



Cooper, S. M., & Slack, R. (2015). Reporting practice, impression management and company performance: a longitudinal and comparative analysis of water leakage disclosure. *Accounting and Business Research*, 45(6-7), 801-840.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00014788.2015.1081554>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):  
[10.1080/00014788.2015.1081554](https://doi.org/10.1080/00014788.2015.1081554)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)  
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Taylor & Francis at <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00014788.2015.1081554>.

## University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

### General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:  
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

**Table 1: Definitions of Impression Management Tactics.**

<b>TACTIC</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Sources</b>
<b>Assertive</b>		
Ingratiation	An organisation's management seeks to gain the audience's approbation by praising and flattering them or by expressing similar beliefs, values and attitudes.	Tedeschi and Melburg (1984), Ogden and Clarke (2005).
Self-promotion	An organisation's management promotes their own competence, qualities, abilities and experience.	Tedeschi and Melburg (1984), Arndt and Bigelow (2000).
Exemplification	An organisation's management seeks to be perceived as morally virtuous and conforming to principled ideals and conduct.	Tedeschi and Melburg (1984), Ogden and Clarke (2005).
Entitlement	An organisation's management claims responsibility for positive events and outcomes.	Tedeschi and Melburg (1984), Aerts (2005), Brennan et al. (2009).
Enhancement	An organisation's management claims that the value of a positive event is greater than thought and/or achieved despite negative external influences.	Tedeschi and Melburg (1984), Aerts (2005).
<b>Assertive or Defensive</b>		
Selectivity	An organisation's management selects performance numbers to portray it in the best possible light.	Godfrey et al. (2003), Brennan et al. (2009).
Performance comparisons	An organisation's management select benchmarks that portray current performance favourably.	Brennan et al. (2009).
<b>Defensive</b>		
Dis(as)sociation	An organisation's management distances itself from events with negative implications often by initiating change in personnel.	Ogden and Clarke (2005), Samkin and Schneider (2010).
Excuses	An organisation's management denies responsibility for an event with negative implications by blaming external factors beyond their control.	Tedeschi and Melburg (1984), Benoit (1995), Arndt and Bigelow (2000), Ogden and Clarke (2005), Brennan et al. (2009).
Justifications	An organisation's management accepts at least partial responsibility for an event, but does not accept the attribution of any negative implications.	Tedeschi and Melburg (1984), Ogden and Clarke (2005), Brennan et al. (2009).
Apologies	An organisation's management accepts at least partial responsibility for an event with negative implications and expresses some remorse.	Tedeschi and Melburg (1984), Benoit, 1995, Ogden and Clarke (2005).
Restitution	An organisation's management compensates a victim to avoid any appearance of injustice or unfairness which lead to negative impressions.	Tedeschi and Melburg (1984).
Concealment	An organisation's management obfuscates or downplays negative information by giving it less prominence.	Brennan et al. (2009), Merkl-Davies et al. (2011), Dhanani and Connolly (2012).
Omission	An organisation's management withhold negative information.	Adams (2004), Belal and Cooper (2011), Boiral (2013)

**Table 2: Empirical studies of Impression Management in Annual Reports and Sustainability Reports**

<b>Author and year</b>	<b>Research method</b>	<b>Sample</b>	<b>Longitudinal data?</b>	<b>Content analysed</b>
Abrahamson and Park (1994)	Quantitative	US listed companies' President's letters	No - cross sectional	Text
Aerts (1994)	Quantitative	Belgian companies' annual reports	No - cross sectional	Attributional statements
Aerts (2001)	Quantitative	Belgian companies' annual reports	Yes	Attributional statements
Aerts (2005)	Quantitative	Belgian companies' annual reports	No – cross sectional	Attributional statements
Arndt and Bigelow (2000)	Qualitative	US hospitals' annual reports	No – cross sectional	Text
Beattie and Jones (2000a)	Quantitative	UK listed companies' annual reports	Yes	Graphs
Beattie and Jones (2002)	Quantitative	Company annual reports from 6 countries	No – cross sectional	Graphs
Beattie et al. (2008)	Quantitative	UK listed companies' annual reports	Yes	Graphs and structure of annual reports
Cho et al. (2012)	Quantitative	US companies' sustainability reports	No – cross sectional	Graphs
Clatworthy and Jones (2001)	Quantitative	UK listed companies' chairman's statements	No – cross sectional	Text - readability
Clatworthy and Jones (2003)	Quantitative	UK listed companies' chairman's statements	No – cross sectional	Text
Clatworthy and Jones (2006)	Quantitative	UK listed companies' chairman's statements	No – cross sectional	Text
Courtis (1998)	Quantitative	Hong Kong listed companies chairman's statements	No – cross sectional	Text - readability
Courtis (2004)	Quantitative + experiment	Hong Kong companies' annual reports	Yes	Colour
Dhanani and Connolly (2012)	Quantitative	Large UK charities' annual reports and annual reviews	No – cross sectional	Text
Godfrey et al. (2003)	Quantitative	Australian listed companies' financial reports	Yes	Graphs
Hrasky (2012)	Quantitative	Australian listed companies' sustainability reports	No – cross sectional	Graphs and photographs
Jones (2011)	Quantitative	UK companies' sustainability reports	No – cross sectional	Graphs
Merkel-Davis et al. (2011)	Quantitative	UK listed companies chairman's statements	No – cross sectional	Text
Neu et al. (1998)	Quantitative	Canadian listed companies' annual reports	Yes	Text
Ogden and Clarke (2005)	Mixed	UK WASCs' annual reports	Yes, but no time series analysis	Text
Preston et al. (1996)	Qualitative	US companies' annual reports	Yes, but no time series analysis	Visual images
Samkin and Schneider (2010)	Qualitative	NZ public sector annual reports	Yes	Text and photographs

**Table 3: WASC performance against OFWAT target.**

<b>WASC</b>	<b>Years target achieved</b>	<b>Years target not met</b>
Anglian	2006-2010; 2012	2011
Dŵr Cymru	2006-2010; 2012	2011
Northumbrian	2006-2009; 2012	2010 and 2011
Severn Trent	2008-2010; 2012	2006 and 2007; 2011
South West (Pennon)	2006-2012	N/A
Southern	2006-2009; 2012	2010 and 2011
Thames	2007-2012	2006
United Utilities	2007-2012	2006
Wessex	2006-2012	N/A
Yorkshire	2006-2009; 2012	2010 and 2011

**Table 4: OFWAT and matched WASC reporting (Thames and United Utilities): 2005-06 and 2006-07.**

OFWAT Reporting	Company leakage reporting	
2005-06 targets not met.	Thames	United Utilities
<p><b>Thames:</b> This year, we have taken formal action against Thames Water, the company with the worst record on leakage control for its continuing failure to hit its leakage target (p.5).</p> <p>Of the three companies that failed their targets in 2005-06, we have taken the strongest action against Thames. The company has given us a legally binding undertaking to meet future leakage targets and to spend an extra £150 million at its own cost to replace an additional 368 km of mains (p.8).</p> <p><b>United Utilities:</b> This is the fourth consecutive annual target failure reported by United Utilities. United Utilities is now performing in line with its recovery action plan (p. 37).</p> <p>In 2005-06, United Utilities reported that leakage fell by 22 MI/d to 477 MI/d – a reduction of 4.4%. This was above the annual average target of 470 MI/d. Despite missing the annual average target, the company did meet all the interim targets for 2005-06 set within its action plan (p. 47).</p>	<p>Whilst there has been progress during the year in tackling leakage and sewer flooding, it is acknowledged that more needs to be done... We are also encouraging customers to think carefully about their use of water (Water Resources pp. 3-4).</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b> Omission of target and actual performance. Omission of failure to achieve target. No visual effects.</p>	<p>Looking beyond the financial bottom-line, the board has been pleased with progress on important areas such as customer service and leakage. (Chairman’s Review, p. 2).</p> <p>Graphic with large colour green and blue bold font showing: Spot leakage as at 31 March 2006 470 MI/d 31 March 2005: 519 MI/d (Business Overview, p. 5).</p> <p><b>Leakage and water efficiency</b> In north west England, United Utilities Water has halved water leakage since 1995 and met its spot target of 470 MI per day at the end of 2005/06. (Corporate Responsibility, p.30).</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b> Omission of target and actual performance. Omission of failure to achieve target. Prominent visual effect (graphic) font, colour. Selective measurement of spot data and performance comparison to prior year. Self-promotion on leakage progress.</p>
2006-07 targets met.	Thames	United Utilities

<p><b>Thames:</b> Thames has achieved the targets set for 2006-07, and we will continue to monitor its performance closely until the undertaking comes to an end in 2010 (p. 2).</p> <p>We secured a legally binding undertaking from Thames in 2005-06 that committed the company to improving its performance, at its own expense, and delivering a score of 100 against its planned level of service by 2009-10. Thames has achieved its target for the first year of the undertaking, largely through a combination of lower leakage and better demand management (p.4).</p> <p><b>United Utilities:</b> Other companies that failed their 12-month rolling average targets in 2005-06, United Utilities hit their target in 2006-07 (p. 7).</p>	<p>Meeting the leakage target to 31 March 2007 was essential and I am pleased to say that this milestone was achieved, by a considerable margin (Chairman’s introduction, p. 3).</p> <p>Key outputs include meeting annual targets for leakage. (Operating Review, p.9)</p> <p>The failure to meet the 2005/06 leakage target, while needing to impose a hosepipe ban as a result of the drought, led to much critical comment from the media and other stakeholders. (Operating Review, p.9)</p> <p>The Company has delivered leakage savings that have met the required target for 2006/07, by a considerable margin.... This is gratifying for the Company, and particularly for the individuals whose efforts have made it possible. (Operating Review, p. 10).</p> <p>KPI table including actual leakage performance against OFWAT target and prior year actual (p. 29).</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b> Prominent location of disclosure of meeting target, subsequently repeated three times. Entitlement, self-referencing and reinforcement of meeting target Disclosure of prior year target failure. Visual effect (table) showing target and actual performance and comparison with prior year.</p>	<p>KPI table showing average annual leakage compared to prior year (restated for 2005-06 comparative) (Business Review, p. 2).</p> <p>We are already seeing some improvement in meeting our leakage performance target set by Ofwat (Chief Executive’s Report, p.5).</p> <p>Blue bubble graphic with large colour font showing: 468MI/d rolling annual average leakage We have achieved our economic level of leakage rolling target (Chief Executive’s Report. p. 6).</p> <p>Leakage level reduced to 468 megalitres per day (Performance summary, p. 28).</p> <p>Security of water supply – U UW met the economic level of leakage rolling target of 470 megalitres per day for 2006/07 for the first time in five years. (Business Review, p.28).</p> <p><b>Leakage</b> In north west England, we have halved water leakage since 1995 and out-performed the rolling average target of 470 MI per day for 2006/07 by achieving 468 MI per day, meeting our agreed target with Ofwat. (Corporate Responsibility, p. 35).</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b> Prominent visual effect (table) showing actual performance and comparison (restated) with prior year. Visual effect (graphic), colour and font of target achievement. Prominent location of disclosure of meeting target,</p>
--	--	---

		subsequently repeated four times and reinforced. Entitlement and self-referencing of meeting target. Disclosure of prior year target failure. Visual effect (bullet point and bold) on performance summary.
--	--	--

**Table 5: OFWAT and matched WASC reporting (Severn Trent): 2005-06 to 2007-08.**

OFWAT Reporting	Severn Trent leakage reporting
<b>2005-06 target not met.</b>	<b>2005-06 target not met.</b>
<p>The company's performance reflects its failure to achieve its leakage target. Should the company fail to deliver this output, we will make an appropriate adjustment to reflect the financial value of the shortfall at the next review of price limits in 2009 (p. 20).</p> <p>We will continue to meet with Severn Trent on a regular basis in the coming year and monitor progress closely. Severn Trent is on notice that we will consider using our formal enforcement powers in the event of any future failures (p. 47).</p>	<p>The one area of the AMP4 contract where our 2005/06 results were disappointing was leakage. The dry summer of 2005 contributed to this performance, causing higher than average levels of burst pipes. Reported actual leakage has increased by approximately 17 Megalitres per day, 3% greater than 2004/05. We have now increased the resources dedicated to detection and reduction of leakage, and we believe that, by the end of the AMP4 period, we can reduce our leakage figures to below the target level set by Ofwat. (Performance Review, p. 17).</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b>  Omission of target and actual performance.  Obfuscation of failure to achieve current year target and target attainment within regulatory period.  Excuse and justification of weather as causal factor.  No visual effects.</p>
<b>2006-07 target not met.</b>	<b>2006-07 target not met.</b>
<p>This year we have taken action against Severn Trent over its deteriorating security of supply and the failure to meet its annual leakage target for the second year in succession. We secured a legal undertaking from the company that commits it to achieve future leakage and security of supply index targets until 2009-10. (p. 2).</p> <p>The company is now committed to overcoming scheme delays and spending an extra £45 million on reducing leakage, at shareholders' expense. (p. 6 and repeated on p. 7).</p>	<p>Our leakage increased in the prior year 2005/06.</p> <p><sup>1</sup>We employed more people, invested in new leak detection technology, fixed 37,000 leaks, 8,000 more than the previous year and invested almost £20 million more than the previous year. This effort has reduced our leakage this year but it was not until the month of March 2007 that we attained a monthly level of leakage commensurate with our Ofwat annual target. Therefore, notwithstanding this reduction, we believe that we will not attain the annual average target level of leakage.</p> <p>We have kept Ofwat fully informed of our progress...In due course we will be discussing with Ofwat our ongoing plans and commitments to maintain our progress in reducing leakage. (Chief Executive's Review, p. 7).</p>

<sup>1</sup> All of the selected disclosure is repeated verbatim on page 14 (Business Review).



<p>We will monitor Severn Trent's performance closely through audited quarterly reports, and will take further enforcement action if it fails to deliver its commitments (p. 7).</p>	<p>Leakage table showing current year only (DMA) (page 8).</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b>  Selectivity and prominent disclosure of prior year poor performance (increase in leakage) and current year leakage reduction.  Disclosure over likely failure to meet target.  Omission of target and actual performance.  Visual effect (table), selective measurement (monthly District Metered Areas, DMA) for current year only.  Repetition of leakage reduction.</p>
<p><b>2007-08 target met.</b></p>	<p><b>2007-08 target met.</b></p>
<p>Severn Trent passed its leakage target this year, after two years of failures. In 2007, we secured a legally binding undertaking from the company to meet its reduction targets. It has made significant reductions this year, and we are pleased with how the company has progressed. We will continue to monitor the company's performance closely against the undertaking during 2008-09 through audited quarterly reports (p. 23).</p>	<p>Large bold blue colour font showing:  Delivering results</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outperformed against Ofwat 2007/08 leakage target (Inside front cover).</li> </ul> <p><b>Leakage</b>  We have outperformed our Ofwat target for 2007/08 having failed to meet this measure for the previous two years. (Chief Executive's Review, p.6).</p> <p>Colour graphic with large blue colour font showing:  KPI highlights: Leakage MI/d 491 (large font)  We have outperformed our leakage target (KPI highlights p.10)</p> <p>KPI table including leakage (p. 11).</p> <p><b>Meeting our leakage target</b>  We have outperformed our leakage target for 2007/08, after failing to meet it for the last two years. We are determined to maintain our performance...in line with our written commitment to Ofwat for the remaining years of AMP4. (Performance Review, p.16).</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b>  Prominent location and visual effect (font, colour, bullet) of meeting target.</p>

	<p>Repeated prominent location of disclosure of meeting target, entitlement and self-referencing, subsequently repeated two times.</p> <p>Reinforcement of meeting target.</p> <p>Disclosure of prior year target failures.</p> <p>Visual effect (graphic, colour, font) to show actual performance and exceeding target, reinforcement, entitlement and self-referencing.</p>
--	--

**Table 6: All targets met –leakage disclosure: 2005-06 to 2007-08.**

<b>Pennon</b>	<b>Wessex</b>
<p><b>2005-06</b> The company’s leakage detection and reduction programme continues to deliver results in line with mandatory targets set by Ofwat (Chairman’s Statement, p. 2)</p> <p>The company...has consistently met its Ofwat leakage target of 84 MI/d (Business Review, p. 18).</p>	<p><b>2005-06</b> We have maintained leakage below the regulatory target and do not anticipate any supply problems in 2006 (Operational Review p. 2)</p> <p>Service to customers – KPI table comparing actual leakage with prior year and target (p. 11)</p>
<p><b>2006-07</b> We achieved our best ever leakage performance. We have achieved or beaten our leakage target in every year since targets were introduced by Ofwat in 1999/2000 (Chief Executives Review, p.4).</p>	<p><b>2006-07</b> Reduced leakage below the target assessed for the 2004 price review to 72 MI/d (Highlights, p. 4).</p> <p>Reducing leakage to 72 MI/d – which is 2 MI/d below the economic level (Regulatory Commentary, p. 34) and OFWAT June return table comparing actual leakage with prior year and target.</p>
<p><b>2007-08</b> We achieved our target of keeping leakage at or below 84MI/d. We have achieved or beaten our leakage target in every year since targets were introduced by Ofwat in 1999/2000 (Chief Executives Review, p.4).</p>	<p><b>2007-08</b> Leakage is currently 72MI/d beating the Ofwat target of 74MI/d. (Customer services, p.13).</p> <p>Service to customers – KPI table comparing actual leakage with prior year and target (p. 31)</p>
<p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b> Consistent, clear and prominent reporting of target achievement. Little variation in annual disclosure. Evidence of consistent use of visual effect (tables) to show leakage performance against target and prior year.</p>	

**Table 7: OFWAT and matched WASC reporting (Severn Trent): 2008-09 to 2011-12.**

<b>OFWAT Reporting</b>	<b>Company reporting</b>
<b>2008-09 to 2009-10: Targets met in all years.</b>	<b>2008-09 to 2009-10: Targets met in all years.</b>
No additional leakage reporting.	<p><b>2008-09</b>                      Severn Trent is delivering performance in key areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outperforming our leakage target (Highlights, p.1).</li> </ul> <p>KPI table showing leakage against prior year (Business Review, p. 8).</p> <p>Meeting our leakage target: Our leakage was 492 MI/d in 2008/09. For the second year running...we have met our leakage target of 500 MI/d set by Ofwat.... being able to reduce leakage becomes ever more important for our customers (Business Review, p. 10).</p> <p><b>2009-10</b>                      For the third year running we achieved our leakage target (Business Review, p.10)</p> <p>KPI table showing leakage against prior year (Business Review, p. 11).</p> <p>...able to achieve Ofwat’s leakage target for the third successive year (2010, Business Review, p. 12).</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b>                      Consistent and prominent reporting of target achievement.                      Repetition of meeting target.                      Consistent use of visual effect (table) to show leakage performance against prior year and industry quartile.                      Reinforcement and emphasis of meeting leakage target.</p>
<b>2010-11 target not met.</b>	<b>2010-11 target not met.</b>
Despite the cold winter of 2010-11, most companies met their leakage targets. But six companies (Southern Water, Yorkshire Water, Northumbrian Water – in its north-east operating	Leakage was above target as a result of the severe winter weather....We maintained our leakage at the same level as last year (Business Review p.7).  Large graphic with large green (current year) and grey (prior year) colour font showing:

<p>area – <b>Severn Trent Water</b>, Anglian Water and Dŵr Cymru) failed.</p> <p>Dŵr Cymru, <b>Severn Trent Water</b> and Northumbrian Water (in its north east operating area) will each provide us with reports every three months on their performance. This is so we can require them to take further action quickly if their performance does not improve.</p>	<p>Leakage – megalitres per day (MI/d) 497: 2011; 497: 2010 (large font and bold) (Business Review, p. 12)</p> <p>Reducing leakage (green and bold font) We were able to maintain leakage at last year’s levels of 497 megalitres per day (MI/d). However, despite deploying additional resources we were unable to achieve our leakage target of 483 MI/d as a direct result of the weather.</p> <p>Colour graph of ‘Winter peaks 2007/08 to 2010/11: Weekly leakage April 2007 to March 2011’ showing increased peaks particularly in the winter of 2010/11 (a peak of approximately 800MI/d, compared to a peak of approximately 650MI/d in the winter of 2009/10 and peaks of less than 600MI/d in earlier years) (Business Review, p. 13)</p> <p>KPI table showing leakage against prior year (p. 123).</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b> Entitlement and performance comparison against prior year. Prominent visual effect (graphic, font, colour) to emphasise performance against prior year Disclosure of failure to achieve target. Excuse and justification of weather as causal factor, repeated a further six times. Visual effect (graph, colour) to emphasise weather. Visual effect (table) and disclosure performance comparison to prior year.</p>
<p><b>2011-12 target met.</b></p>	<p><b>2011-12 target met.</b></p>
<p>No additional leakage reporting.</p>	<p><b>Bold and bullet: Leakage reduced 7% year on year to a record low level and below OFWAT target (Highlights: Inside front cover and repeated Chairman’s Statement , p. 2)</b></p> <p>We have met our leakage targets: Large graphic of leakage levels with large bold font for current year leakage 464 MI/d. (Chief Executive’s review, p. 5).</p> <p>Leakage was reduced to a new low, ahead of our target (Chief Executive’s review, p. 6).</p>

Colour graphic with large blue colour font showing:

Meeting leakage targets:

We have achieved our lowest levels of leakage ever, and have beaten our Ofwat target of 474 MI/d by 10 MI/d (2%)

Lowest levels of leakage achieved

(Keeping customers happy: Business Review, p.15).

Severn Trent is the only company to have targeted a significant reduction in leakage during AMP5. We were pleased to improve our performance again during the year. We cut leakage to 464 megalitres per day (MI/d), compared to 497 MI/d last year and our target of 474 MI/d (Deploying water resources, p. 18).

KPI table showing leakage against prior year page (p.139).

**Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:**

Prominent location and visual effect (bold, bullet) of disclosure of meeting target.

Prominent reporting of target achievement, entitlement, repeated six times.

Entitlement, reinforcement and visual effect (graphic, colour, font, italics) of meeting leakage target.

Exemplification of leakage reduction in AMP5 period.

Performance comparison to prior year and target

Visual effect (table) of leakage compared to prior year.

**Table 8: OFWAT and matched WASC reporting (Southern, Northumbrian and Yorkshire): 2005-06 to 2011-12.**

OFWAT Reporting	Examples of company leakage reporting		
Prior years targets met (2006-09).	Southern	Northumbrian	Yorkshire
No additional leakage reporting.	<p>All years 2006-09, leakage tables showing year on year actual leakage since 2006 and next year's target level.</p> <p>All years 2006-09, disclosure of achieving leakage target and low industry levels on leakage.</p>	<p>Leakage targets achieved (2008, Highlights, p.1 and very similar in 2006 and 2007).</p> <p>Table showing comparison of actual levels with prior year and OFWAT leakage target (2007, p22 and 2008, p.22, repeated p.30).</p> <p>The leakage targets agreed with Ofwat have been met.... NWL...is playing a leading role in a review of leakage methodologies with the EA and Ofwat. (2009, Business Review, p.29).</p>	<p>We achieved our leakage target for the tenth year running. (2008, Managing Director's Review, p.1).</p> <p>We have achieved Ofwat's leakage target for the tenth year running (2008, Business Review, p.5)</p> <p>We had a good year in terms of leakage reduction... turning out at 295MI/d and we out-performed our regulatory target of 297.1MI/d (2009, Business Review, p 5).</p>
	<p><b>Common reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b>            Consistent disclosure of meeting target.            Performance comparison of target attainment and actual leakage levels.            Visual effect (tables) showing target and actual performance and comparison with prior year.            Repetition of meeting target.</p>		
2009-10 targets not met.	Southern	Northumbrian	Yorkshire
Most companies met their leakage targets, in spite of the unusually cold winter conditions. However, <b>Southern, Northumbrian (and) Yorkshire</b> failed to	Southern Water's aim is to beat annual leakage targets set by Ofwat (92 MI/d for 2009-10) maintaining its position as the water and sewerage company with the lowest leakage levels in the industry, measured on a per property basis	The severe freeze... meant we, along with other companies, did not meet our annual targets this year although our three year rolling targets have again been met. (Operational Performance, p.35)	Our aim is to be OFWAT's frontier company for financial performance and to outperform our targets. (2010 Business Review, p. 6).  <b>Reporting of performance against</b>

<p>meet their targets. We have focused on what these companies need to do to restore their performance and we have increased their reporting requirements while they do so.</p>	<p>(Operating and Financial Review, p.4). Leakage table showing year on year actual leakage since 2006 and next year's target level.</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b> Obfuscation of failure to achieve target. Table to show prior year performance and future leakage target. Self-promotion and selectivity of measurement for industry positioning.</p>	<p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b> Obfuscation of failure to achieve target, through selectivity of attaining rolling targets and annual average measures. Excuse and justification of weather as causal factor. Diminution of failure by reference to other WASCs. No tables or other visual effects.</p>	<p><b>OFWAT target:</b> Omission of target and actual performance. Omission of failure to achieve target. Self-promotion of regulatory positioning. No tables or other visual effects.</p>
<p><b>2010-11 targets not met.</b></p>	<p><b>Southern</b></p>	<p><b>Northumbrian</b></p>	<p><b>Yorkshire</b></p>
<p>Despite the cold winter of 2010-11, most companies met their leakage targets. But six companies (<b>Southern Water, Yorkshire Water, Northumbrian Water</b> – in its north-east operating area – Severn Trent Water, Anglian Water and Dŵr Cymru) failed.</p> <p>Dŵr Cymru, Severn Trent Water and <b>Northumbrian Water</b> (in its north east operating area) will each provide us with reports every three months on their performance. This is so we can require them to take further action quickly if their</p>	<p>Following three harsh winters...as a result we have been unable to achieve the challenging leakage targets that we set for ourselves, though we continue to have the lowest leakage levels of any of the ten water and sewerage companies in England and Wales... we remain committed to leading the industry on leakage (Operating and Financial Review, p.4).</p> <p>Southern Water's aim is to beat annual leakage targets agreed with Ofwat. The target was 83 MI/d for 2010-11. We are very disappointed to report that, despite finding and repairing a record 22,000 leaks during the year, we have not met this target, with levels for the year being at 92 MI/d... We are discussing these</p>	<p>Yet again, the weather had a huge impact on our operations during the year. The worst winter in over 100 years posed many challenges for us. Due to the extraordinary work of teams across the company, supplies to our customers were not affected. I must pay tribute to those who worked in exceptionally hard conditions to guarantee supplies and to deal with the inevitably increased leakage quickly, although, in these circumstances, it was not possible to achieve our leakage target in the north. (Chairman's Statement, p. 5)</p> <p>Table showing leakage targets for 2011-12 only, no current year figures (p. 12).</p> <p>The severe freeze...as a result, we,</p>	<p>Within a month we began implementing the plan with a view to reducing leakage to 297MI/d by the end of the financial year. However with the cold winter weather of 2010/11 turning out to be even worse than that of the previous year, we finally out-turned at 325MI/d. (Business Review, p. 7).</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b> Disclosure of actual performance. Obfuscation of failure to achieve target. Excuse and justification of weather. No tables or other visual effects.</p>



<p>performance does not improve.</p>	<p>issues with Ofwat and hope to agree a revised target profile.</p> <p>Table showing current and past leakage performance showing improvement from prior year. (No targets shown)</p> <p>However, even at the reported level, our leakage levels remain the lowest of the ten water and sewerage companies in England and Wales (Operating and Financial Review, p.6).</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b> Disclosure of target and actual performance. Disclosure of failure to achieve target Excuse and justification of weather as causal factor. Visual effect (table) but changed format showing current and prior year performance only – omission of target data as prior years. Self promotion and repetition of industry positioning.</p>	<p>along with other companies, did not meet our annual leakage target. In our southern region, conditions were not quite so severe and we achieved our target. (Operational Performance, p.39).</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b> Disclosure of failure to achieve target, but diminution by reference to other WASCs. Excuse and justification of weather as causal factor, repetition. Visual effect (table) showing leakage target only.</p>	
<p><b>2011-12 targets met.</b></p>	<p><b>Southern</b></p>	<p><b>Northumbrian</b></p>	<p><b>Yorkshire</b></p>
<p>No additional leakage reporting.</p>	<p>In terms of leakage we recorded our lowest figure ever and beat the current target set by our regulator OFWAT by 11 Ml/d. We remain the water and sewerage company with the lowest leakage level (Chief Executive’s review,</p>	<p>Table showing comparison of actual levels with OFWAT leakage target (Business Review, p. 8).</p> <p>Throughout 2011/12, distribution input and leakage levels have been at their</p>	<p>The success we achieved in driving down leakage ... During 2011-12 we put significant additional resource into tackling leakage and reduced levels in our region to the lowest on record. (Chairman’s Review, p.1).</p>

	<p>p.3).</p> <p>Leakage table showing six year comparison of actual leakage levels. (Operating review, p. 7).</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b>  Prominent disclosure of meeting target. Repetition (four times), entitlement and reinforcement of meeting target. Self-promotion and repetition (four times) of industry positioning. Visual effect (table) showing current and prior year performance.</p>	<p>lowest ever. Our final reported leakage figure has met our target comfortably (Environment, p.17).</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b>  Visual effect (table) to show target and actual performance. Entitlement and reinforcement of meeting target.</p>	<p>Comfortably over achieve the leakage target of 297 Ml/d and achieve the lowest ever levels. (Business Review, p. 4).</p> <p>Table showing comparison of actual levels with prior year and OFWAT leakage target. (Business Review, p. 4).</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b>  Prominent disclosure of meeting target. Visual effect (table) to show target and actual performance current and prior year. Repetition and reinforcement of meeting target.</p>
--	---	---	---

**Table 9: OFWAT and matched WASC reporting (Anglian and Dŵr Cymru): 2009-10 to 2011-12.**

OFWAT Reporting	Company leakage reporting	
2009-10 targets met.	Anglian	Dŵr Cymru
<p>No additional leakage reporting.</p>	<p>We met leakage target despite severe weather. Column chart showing current year (2009/10 5.62m<sup>3</sup>/km/day in blue colour) and prior years leakage to 2005/06 (5.80 m<sup>3</sup>/km/day) in grey colour. (KPI review, p. 4).</p> <p>For the ninth year in succession, we have once again met our demanding targets on reducing leakage (Managing Director’s Statement, p. 6).</p> <p>We have one of the best records for leakage control in the UK water industry, meeting all our AMP4 targets and with water loss figures at around half the industry average. In spite of the severe winter weather of 2009/10, we maintained our service levels and met our leakage target of 211.2 Ml/d (Business Review, p.31)</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b>                      Prominent location of disclosure of meeting target, subsequently repeated three times.                      Entitlement and reinforcement of meeting target                      Visual effect (column chart), actual performance and comparison with prior year.                      Performance comparison and self-promotion of industry positioning</p>	<p>Last year we again achieved OFWAT’s leakage reduction target (Managing Director’s report, p. 2).</p> <p>KPI table comparing leakage against prior year and target. Tick boxes for respective performance. (Business Review, p. 7).</p> <p>In 2009-10 we met our mandatory target for leakage reduction, and over the last five years we have reduced by 33 mega litres per day (ml/d) or 15%. This means that leakage in our region, once one of the highest in the UK, is now in line with the industry average (Business Review, p. 15).</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b>                      Prominent location and entitlement of meeting target, subsequently repeated three times.                      Visual effect (table and tick box) to show actual performance, target and comparison with prior year.                      Self-promotion of industry positioning.</p>
2010-11 targets not met.	Anglian	Dŵr Cymru
<p>Despite the cold winter of 2010-11, most companies met their leakage targets. But six</p>	<p>Our leakage rates are consistently almost half the industry average.</p>	<p>Last year leakage was 199Mld (mega litres a day), 9Mld above target and 3% higher than the previous</p>

<p>companies (Southern Water, Yorkshire Water, Northumbrian Water – in its north-east operating area – Severn Trent Water, <b>Anglian Water</b> and <b>Dŵr Cymru</b>) failed.</p>	<p>Column chart showing current year (2010/11 6.10 m<sup>3</sup>/km/day in pink colour) and prior years leakage to 05/06 (5.80 m<sup>3</sup>/km/day) and industry average for 2009/10 (10.9 m<sup>3</sup>/km/day) in orange colour. (KPI review, p. 4).</p> <p>In contrast to some other areas of the UK, we maintained supplies to our customers, which included increasing water put into supply and maintaining or increasing pressure to guarantee water supplies. As a consequence our total leakage for 2010/11 was 229 MI/d; which was above our target in the north of the region where the conditions were most severe. However, in the south east of the region leakage levels were lower than last year. Our underlying leakage levels remain amongst the lowest in our sector; we have met our leakage targets for the last eight years (Business Review, p. 29).</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b> Concealment of target failure and claims of meeting target by region or historically. Visual effect (table), actual performance, comparison with prior year and industry average. Performance comparison and self-promotion of industry positioning repeated three times.</p>	<p>year. Over the last 16 years we have reduced our leakage by more than half from 413 MI/d to 199 MI/d. (Managing Director’s Report, p. 4).</p> <p>KPI table comparing leakage against prior year with tick box (Business Review, p.7). No target figure.</p> <p>The last winter was one of the harshest on record and for the first time since targets were introduced by Ofwat we did not meet our target for leakage reduction (Our performance, p. 10)</p> <p>Graph (visual effect) showing ten year trend in leakage reduction from 224 MI/d in 2001-02 to 199 MI/d in 2010-11 (p. 18).</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b> Prominent disclosure of failure to meet target, subsequently repeated three times. Disclosure of actual and target leakage. Table (visual effect), performance comparison with prior year. Excuse and justification of weather Visual effect (graph) to show leakage reduction, obfuscating final year increase (measurement distortion).</p>
<p><b>2011-12 targets met.</b></p>	<p><b>Anglian</b></p>	<p><b>Dŵr Cymru</b></p>
<p>No additional leakage reporting.</p>	<p>Colour graphic with large font showing: 6% in bold and purple colour We beat our leakage target by over 6% this year. (Inside front cover)</p> <p>Beating our leakage target (set by Ofwat) by over 6%</p>	<p>Graph under the caption ‘Leakage is at an all time low’ showing leakage falling from approximately 250 MI/d in 2001/02 to less than 200 MI/d in 2011/12. (Inside front cover)</p> <p>We achieved our target for the year, bringing leakage</p>

	<p>– the lowest ever level of leakage (Highlights, p. 2)</p> <p>Beaten (in purple colour and bold font) our leakage target by over 6% (Performance, p. 4)</p> <p>This year we achieved our best ever performance on leakage to reflect our commitment to securing supply to our customers and protect our environment against potential drought .</p> <p>Table of actual and prior year performance (KPI review, p. 6)</p> <p>Large purple colour water drop graphic with large font showing: Our regulatory target for 2011/12 was beaten by over 6% (Business Review, p. 26)</p> <p>At around half the national average, our leakage level is the lowest ever recorded, making Anglian Water an industry leader for 2011/12 (Business Review, p. 41)</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b> Prominent location and visual effects (graphics, colour and font) of disclosure of meeting target, repeated five times. Entitlement and reinforcement of meeting target. Performance comparison and self-promotion of industry positioning. Ingratiation to stakeholders (customers and environment). Visual effect (table), actual performance, comparison with prior year and industry average.</p>	<p>down to a lowest ever level. (Operational Review, p.10)</p> <p>Bar chart under the caption ‘Protecting the Environment: Leakage (MI/d)’ showing leakage in 2011 at MI/d: 2012 at 185MI/d with tick to show comparison (and achievement) with target (Performance Review, p. 20).</p> <p><b>Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:</b> Prominent location and visual effects (colour and graphics) of disclosure of actual leakage levels, repeated four times. Disclosure of meeting target, repeated three times. Visual effect (graph) showing leakage reduction, rescaled.</p>
--	---	--

**Table 10: All targets met –leakage disclosure: 2009-10 to 2011-12.**

Pennon	Wessex
<p><b>2009-10</b> Despite the coldest winter for nearly 30 years causing a surge in burst pipe incidents for both our customers and network, we still beat our leakage control target of 84 Megalitres per day (Ml/d), and achieved a best ever performance of 82 Ml/d. We have now achieved or beaten our leakage targets every year since they were first introduced by Ofwat in 1999/2000. Our leakage rate remains amongst the lowest in the industry (Chief Executive’s Review, p. 9).</p>	<p><b>2009-10</b> Kept leakage within our target level, despite the major increase in bursts caused by the very cold winters this year and last (highlights, p. 1, repeated business Review, p. 5).  Service to customers – KPI table comparing actual leakage with cycle average and target (p. 11)  Although it remains within our monitoring plan target, leakage increased from 72.2ML/d last year to 73.9ML/d this year as a result of cold conditions at the start of 2010 (p. 17).</p>
<p><b>2010-11</b> Highlights of the year: Industry leading performance in tackling leakage (Inside front cover)  Our water losses from leakage are the lowest in the country (Chief Executive’s Review, p. 5).  2010/11 notable achievements: Successfully met annual leakage target in spite of coldest December in England in the last 100 years,...Industry-leading performance in tackling leakage (Business Review , p. 8)  This year the company again successfully met both its annual and three-year rolling leakage targets and has done so ever since leakage targets were originally set by Ofwat (Business Review, p. 10).</p>	<p><b>2010-11</b> Despite the prolonged sub-zero temperatures and snow cover during December 2010 and the subsequent rapid thaw in January 2011, we not only cut leakage but also met a challenging new target (Chairman’s Statement p. 1)  Cut leakage and met our new leakage target (Highlights, p. 3)  Service to customers – KPI table comparing actual leakage with cycle average and target (p. 11)  Despite the prolonged sub-zero conditions and snow cover during December 2010 we have cut leakage from 74ML/d and met our new target of 71ML/d (Leakage, p. 20)</p>
<p><b>2011-12</b> Highlights of the year: Industry leading performance in tackling leakage (Inside front cover)  Best ever leakage results 15<sup>th</sup> consecutive year without water restrictions. Best ever and industry-leading leakage control performance (Business Review, p.12).</p>	<p><b>2011-12</b> We once again beat our leakage target (Highlights, p.3)  Service to customers – KPI table comparing actual leakage with cycle average and target (p. 5)  Our innovative schemes and our efforts to bring leakage down to 15%, amongst</p>

	the lowest in Europe (p. 35)
--	------------------------------

**Reporting of performance against OFWAT target:**

Consistent and prominent reporting of target achievement.

Self-promotion and performance comparison against industry.

Reinforcement and enhancement of performance despite the weather conditions

Consistent use of tables or charts to show leakage performance against target and prior year.