 Moving Annual Average comparisons (pages 18 to 24)
- 8 Tap or bottled water preference (pages 25 to 26)

STAKEHOLDER TRACKING – Q1 2022 INTRODUCTION

This is an ongoing research programme with NWGs key stakeholders

- Carried out by phone
- 50 interviews per quarter
- Data provided by NWG to Trinity McQueen
- Quotas set in proportion to the profile of stakeholders by:
 - Region NW, ESW and National
 - Type Public Affairs, NGO and Media
- Q1 fieldwork dates: 28 February to 12 April
- Average interview length: 12.5 minutes

Type of business	Number of interviews
Public	27
NGO	19
Media	4

Topics discussed cover:

- Trust and other brand values measures
- Likelihood to recommend, with reasons
- Overall satisfaction
- Contact satisfaction (where applicable)
- Preferences for information channels

Location	Number of interviews
NWG	50
NW	27
ESW	9
National	14

As seen with the Q1 results we continue to see a slight dip in scores, mainly due to the low number of monthly responses and the stakeholder type being interviewed quota differing each phase.

drop in expected, due to the low number of responses so far this year, we see a drop in most scores when comparing to the 2021 YTD results. When compared to the previous quarter we see a drop in a high proportion of scores overall, in particular, NPS 17.5 (down 21.5), this is mainly due to the score for National 0 (down 37.5) and NW 22.7 (down 22.5). Whereas in ESW we seen an increase of 25, now scoring 25 for Q1.

Satisfaction with most recent contact overall (8.5) is down 0.4. Both NW (7.2) and ESW (8.0) see a drop of 0.6 and 0.3 respectively.

Agreement with all brand value statements are down overall, the biggest drop being seen for providing affordable and inclusive services 7.4 and contributing to building a successful economy in the region 7.7 (both down 0.4). NW's biggest drop is for providing affordable and inclusive services (7.0), down 1.1.

ESW scores have increased for all brand value statements when compared to Q4 2021, the highest being:

- Providing affordable and inclusive services (7.7), an increase of 2.4
- Providing an unrivalled customer experience (7.3), an increase of 1.8
- Trusting we work with others to improve the environment (8.3), an increase of 1.5
- 4 Leading in tackling leakage (7.8), an increase of 1.3
- Leading in innovation (8.3), an increase of 1.0

SAMPLE PROFILE

STAKEHOLDER TRACKING – Q1 2022 SAMPLE PROFILE

Variation in the profile from year to year





SATISFACTION

WITH TRUST, OVERALL SATISFACTION AND BRAND VALUES

STAKEHOLDER TRACKING – Q1 2022 TRUST

NWG is a company you can trust

(10 = agree strongly, 0 = disagree strongly)



Mean score: 8.0

	NW (25)	8.0
Region	ESW (9)	7.9
	National (14)	8.1
	Public Affairs (25)	7.9
Туре	NGO (19)	8.1
	Media (4)	8.0



Q7g:Thinking about your overall impressions of [NW/ESW/NWG], to what extent would you agree or disagree with the following statements? They are a company that you can trust. Q8 In relation to the statement 'They are a company that you can trust', you [gave a score of .../couldn't give a score out of 10]. Why is that? Q8: Reason for trust score.

STAKEHOLDER TRACKING – Q1 2022 OVERALL SATISFACTION

9



Q5: Now, using a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is very dissatisfied and 10 is very satisfied, how satisfied are you overall with [NW/ESW/NWG]? Q6: Over the last year, would you say your overall satisfaction with [NW/ESW/NWG] has decreased, stayed the same or increased?

STAKEHOLDER TRACKING – Q1 2022 SATISFACTION WITH MOST RECENT CONTACT



Mean score: 8.5

	NW (25)	8.4
Region	ESW (8)	8.0
	National (12)	9.0
	Public Affairs (23)	8.7
Туре	NGO (19)	8.2
	Media (3)	8.7

One stakeholder commented on why they scored low:

"They won't engage or answer the questions. We are a big landowner and they have a huge amount of equipment on our land and it is continually bursting, breaks and explodes, both clean water and drainage.

The infrastructure is substandard and they do not reinvest. The only time we get a sensible response is when you take them to court."

NGO, NW (score 0)

10 Q2a: When did you last have contact with or from [NW/ESW/NWG], in a professional capacity? Q2b: Through which of the following channels was your most recent contact with them? Q2c: How did you feel about this last contact with them - using a scale of 0 to 10 where 0 is 'very dissatisfied' and 10 is 'very satisfied'?

STAKEHOLDER TRACKING – Q1 2022 BRAND VALUES – PROGRESS MONITORING

Brand values	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022 YTD	Q1 '22	
Provide an unrivalled customer experience	7.8	8.0	7.1	7.6	7.5	7.2	7.2	Lowest scoring Public Affairs at 6.8
Provide affordable and inclusive services			7.5	8.2	8.1	7.4	7.4	
Provide reliable and resilient services			8.2	8.5	8.2	7.7	7.7	
Leading in innovation	7.6	7.9	7.3	8.4	8.2	7.9	7.9	Lowest scoring Media at 6.0 Highest scoring ESW at 8.3
Trusted to work with others to improve the environment	7.9	8.2	8.0	8.8	8.3	7.9	7.9	Highest scoring ESW at 8.3
Contribute to building a successful economy in the region			7.8	8.5	8.2	7.7	7.7	
Company you can trust	8.1	8.2	8.2	8.7	8.5	8.0	8.0	
Leading company in tackling leakage			7.6	7.8	7.5	6.9	6.9	Lowest scoring NGO at 6.5 Highest scoring ESW/Media both at 7.8
Working to improve environmental impact for customers/communities – now						7.7	7.7	Highest scoring NGO at 8.0
Working to improve environmental impact for customers/communities – for future generations						7.8	7.8	Highest scoring NGO at 8.2



Likelihood to recommend NWG

(Score range: Detractor 0-6; Passive 7-8; Promoter 9-10)



Overall NPS: 17.1

	NW (22)	22.7
Region	ESW (8)	25.0
	National (11)	0.0
	Public Affairs (20)	0.0
Туре	NGO (17)	29.4
	Media (4)	50.0

13 Q1: Thank you. Now, if people could choose their water provider, how likely would you be to recommend [NW/ESW/NWG] to colleagues, friends or family, using a scale of 0 to 10 where 0 is 'not at all likely' and 10 is 'extremely likely'? Q1b: Why do you say that?

PROMOTERS

- Happy with the service (5)
- Professional/efficient (3)
- Water quality is good (3)
- Customer focussed (3)
- Supply is reliable/consistent (2)
- Good experience with them (2)

PASSIVES

- No problems happy with the service (4)
- Good experience with them (4)
- Professional/efficient (3)
- Good working relationship (2)
- Always room for improvement (2)
- Can't make comparison no real choice of supplier (2)
- Better communications required, including notice of works (2)
- It's a monopoly (2)
- Should be more responsive/quicker to resolve issues (2)
- Customer focused (2)
- Do a good job (2)

DETRACTORS

- Would not/no need to recommend – up to the individual (2)
- Little/no contact don't know enough about them (2)
- Don't think about it (2)

14 Q1: Thank you. Now, if people could choose their water provider, how likely would you be to recommend [NW/ESW/NWG] to colleagues, friends or family, using a scale of 0 to 10 where 0 is 'not at all likely' and 10 is 'extremely likely'? Q1b: Why do you say that?

CONTACT

MOST RECENT CONTACT, CHANNEL, SUPPLIED WITH ALL INFORMATION WANTED, AND PREFERRED CHANNEL FOR REGULAR INFORMATION

STAKEHOLDER TRACKING – Q1 2022 CONTACT



Channel of most recent contact



16 Q2a: When did you last have contact with or from [NW/ESW/NWG], in a professional capacity? Q2b: Through which of the following channels was your most recent contact with them? Q2c: How did you feel about this last contact with them - using a scale of 0 to 10 where 0 is 'very dissatisfied' and 10 is 'very satisfied'?

STAKEHOLDER TRACKING – Q1 2022 INFORMATION



Preferred channel(s) for regular information (prompted)



Q3: Has NWG supplied you with all the information you want, to feel informed about the services they provide? Q4: How would you prefer to receive regular information from [NW/ESW/NWG]?

MOVING ANNUAL AVERAGES COMPARISON

(MAA)

The sample base each quarter is relatively small, so the scope for analysis of trends within the region and sample type sub-groups is limited. Therefore, a MAA has been included in order to increase the sub-group bases and also to iron out peaks and troughs in the data caused by sample profile differences from wave to wave.

Each MAA data point is a total of the interviews completed in the four quarters up to and including that wave. This gives a total bases averaging around 120 for NW and 60-80 for ESW, along with 90 for public affairs, 65 for NGOs and 40 for media; it is then possible also to significance test the MAA data points. The moving annual average was stable in 2021, we have seen a drop overall in Q1 2022. The lowest scoring area being ESW and Media, but it's worth noting that this is due to the low number of responses in these two areas

MA 12 mon		Q1 '18	Q2 '18	Q3 '18	Q4 '18	Q1 '19	Q2 '19	Q3 '19	Q4 '19	Q1 '20	Q2 '20	Q3 '20	Q4 '20	Q1 '21	Q2 '21	Q3 '21	Q4 '21	Q1 '22
	Total	8.1	8.2	8.3	8.2	8.2	8.2	8.1	8.2	8.3	8.5	8.6	8.7	8.7	8.6	8.6	8.5	8.3
Region	NW	8.4	8.5	8.4	8.3	8.3	8.2	8.2	8.2	8.3	8.6	8.6	8.7	8.7	8.6	8.6	8.5	8.4
	ESW	7.7	7.8	7.9	8.1	7.9	8.2	8.1	8.1	8.0	7.9	8.3	8.2	8.1	8.1	8.0	8.0	8.0
	Public	7.7	8.0	8.0	8.1	8.3	8.2	8.0	8.2	8.1	8.3	8.5	8.5	8.4	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.2
Туре	NGO	8.7	8.4	8.4	8.3	8.0	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.6	8.7	8.8	8.9	9.0	8.9	8.8	8.8	8.5
	Media	8.3	8.2	8.4	8.3	8.2	8.2	8.1	7.9	7.7	7.9	7.8	7.8	8.3	7.8	8.4	8.1	8.0



20 Q7g:Thinking about your overall impressions of [NW/ESW/NWG], to what extent would you agree or disagree with the following statements? They are a company that you can trust.

STAKEHOLDER TRACKING – Q1 2022 OVERALL SATISFACTION

The trend remains broadly steady, although there is an increase in the Media MAA in Q1 2022

MA 12 mon		Q1 '18	Q2 '18	Q3 '18	Q4 '18	Q1 '19	Q2 '19	Q3 '19	Q4 '19	Q1 '20	Q2 '20	Q3 '20	Q4 '20	Q1 '21	Q2 '21	Q3 '21	Q4 '21	Q1 '22
	Total	8.3	8.3	8.4	8.4	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.4	8.6	8.7	8.7	8.6	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.4
Region	NW	8.5	8.5	8.6	8.5	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.5	8.7	8.7	8.6	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.4
	ESW	7.9	7.9	8.2	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.2	8.3	8.1	8.1	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.1	8.0
	Public	8.0	8.1	8.2	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.4	8.5	8.5	8.4	8.3	8.5	8.4	8.4
Туре	NGO	8.7	8.6	8.7	8.6	8.3	8.4	8.3	8.3	8.6	8.7	8.8	8.8	8.7	8.7	8.6	8.6	8.5
	Media	8.3	8.2	8.4	8.3	8.3	8.1	7.9	8.1	8.1	8.6	8.5	8.6	8.2	8.0	8.3	7.3	7.5



Although the overall NPS has fallen slightly in Q1 2022, it remains higher than it was in 2018 and 2019. Again, expect this number to change once the quota has been achieved for all the region and stakeholder types

MA 12 mon		Q1 '18	Q2 '18	Q3 '18	Q4 '18	Q1 '19	Q2 '19	Q3 '19	Q4 '19	Q1 '20	Q2 '20	Q3 '20	Q4 '20	Q1 '21	Q2 '21	Q3 '21	Q4 '21	Q1 '22
	Total	29.4	30.2	31.8	29.2	27.4	27.2	28.7	23.0	24.2	33.9	36.9	43.8	44.6	42.0	39.1	40.4	35.1
Region	NW	44.6	43.6	40.5	32.7	29.2	27.8	33.3	31.4	38.7	50.0	47.5	50.8	48.0	43.7	40.2	43.2	38.2
	ESW	7.2	11.3	16.9	21.3	23.5	26.0	19.1	8.5	-4.1	-24.2	-13.3	-4.5	0.0	4.0	12.0	12.0	21.7
	Public	25.0	30.7	29.7	34.4	43.3	36.1	34.2	22.5	16.9	23.7	28.8	40.9	35.1	31.6	34.9	39.1	36.0
Туре	NGO	47.4	39.0	40.6	35.8	21.8	27.9	27.7	29.8	34.8	47.4	49.4	47.0	54.9	52.8	45.8	44.9	35.9
	Media	9.1	15.8	20.9	12.5	9.5	11.1	12.5	10.7	18.2	18.8	6.3	30.0	14.3	16.7	12.5	12.5	20.0



22 Q1: Thank you. Now, if people could choose their water provider, how likely would you be to recommend [NW/ESW/NWG] to colleagues, friends or family, using a scale of 0 to 10 where 0 is 'not at all likely' and 10 is 'extremely likely'?

The overall moving annual average remains consistent, and we see a slight increase in Public Affairs

MA 12 mon		Q1 '19	Q2 '19	Q3 '19	Q4 '19	Q1 '20	Q2 '20	Q3 '20	Q4 '20	Q1 '21	Q2 '21	Q3 '21	Q4 '21	Q1 '22
	Total	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.6	8.7	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8
Region	NW	8.6	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.6	8.7	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.8	8.9	8.8
	ESW	8.5	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.2	8.1	8.2	8.0	8.2	8.3	8.2	8.3	8.2
	Public	8.4	8.6	8.5	8.4	8.4	8.5	8.6	8.8	8.7	8.7	8.8	8.7	8.8
Туре	NGO	8.6	8.5	8.6	8.7	8.8	8.9	8.9	8.9	8.9	8.9	8.8	8.9	8.7
	Media	8.6	8.2	8.1	8.4	8.3	8.5	8.6	8.3	8.4	8.5	9.0	9.0	8.9



With the exception of leading in innovation which remains the same as Q4 2021 (8.2), the moving annual averages continue showing downward trend



TAP OR BOTTLED WATER PREFERENCE

STAKEHOLDERS WHO ARE ALSO DOMESTIC CUSTOMERS

STAKEHOLDER TRACKING – Q1 2022 TAP OR BOTTLED WATER PREFERENCE

70% of stakeholders are supplied by NW or ESW at home

Satisfaction with domestic supply	2021	2022 YTD	Q1 '22
Supply clean and clear drinking water	9.2	9.2	9.2
Supply drinking water that tastes and smells good	8.9	9.0	9.0
Provide a reliable supply of water	9.4	9.5	9.5
Provide sufficient pressure	9.0	9.2	9.2

Stakeholders who are supplied water at home who prefer tap water to bottled water





	NW (19)	90%
Region	ESW (3)	60%
	National (5)	83%
	Public Affairs (12)	86%
Туре	NGO (13)	87%
	Media (2)	67%

First three things that come to mind when using tap water at home

91%

26 Q14: Which company provides your water supply at home? Q16: To what extent would you agree or disagree with the following statements, about your domestic water supply from. Base: Total (50) Q17: If you had to choose, would you drink tap water or bottled water? Base: Supplied by NW/ESW at home (32)

