APPENDIX C

JURISDICTIONAL URBAN WATER PLANNING ARRANGEMENTS

State and territory water officials were asked to provide information on urban water planning requirements in their jurisdiction. Each jurisdictional representative was provided with the same template to complete – see Attachment A.

The questions identified in the template were intended to assess the extent to which the National Urban Water Planning Principles have informed government planning processes to date and will do so into the future, particularly in the context of new approaches to planning, such as risk or adaptive management planning, and integrated urban water management and water-sensitive urban design.

Responses were analysed and used selectively in the body of the report. A copy of the complete responses is provided below, for reference. Victoria was unable to provide a response.
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# New South Wales – metropolitan

## Overview of planning arrangements

### Briefly describe the governance arrangements for urban water planning in your jurisdiction.

Water planning for the greater Sydney region and the lower Hunter region is coordinated by the Metropolitan Water Directorate (MWD) with oversight by the Metropolitan Water Chief Executive Officers’ Committee (CEOs’ Committee) supported by expert advice from the Independent Water and Advisory Panel, senior officer groups and technical working groups. The CEOs’ Committee is made up of representatives from Sydney Water Corporation (Sydney Water), Hunter Water Corporation (Hunter Water), Sydney Catchment Authority (SCA), The NSW Treasury, Department of Premiers and Cabinet, Environment Protection Authority, NSW Office of Water, and the Department of Planning and Environment.

### Provide an outline of statutory requirements for urban water planning.

There is no statutory framework for the Metropolitan Water Plan (MWP) or the Lower Hunter Water Plan (LHWP) although there was a Government decision to develop and implement these plans. Under the Operating Licence for the major metropolitan water utilities (Sydney Water, SCA and Hunter Water) there are requirements for the utilities to implement their responsibilities under the MWP and the LHWP, respectively. Also the under *Water Industry Competition Act 2006* (WIC Act), the Sydney Desalination Plant (SDP) was granted a network operator’s licence which includes a Ministerial imposed condition to ensure that SDP meets the operating rules imposed under the Metropolitan Water Plan.

The former Minister Finance and Services recently released the LHWP and agreed to the process for reviewing the 2010 MWP. Cabinet approval will be sought for key matters of the MWP later in 2014.

With the aim of increasing competition in the water industry and reducing red tape the MWD also administer the WIC Act on behalf of the responsible Minister. The WIC Act is currently being reviewed.

Access to raw water is regulated by water sharing plans under the *Water Management Act 2000*.

The supply of bulk water and retail water services and supply to the Sydney and Hunter metropolitan regions are regulated by the *State Owned Corporations Act 1989, Sydney Water Act 1994, Hunter Water Act 1991 and Sydney Catchment Management Act 1998*.

### What (if any) non-statutory drivers inform and/or trigger urban water planning?

The MWD was established around 2003 to coordinate development of the 2004 MWP for Sydney. The MWP was updated in 2006 and 2010 to reflect refinements in the approach to planning diversity and demand and supply side options. The MWP is also currently undergoing a review.

The functions of the MWD align with Goal 21 in the NSW 2021 Plan, Securing Potable Water Supplies. A priority action under Goal 21 is to ‘implement the MWP to secure Sydney’s Water supply through an ongoing focus on dams recycling, desalination and water efficiency’.

Metro Water’s community engagement, social research and education program (Water for Life) is also aligned with the Government’s commitment to NSW 2021 Goal 32 – involve the community in decision making on government policy. The Metropolitan Water Plan’s objective to support liveable urban communities further aligns with the NSW 2021 Goal 20 – Build liveable cities.

In 2011, the NSW Government tasked MWD with responsibility for delivering the Lower Hunter Water Plan – this aligns with the Government’s priorities as set outlined in the State Infrastructure Strategy and five year State Infrastructure Plan. The LHWP was released in early 2014.

The MWP and LHWP are designed to be flexible to adapt to challenges such as variable climate, droughts, climate change and a growing populations. A key driver for the plans is to manage water supply and demand to determine the need for major system. The portfolio approach involves analysing different combinations of existing and new water supply and demand measures to identify the mix that provides water security for people and for the environment at the least cost.

### What planning documents are currently in operation in your jurisdiction?

2010 Metropolitan Water Plan

2014 Lower Hunter Water Plan

Various Water sharing plans for the Sydney and lower Hunter Region, including:

* Water Sharing Plan for the Greater Metropolitan Region Groundwater Sources
* Water Sharing Plan for the Greater Metropolitan Region Unregulated River Water Sources
* Water Sharing Plan for the Hunter Unregulated and Alluvial Water Sources Water Sharing Plan for the Hunter Regulated River Water Source.

NSW 2021 – State Plan – is a 10 year plan to rebuild the economy, return quality services, renovate infrastructure, restore accountability to government, and strengthen our local environment and communities. It replaces the State Plan as the NSW Government’s strategic business plan.

This plan sets immediate priorities for action and guides NSW Government resource allocation in conjunction with the NSW Budget. Agencies will identify cost-effective initiatives to achieve the goals and targets within the plan.

The draft Metropolitan Strategy for Sydney (2031) – The new draft strategy will help to put new housing and jobs in places right across the city. This will help to give people a choice of housing that is more affordable and enable them to work closer to where they live. In particular, the draft strategy identifies a number of key places to focus new housing and jobs alongside good transport connections.

[State Infrastructure Strategy](http://www.infrastructure.nsw.gov.au/state-infrastructure-strategy.aspx) (2012–2032) – assesses the current state of infrastructure and identifies strategic priorities.

The Strategy is independent advice to the Government on the specific infrastructure investments and reforms. The Strategy looks across a broad range of sectors and identifies specific projects and programs for priority consideration. It also makes recommendations to the NSW Government on how to fund these recommendations.

Lower Hunter Regional Strategy (2006–31) – The Regional Strategy represents an agreed NSW government position on the future of the Lower Hunter. It is the pre-eminent planning document for the Lower Hunter Region and has been prepared to complement and inform other relevant State planning instruments.

## Extent to which planning principles are used

### To what extent are the National Urban Water Planning Principles (the Principles) referred to in planning documents and processes?

The Principles underpin the MWP and the LHWP in the greater Sydney and lower Hunter metropolitan regions. The MWP and LHWP and related documents explicitly refer to the planning principles and planning processes are designed in accordance with the principles. The planning process for the MWP and LHWP includes a strong focus on the following issues covered by the principles:

* Levels of service for drought security
* Using best available information and continually improving the knowledge base
* Adopting a partnership approach with stakeholder and community engagement
* Managing water whole-of-water-cycle basis
* Considering the full portfolio of water supply and demand options
* Managing supplies with sustainable limits
* Periodically reviewing urban water plans.

An important aspect of the planning process for the LHWP and MWP is community engagement and ensuring that community and key stakeholders are informed about the portfolio measures, which then allows them to express which measures they would like to be included in the plan.

The MWP and LHWP are adaptive management plans and are designed to be reviewed as new science is developed and other influences impact the water security and supply.

The implementation of the MWP to secure Sydney’s water supply through an ongoing focus on dams, recycling, desalination and water efficiency is listed as a priority action under Goal 21 of The NSW 2012 State Plan.

### What other guidelines/sources of information are considered in urban water planning processes?

The MWD considers all available relevant information in its urban water planning processes including:

* Water demand and supply forecasts from water agencies
* Regional planning strategies and population growth predictions from planning agencies and the Australian Bureau of Statistics.
* Available information on costs and water saved or supplied for measures being evaluated.
* Information from government agencies involved in water resource management about environmental requirements and impacts, water sharing arrangements, economic appraisal guidelines etc.
* Australian Guidelines for Water Recycled Water.
* Community and stakeholder engagement to understand their values and preference.
* Pricing regulations and guidelines and relevant reports from the Productivity Commission.
* Climate change information from the NSW and Act Regional Climate Model (NARCLiM) and Eastern Seaboard Climate Change Initiative.

### If applicable, outline the approach used to promote awareness of the Principles.

The Principles were outlined in community engagement were outlined in the community engagement workshops and other presentations during the planning process. Published materials (including fact sheets, discussion papers and the LHWP) also set out the planning principles and there is a quick-link to the guidelines from the MWD website. The 210 MWP also refers to the planning principles.

MWD consistently makes references to the National Planning Principles when communicating to the Government and public the process used to develop and review the metropolitan water plans in greater Sydney and lower Hunter regions.

## Usefulness and relevance of planning principles

### Have the Principles been useful in guiding urban water planning?

MWD supports the use of the Principles, which are useful because they provide a clear framework for developing the water plans and have the support of Commonwealth and State Governments, providing national consistency.

The Principles have shaped MWD’s planning processed – we have refined and improved our planning frameworks to continually improve the way we deliver consistency with the Principles.

### How useful are the Principles as a set of national guidelines?

The Principles are a useful set of goals for water planning at a national level, and are very relevant to metropolitan water planning. Some water planning entities may be in a better position to comply with the Principles than others, but they provide a consistent framework to work within, while allowing enough flexibility to accommodate different circumstances including different geographical and jurisdictional governance arrangements.

In the review conducted by MJA some participants suggested that the ‘partnership approach suggested in principle 3. be removed. MWD does not agree that with this suggestion as community consultation and engagement is a very significant part of the development and review of water plans for Sydney and the lower Hunter. Community engagement is the key aspect in measuring the social impacts of proposed portfolios of the plans. Perhaps the principle could be recast so that there is a clear distinction between stakeholder partnerships and community engagement.

In regard to incorporating liveability into the Principles the water industry would benefit from clarification around what is meant by liveability and it would be good for an agreed definition to be included in the planning principles.

### Will the Principles continue to be as relevant as they were when they were introduced in 2008?

The principles are still relevant in 2014. It is unlikely that any water planning bodies comply 100 per cent with the Principles – e.g., some options are politically sensitive and this may limit the capacity for planners to truly consider all the options (e.g., indirect potable re-use).

Improved analytical capacity, better information gathering/sharing and experience over time will allow planners to refine the way they comply with the Principles into the future. It may be useful to revise the text accompanying the Principles to provide guidance where there have been advances in analytical approaches (e.g. multi-objective optimisation, real options analysis, risk assessment etc.).

## Planning principles’ role in new approaches to planning

### Please outline any requirements or forms of guidance in your jurisdiction regarding real options/risk or adaptive management planning; and/or water sensitive urban design/integrated urban water management.

The Water Services Association of Australia (WSAA) Occasional Paper No. 20 (April 2008) provides guidance on the potential use of real options analysis in urban water resource planning, providing a means of integrating uncertainty into project evaluation*.*

### Do the Principles provide sufficient guidance on the ‘new’ approaches to planning outlined above? Why or why not?

No. There is very little guidance that is easily accessible on how these approaches can be applied to water planning. Methods for incorporating risk and economic optimisation in water planning are highly technical and not easily understood. Modelling complex water systems requires very large data processing/storage capacity, which is only now becoming available. MWD has adopted ‘real options’ thinking (i.e. overall approach) without implementing ‘real options analysis’ (economic modelling).

### If you think the Principles do NOT provide sufficient guidance on the ‘new’ approaches to planning, how should they be amended to better support/advance these issues?

More clearly addressing the concepts associated with the ‘new’ concepts would be helpful. For example, information papers on these approaches would be useful to some extent, but as with the WSAA paper on real options analysis, these do not necessarily provide the tools/guidance on how to apply them in the complex world of urban water planning, where we are trying to determine the optimal portfolio of supply and demand measures over a long timeframe, based on full economic costs and benefits, with a high degree of uncertainty about climatic conditions etc. These approaches have rarely (if ever, in some cases) been applied in the context of metropolitan water planning, but detailed examples of application and/or tools would be useful.

### Do you have any suggestions for alternative ways (i.e. other than the Principles) to advance the ‘new’ approaches?

Some sort of combined analysis or analytical community would be useful so that practitioners can access information from others who have used new approaches. Workshops to demonstrate tools, their application and outcomes would also be valuable.

## Opportunities for improving the planning principles

### What recommendations would you provide for improving the Principles?

The principles themselves remain sound and relevant.

One particular challenge for water planners is to engage in a broader conversation on water recycling, including the sensitive issue of indirect or direct potable reuse without becoming a target. This needs to be addressed at a broader, whole-of-government level and bring in research organisations and water industry associations to engage on the pros and cons – some jurisdictions have been directed not to engage on this option, which inhibits the full application of the principle of considering the full portfolio of water supply and demand options.

### Could communication of the Principles be improved and if so, how? Would any additional forms of guidance be useful?

Provide practical guidance to planners on how to achieve the principles, perhaps catering for different sizes and capabilities of planning bodies. WSAA and/or the Australian Water Association could play a valuable role in this.

# New South Wales – regional utilities

## Overview of planning arrangements

### Briefly describe the governance arrangements for urban water planning in your jurisdiction.

An overview of responsibilities and administrative arrangements in NSW are provided on:

* Pages 141–144 of National Performance Report 2012–13 for Urban Water Utilities ([www.nwc.gov.au/publications](http://www.nwc.gov.au/publications))
* Pages 90–98 of 2012–13 NSW Water Supply and Sewerage Performance Monitoring Report ([www.water.nsw.gov.au](http://www.water.nsw.gov.au/))

In regard to regional NSW, the principal regulator is the NSW Office of Water and urban water supply and sewerage services are provided by 105 local water utilities (LWUs), which are mostly local government councils.

### Provide an outline of statutory requirements for urban water planning.

100 water utilities are regulated under Local Government Act 1993.

5 water utilities are regulated under the Water Management Act 2000.

The NSW Best-Practice Management of Water Supply and Sewerage Framework ([www.water.nsw.gov.au](http://www.water.nsw.gov.au/ArticleDocuments/36/best_practice_management_water_sewerage_framework.pdf.aspx)) is based on the Best-Practice Management of Water Supply and Sewerage Guidelines[[1]](#footnote-1), 2007. The Framework addresses the nine key national requirements shown and is the driver for reform of planning, management and pricing and for continuing productivity improvement by all the LWUs.

### What (if any) non-statutory drivers inform and/or trigger urban water planning?

All the regional LWUs are expected to implement the 19 requirements of the NSW Best-Practice Management Framework. In line with the recommendations of a number of reviews, it is expected that these requirements will be mandated by the NSW Government.

In addition as shown in the Framework, all the utilities responsible for water supply are required to prepare and implement a Drinking Water Management System (DWMS) in accordance with NSW Guidelines for Drinking Water Management Systems, NSW Health and NSW Office of Water 2013. These DWMSs are required from 1 September 2014 under the Public Health Act 2010.

### What planning documents are currently in operation in your jurisdiction?

The NSW Best-Practice Management Framework (1.2 above) has 19 requirements including:

* Integrated water cycle management
* Strategic business planning
* Water conservation
* Drought management
* Trade waste regulation policy

A current Integrated Water Cycle Management (IWCM) Strategy and Strategic Business Plan (SBP) are the peak planning documents for an LWU’s water supply and sewerage businesses.

The streamlined IWCM Check List and SBP Check List (References 19 and 20 of 2.2 below) are available on the NSW Office of Water’s web site ([www.water.nsw.gov.au](http://www.water.nsw.gov.au)) and any new IWCM Strategies or SBPs will need to be prepared in accordance with these Check Lists.

Each Check List revises and updates the outcomes that need to be achieved by the IWCM Strategy and the SBP in order to streamline utility planning and reduce red tape and the time and effort in preparing and updating plans. This streamlining has become possible as the overall level of implementation of the 19 requirements of the NSW Government’s Best Practice Management of Water Supply and Sewerage Framework by the NSW utilities is now 90% compared to 46% eight years ago.

The IWCM Strategy and SBP will now need to be prepared every 8 years on a rotation of every 4 years, as shown below. This will involve preparing a Total Asset Management Plan (TAMP) and Financial Plan (FP) every 4 years, updating these plans annually, and including any necessary corrective action in the utility’s annual Action Plan to Council.

The boxes below summarise the key outcomes of the IWCM Strategy and SBP.

|  |
| --- |
| IWCM Strategy:   * ‘Right sizes’ any projects and identifies the best-value 30-year IWCM scenario and Strategy on a triple bottom line (TBL) basis. It includes a 30‑year TAMP and FP. * Identifies the lowest uniform level of stable typical residential bills (TRBs) to meet the levels of service negotiated with the community and the price path for the next 4 years in current dollars. * The adopted IWCM scenario includes an update of the existing 30-year renewals plan, with only proven evidence based renewals included for the first 5 years. The renewals plan takes account of any avoided, re-sized, abandoned or re‑prioritised works. * An IWCM Strategy is prepared every 8 years. * NSW Office of Water (NOW) concurrence is needed to the IWCM Issues Paper, the final IWCM Strategy and scenario and the Financial Plan prior to LWU implementation of the scenario. |

|  |
| --- |
| SBP:  Reviews and updates the LWU’s existing 30-year TAMP, identifies any opportunities to downsize or defer significant projects and includes a FP.  Analyses the renewals component of the TAMP to develop a sound 30‑year renewals plan, the first 5 years of which include only proven evidence based renewals that provide value for money.  Identifies the lowest uniform level of stable TRBs to meet the levels of service negotiated with the community and the price path for the next 4 years in current dollars.  A SBP is prepared every 8 years, i.e. 4 years after preparing the IWCM Strategy.  Provide to NSW Office of Water for registration, your final SBP and FP. |

Both the IWCM Check List and the SBP Check List are comprehensive as they define the required scope of work and can be used for engaging a consultant to prepare the IWCM Strategy or SBP document.

As noted above, an IWCM Strategy prepared in accordance with the IWCM Check List ensures the projects are ‘right sized’ and the strategy is ‘fit for purpose’ and without ‘gold plating’.

The SBP reviews and updates the TAMP with a focus on developing an evidence based renewals plan.

*Integrated Water Cycle Management*

Guidance is provided in IWCM Information Sheet Nos 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7 ([www.water.nsw.gov.au](http://www.water.nsw.gov.au)) and the above IWCM Checklist.

LWUs need to assess their water security in accordance with ‘Assuring future urban water security – assessment and adaption guidelines for NSW local water utilities’. These Guidelines address the impact of climate variability on urban water supply security, have been prepared by NSW Office of Water and are proposed to be released shortly.

*Strategic Business Planning (SBP)*

The 30-year strategic business plan (SBP) must include:

* A Total Asset Management Plan (capital works – identifying each of the growth, improved standards and renewals components), operation and maintenance plans.
* A 30-year financial plan with typical residential bill in current dollars
* A drought management plan

The current SBP Guidelines were prepared in 2011 ([www.water.nsw.gov.au](http://www.water.nsw.gov.au)) to update and extend guidelines which had been in place since 1993.

## Extent to which planning principles are used

### To what extent are the National Urban Water Planning Principles (the Principles) referred to in planning documents and processes?

The bulk of the planning requirements have been in place in NSW since 1993 (refer to SBP Guidelines in 1.4 above and to Reference 1 in 2.2 below).

As noted above, the NSW Best-Practice Management Framework lists the National Urban Water Planning Principles (NUWPP) as 1 of the 9 National requirements which need to be addressed by each LWU. The NSW requirements for IWCM (1.4 above) address the NUWPP but go a lot further:

* Require a 30-year IWCM Strategy (water supply, sewerage and stormwater) to be prepared by each LWU.
* Each LWU required to implement the 19 Best-Practice Management requirements. These include 11 pricing requirements, which have been successful in achieving efficient use[[2]](#footnote-2) of water and sewerage services in regional NSW and have greatly reduced the need for new capital expenditure.

Levels of service have been explicitly addressed since 1993 in regional NSW (refer to the SBP Guidelines in 1.4 above and to Reference 1 in 2.2 below).

Extensive community involvement and consultation is required in NSW (SBP Guidelines) and attached Consultation Draft Community Involvement Guidelines.

Reviews:

* As noted above, the IWCM Strategy needs to be reviewed after 4 years [as part of the preparation of a SBP] and a new strategy prepared after 8 years.
* The SBP needs to be prepared every 8 years i.e. 4 years after the preparation of an IWCM Strategy and must include a review and update of the existing 30-year TAMP.
* The financial plan and the asset management plan need to be reviewed and updated annually, and any necessary corrective action included in the LWU’s annual Action Plan to Council.

### What other guidelines/sources of information are considered in urban water planning processes?

1. NSW Water and Sewerage, Strategic Business Planning Guidelines, NSW Office of Water, NSW, July 2011 (available on [www.water.nsw.gov.au](http://www.water.nsw.gov.au)).
2. FINMOD User Manual [Draft], NSW Office of Water, 2011 – NSW Financial Planning Model for Water Supply and Sewerage (FINMOD).
3. 2012–13 NSW Water Supply and Sewerage Performance Monitoring Report, NSW Office of Water/Local Government Association and Shires Association, NSW (available on [www.water.nsw.gov.au](http://www.water.nsw.gov.au)).
4. Water Supply, Sewerage and Trade Waste Pricing Guidelines, Department of Land and Water Conservation, NSW, 2002 (available on request).
5. Liquid Trade Waste Regulation Guidelines, Department of Water and Energy, NSW,   
   April 2009 (available on [www.water.nsw.gov.au](http://www.water.nsw.gov.au)).
6. Developer Charges Guidelines for Water Supply, Sewerage and Stormwater, NSW Office of Water, 2012 [Consultation Draft] (available on [www.water.nsw.gov.au](http://www.water.nsw.gov.au)).
7. Environmental Management Systems – Specification with guidelines for use, International Standard ISO 14001.
8. Integrated Water Cycle Management Guidelines for NSW Local Water Utilities, Department of Energy, Utilities and Sustainability, NSW, October 2004 and 7 IWCM Information Sheets (2010) (available on [www.water.nsw.gov.au](http://www.water.nsw.gov.au)).
9. Wise Water Management – A Demand Management Manual for Local Water Utilities, Water Services Association of Australia, 1998 (available on request).
10. Water Supply and Sewerage Management Guidelines, NSW Government, 1991 (available on request).
11. NSW Water and Sewerage Community Involvement Guidelines [Consultation Draft],   
    NSW Office of Water, 2012 (available on request).
12. Work Health and Safety Act 2011 and Work Health and Safety Regulation 2011.
13. NSW Water and Sewerage Asset Management Guidelines [Draft], NSW Office of Water, 2011.
14. Best-Practice Management of Water Supply and Sewerage Guidelines, NSW Government, 2007 (available on [www.water.nsw.gov.au](http://www.water.nsw.gov.au)).
15. NSW Reference Rates Manual for Valuation of Water, Sewerage and Stormwater Assets, 2014.
16. 2012–13 NSW Water Supply and Sewerage Benchmarking Report, NSW Office of Water/Local Government Association and Shires Association, NSW (available on [www.water.nsw.gov.au](http://www.water.nsw.gov.au)).
17. NSW Guidelines on Assuring Future Urban Water Security – Assessment and Adaption Guidelines for NSW Local Water Utilities, 2014.
18. 2013–14 National Performance Framework: Urban performance reporting indicators and definitions handbook, Australian Government National Water Commission ([www.nwc.gov.au](http://www.nwc.gov.au)).
19. Integrated Water Cycle Management (IWCM) Check List (available on [www.water.nsw.gov.au](http://www.water.nsw.gov.au)).
20. Strategic Business Planning (SBP) Check List (available on [www.water.nsw.gov.au](http://www.water.nsw.gov.au)).
21. Example Planning Data Set for NSW Water Utilities (available on [www.water.nsw.gov.au](http://www.water.nsw.gov.au)).

### If applicable, outline the approach used to promote awareness of the Principles.

As noted in 2.1 above, the requirements of the NUWPP are addressed by the NSW IWCM requirements and the NUWPP are listed as one of the 9 national requirements addressed by the NSW Best-Practice Management Framework ([www.water.nsw.gov.au](http://www.water.nsw.gov.au)). 2.1 above notes that the IWCM requirements in NSW go a lot further than the NUWPP.

As noted in 1.4 above the key requirements of the NUWPP have been in place in regional NSW since 1993. It is therefore not opportune for the NSW Office of Water to refer frequently to the NUWPP in its regular communications with LWUs, but rather, it refers to the 19 requirements of the NSW Best-Practice Management Framework, which need to be implemented by each LWU. The requirements implemented by each utility are disclosed in Appendix C of the annual NSW Performance Monitoring Report [Reference 3 in 2.2 above].

## Usefulness and relevance of planning principles

### Have the Principles been useful in guiding urban water planning?

As noted in 1.4 above, the bulk of the requirements of the NUWPP have been in place in regional NSW since 1993, all of the requirements of the NUWPP are addressed by the NSW IWCM requirements, which go a lot further as noted in 2.1 above.

### How useful are the Principles as a set of national guidelines?

The NUWPP are considered to be broadly fit for purpose. They could be improved by including all of the NSW requirements for IWCM noted in 1.4 and 2.1 above.

The new IWCM Check List and the Planning Data Set [References 19 and 21 in 2.2 above] provide the necessary guidance for any utilities wishing to pursue such improvements.

### Will the Principles continue to be as relevant as they were when they were introduced in 2008?

Refer to 3.2 above.

## Planning principles’ role in new approaches to planning

### Please outline any requirements or forms of guidance in your jurisdiction regarding real options/risk or adaptive management planning; and/or water sensitive urban design/integrated urban water management.

Refer to 1.4 and 2.1 above regarding IWCM Information Sheets Nos 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7, the IWCM Check List and the Planning Data Set [References 19 and 21 in 2.2 above].

### Do the Principles provide sufficient guidance on the ‘new’ approaches to planning outlined above? Why or why not?

Refer to 3.2 above.

### If you think the Principles do NOT provide sufficient guidance on the ‘new’ approaches to planning, how should they be amended to better support/advance these issues?

Refer to 3.2 above.

### Do you have any suggestions for alternative ways (i.e. other than the Principles) to advance the ‘new’ approaches?

Refer to 3.2 above.

## Opportunities for improving the planning principles

### What recommendations would you provide for improving the Principles?

Refer to 3.2 above.

### Could communication of the Principles be improved and if so, how? Would any additional forms of guidance be useful?

Refer to 3.2 above.

# Australian Capital Territory

## Overview of planning arrangements

### Briefly describe the governance arrangements for urban water planning in your jurisdiction.

Urban water planning in the ACT is set out under the ACT’s water resource strategy and two senior water inter-agency management committees but also under specific arrangements although not formalised arrangements between the ACT Government and the ACT’s water utility, ACTEW Water.

### Provide an outline of statutory requirements for urban water planning.

Apart from Commonwealth legislation there are a number of statutes and regulations that govern water planning and water management. These are:

* The Utilities Act 2000 & related instruments
* The Water Resources Act 2007 & related instruments
* The Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission Act 1997
* Planning and Land Act 2007

### What (if any) non-statutory drivers inform and/or trigger urban water planning?

The ACT’s Water Strategy and the Canberra Plan

### What planning documents are currently in operation in your jurisdiction?

*Think water, act water* which is about to be replaced in the coming months

## Extent to which planning principles are used

### To what extent are the National Urban Water Planning Principles (the Principles) referred to in planning documents and processes?

The National Urban Water Planning Principles were acknowledged in the review of the previous ACT water strategy and referred/incorporated into the latest ACT water strategy (currently in final draft form).

### What other guidelines/sources of information are considered in urban water planning processes?

The water planning work undertaken by the ACT utility, ACTEW Water. Recent reports on water policy issues released by the Independent Competition and Regulatory Commission on a number of issues such as water sensitive urban design and statements on water planning processes.

### If applicable, outline the approach used to promote awareness of the Principles.

Mainly through forums on ACT water policy development involving agencies involved in water policy issues. There is a key inter-agency working group.

## Usefulness and relevance of planning principles

### Have the Principles been useful in guiding urban water planning?

Limited use – used as a general guide especially to inform those involved in water policy development and management. It is expected to be of greater use and application when the ACT Government develops stronger governance arrangements with the ACT’s water utility in the near future.

There needs to be greater circulation, awareness and understanding of the principles.

I will need to promote the Principles with the ACT’s Treasury. New staff are now in central ACT agencies and are unlikely to be aware of the Principles.

### How useful are the Principles as a set of national guidelines?

### Will the Principles continue to be as relevant as they were when they were introduced in 2008?

Although quite general, Yes –as they are the only national and accepted set of water planning documentation. They are written to have future relevance and application but may need fresh examination and renewal.

They are not overly prescriptive but could be checked for continued relevancy eg in light of critical or extreme events and pricing or emerging technology and markets.

## Planning principles’ role in new approaches to planning

### Please outline any requirements or forms of guidance in your jurisdiction regarding real options/risk or adaptive management planning; and/or water sensitive urban design/integrated urban water management.

There is a need to consider the use of these principles in guiding the use and further adaptation and development of water sensitive urban design.

### Do the Principles provide sufficient guidance on the ‘new’ approaches to planning outlined above? Why or why not?

In a general sense the Principles provide general guidance to elements of the new ACT strategy but it will not be until some of these aspects are implemented over time will there be a better understanding of the use and benefits of the Principles. There will be a need to re-consider the Principles and further promote the principles in the meantime.

A difficulty in this process of recognition and promotion is the status of the Principles. There are of course not legislated.

In many respects the content of the Principles are what sound water planning practices should follow.

### If you think the Principles do NOT provide sufficient guidance on the ‘new’ approaches to planning, how should they be amended to better support/advance these issues?

The principles are sound in themselves and make good sense. The Principles are an obvious balancing act in that there are difficulties in being overly prescriptive but yet to be useful they need to have substance.

### Do you have any suggestions for alternative ways (i.e. other than the Principles) to advance the ‘new’ approaches?

Perhaps in the activities of future national water reform forums and also through further promotion to jurisdictional independent water pricing commissions/authorities.

## Opportunities for improving the planning principles

### What recommendations would you provide for improving the Principles?

There appear to be quite general in places. Consider whether there is scope to link the principles with other critical aspects of the national water reform so as to give the principles greater coverage and application.

More critically there could be a fresh consideration of ‘agreed levels of service’ and also on ‘Sustainable limits/levels of extraction’.

### Could communication of the Principles be improved and if so, how? Would any additional forms of guidance be useful?

Yes – general promotion on Commonwealth websites and related national water reform documents eg water pricing; promotion to national water utility forums eg WSA and AWA.

# Northern Territory

## Overview of planning arrangements

### Briefly describe the governance arrangements for urban water planning in your jurisdiction.

Power and Water Corporation (PWC) is a government-owned utility that manages public water supply and sewerage services to around 85,000 customers across the Northern Territory (NT).

In relation to urban water, PWC provides water and sewerage services to the NT’s five major centres (Darwin, Alice Springs, Katherine, Tennant Creek and Yulara), as well as water to 13 minor centres and sewerage services to five of those.

PWC provides all planning functions in relation to urban water for these locations, as well as being the water provider.

There are two minor urban centres (Jabiru and Nhulunbuy) which are serviced by a local council and mining company respectively. PWC has no current role in the planning or operation of these systems.

The Department of Land Resource Management (DLRM), as the regulatory agency, administers water extraction licences and Water Allocation Plans under the NT *Water Act*.

### Provide an outline of statutory requirements for urban water planning.

Statutory requirements, under NT Legislation, are limited to those under the Water Supply and Sewerage Services Act and relate to the provision of Asset Management Plans to the Utilities Commission, and consideration and reporting of water quality.

### What (if any) non-statutory drivers inform and/or trigger urban water planning?

Please describe any non-statutory drivers that exist (eg guidelines) and explain their function in urban water planning processes.

PWC, as the water provider, has determined Levels of Service for the main urban supply in Darwin, through an industry benchmarking and system analysis approach. These have been noted by Government through a Cabinet process. Levels of Service have not been formalised for other urban supplies, other than for water quality.

### What planning documents are currently in operation in your jurisdiction?

The primary planning documents (apart from those developed by the water service provider) are Water Allocation Plans. Water Allocation Plans are being developed on a priority basis in Water Control Districts where there are competing demands for human consumptive needs and/or where natural aquatic ecosystems have significant ecological or social values.

Water Allocation Plans set the extraction limits, rules and security levels for urban water supply. Water Allocation Plans are in place for Alice Springs Water Control District (partial coverage centered on Alice Springs), Ti Tree Water Control District, Western Davenport Water Control District and Daly Roper Water Control District (partial coverage centered on Katherine)

Please refer to Table 1 of the NT Case Study 2 Report for water service providers’ planning documents

## Extent to which planning principles are used

### To what extent are the National Urban Water Planning Principles (the Principles) referred to in planning documents and processes?

Please refer to Section 1.3 of the NT Case Study 2 Report

### What other guidelines/sources of information are considered in urban water planning processes?

Please refer to Table 1 of the NT Case Study 2 Report

### If applicable, outline the approach used to promote awareness of the Principles.

Principles not communicated in Northern Territory to date.

## Usefulness and relevance of planning principles

### Have the Principles been useful in guiding urban water planning?

As noted in the Case Study report, PWC was not aware of the detail of the Principles and has not considered them in their planning in the past.

PWC is of the view that the Principles are relevant in guiding urban water planning in general, but that they are not necessarily all relevant to PWC.

PWC considers that the Queensland Government’s Planning Guidelines for Water Supply and Sewerage are more useful because they are more detailed and practical than the Principles.

### How useful are the Principles as a set of national guidelines?

The Principles should recognise that circumstances may not allow for (or require) an integrated water management approach, for example consideration of stormwater waterway health.

Water providers may not have the resources or capability to consider all aspects of the water cycle in their planning processes.

### Will the Principles continue to be as relevant as they were when they were introduced in 2008?

Refer to comments in Section 5.

## Planning principles’ role in new approaches to planning

### Please outline any requirements or forms of guidance in your jurisdiction regarding real options/risk or adaptive management planning; and/or water sensitive urban design/integrated urban water management.

No relevant requirements of forms of guidance in general use in Northern Territory to date.

### Do the Principles provide sufficient guidance on the ‘new’ approaches to planning outlined above? Why or why not?

Principles have not been applied in Northern Territory to date.

### If you think the Principles do NOT provide sufficient guidance on the ‘new’ approaches to planning, how should they be amended to better support/advance these issues?

Principles have not been applied in the Northern Territory to date.

### Do you have any suggestions for alternative ways (i.e. other than the Principles) to advance the ‘new’ approaches?

No suggestions from the Northern Territory.

## Opportunities for improving the planning principles

### What recommendations would you provide for improving the Principles?

The Principles are considered to be at a high level, and their value is in complementing the more technical or detailed guidelines which are used by water providers.

In terms of adding any additional principles, it is suggested that two additional Principles could be considered:

* a Principle that considers a ‘whole of system approach’ to delivering water supplies, including a full consideration of alternative investment options, such as leak management compared with investment in new water sources;
* a Principle that considers the economic and social objectives of urban water supply planning, rather than just the environmental sustainability objectives.

In addition, the Principles should be explicitly considered in terms of wastewater as well as water, given that many utilities have responsibility for both.

### Could communication of the Principles be improved and if so, how? Would any additional forms of guidance be useful?

As outlined in the NT Case Study, it is suggested that communication with water providers would be greatly improved though engagement with industry peak bodies such as WSAA.

# Queensland

## Overview of planning arrangements

### Briefly describe the governance arrangements for urban water planning in your jurisdiction.

Urban water service providers (generally local governments in regional Queensland and Seqwater (bulk), QUU and Unitywater (distributor retailers) and some local governments) are responsible for urban water planning. The Department of Natural Resources and Mines manages the allocation and management of surface and groundwater while the Department of Energy and Water Supply monitors the performance of water service providers. DEWS also regulates dam safety and drinking water quality and provides regional planning support where multiple urban, rural, mining and industrial water service providers are involved.

### Provide an outline of statutory requirements for urban water planning.

Seqwater is required to develop a regional water security program to deliver levels of service specified by the State for the SEQ region. State-wide there is a requirement to comply with dam safety and drinking water regulations. Asset management and water charges meet financial standards, regulatory and prices oversight requirements.

### What (if any) non-statutory drivers inform and/or trigger urban water planning?

Government decisions to undertaken planning and projects. Guidelines covering asset management and planning and WSAA codes provide a framework for / inform planning. The development of the 30 year water strategy, commits the Queensland Government to undertake a three year program of regional water supply security assessments for areas of high growth.

### What planning documents are currently in operation in your jurisdiction?

Water service providers establish their own forward works programs based on local planning. Regional water supply security assessments are currently being prepared for major regional centres by DEWS in partnership with councils and other stakeholders. The regional water supply security assessments will replace the former Regional Water Supply Strategies program – strategies completed include: South East Queensland; Far North Queensland; Central Queensland and North West Queensland.

<http://www.dews.qld.gov.au/water-supply-regulations/regional-water-supply/south-east-queensland>

## Extent to which planning principles are used

### To what extent are the National Urban Water Planning Principles (the Principles) referred to in planning documents and processes?

Queensland does not monitor reference to or the extent to which the Principles are followed. Regional planning is generally consistent with the principles. It is believed that the consistency of urban water planning undertaken by water service providers with the principles would be highly variable.

The concepts of levels of service/standards of service are understood by water service providers and utilised in regional planning. Stakeholders are usually engaged in the planning processes and there is intention to regularly review the planning undertaken appropriate to the circumstances.

### What other guidelines/sources of information are considered in urban water planning processes?

Queensland Planning Guidelines for Water and Sewerage, Strategic Asset Management Plan Guidelines, Drinking Water Quality Management Plan Guidelines, Water Resource Plans and information supplied by the urban, rural, industrial and mining sectors on water demands

### If applicable, outline the approach used to promote awareness of the Principles.

Queensland promotes an understanding of water supply system performance through the use of about to be introduced performance indicators.

## Usefulness and relevance of planning principles

### Have the Principles been useful in guiding urban water planning?

The urban water industry is a relatively mature industry. The Principles are basically common-sense good planning which many water services would undertake whether or not the Principles existed. The extent of consistency with the principles depends on the situation and practicality. The timelines to be completely consistent with the Principles may not always be acceptable.

### How useful are the Principles as a set of national guidelines?

The Principles are generic statements of good practice. The Principles need more substance at a more practical level to make any impact e.g. supporting national guidelines and programs.

### Will the Principles continue to be as relevant as they were when they were introduced in 2008?

The Principles are robust.

## Planning principles’ role in new approaches to planning

### Please outline any requirements or forms of guidance in your jurisdiction regarding real options/risk or adaptive management planning; and/or water sensitive urban design/integrated urban water management.

While each jurisdiction has their own approaches to levels of service and water security, a national approach to these issues is warranted given the wide range of community needs and expectations and costs of delivering services and constraints on sources of supply. These issues are important even just from the point of view of being able to benchmark.

### Do the Principles provide sufficient guidance on the ‘new’ approaches to planning outlined above? Why or why not?

No – see response to 3.2 and 4.1.

### If you think the Principles do NOT provide sufficient guidance on the ‘new’ approaches to planning, how should they be amended to better support/advance these issues?

See 3.2. Market solutions are limited in their scope for solving urban water supply issues. The crafting of Principle 7 needs to be revisited to recognise realities.

### Do you have any suggestions for alternative ways (i.e. other than the Principles) to advance the ‘new’ approaches?

See 3.2.

## Opportunities for improving the planning principles

### What recommendations would you provide for improving the Principles?

See 3.2 and 4.3

### Could communication of the Principles be improved and if so, how? Would any additional forms of guidance be useful?

The principles do not need communication. The pragmatics of implementing some of them needs more guidance.

# South Australia

## Overview of planning arrangements

### Briefly describe the governance arrangements for urban water planning in your jurisdiction.

The *Natural Resources Management Act, 2004* (NRM Act) is the legislative foundation for the sustainable management of water in South Australia. The *Environment Protection Act, 1993* (EP Act) provides the legislative basis for management of water quality and pollution*.*

These Acts provide the primary legislative basis for managing natural water resources in South Australia including (but not limited to) water resources available to urban areas. Under the NRM Act*,* a water resource may be ‘prescribed’ by the State*,* beginning a process that requires the development of a Water Allocation Plan (WAP) by the relevant Natural Resources Management Board. This process introduces a tradeable water rights regime.

The *Water Industry Act 2012* (WI Act) provides the legislative framework to facilitate water supply planning. In addition, it provides for regulation of the water industry through establishment of a licensing regime and provides for regulation of prices, customer service standards, technical standards for water and sewage infrastructure and plumbing; and performance monitoring of the water industry.

Underpinning the State’s legislative requirements, the Government’s water security plan to 2050, Water for Good,outlines 94 actions to ensure the future availability of water. Released in 2009, the plan was developed during a time of severe drought. While having a focus on water quantity it also addresses quality and supports other State initiatives including recommendations of the Adelaide Coastal Waters Study for improving the quality of water discharged into Gulf St Vincent from Adelaide’s urban and peri-urban areas.

Under Water for Good, Regional Demand and Supply Statements (RDSSs) are progressively being prepared for each of South Australia’s eight NRM regions. RDSSs provide a long-term (40-year) overview of water demand and supply. They provide information on the condition of water resources in a region for drinking and non-drinking quality water, list major demands on these water resources, and identify expected timeframes for any possible future demand-supply gaps. Once prepared, RDSSs are reviewed annually as a guide to assist decision-makers in planning for the timing and nature of future demand management or supply options. In accordance with Water for Good, if an RDSS indicates a projected demand and supply imbalance, an Independent Planning Process is demand or supply options to address the shortfall will be initiated five years before the projected imbalance to thoroughly assess supply augmentation and demand management opportunities.

To date, RDSSs have been released for the Eyre Peninsula NRM region (April 2011), Northern and Yorke NRM region (December 2011), and [Alinytjara Wilurara](http://www.environment.sa.gov.au/files/351948b4-ea37-4af6-98cf-a28900e2b4ee/alinytjara-wilurara-demand-and-supply-statement-2013-gen.pdf) NRM region (December 2013). An RDSS for Kangaroo Island is currently being developed.

In addition to RDSSs, SA Water (State owned water utility) prepares Long Term Plans to ensure that its customers have a secure water supply and that its wastewater treatment plants have capacity to meet potential increases in demand. These plans have a 25-30 year timeframe. They provide a proactive approach to planning the strategic direction for augmenting SA Water’s assets and guiding investment in new infrastructure to meet SA Water’s customer requirements into the future. Since 2008, Long Term Plans have been released for Eyre Peninsula, Yorke Peninsula, Kangaroo Island, and Upper Spencer Gulf. A Plan is also being prepared for the South East region of South Australia.

Governance:

Key entities in urban water planning and management and providers of water services:

* Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources (DEWNR) – is lead agency for the policy, management and administration of the State’s water and other natural resources. DEWNR assists the Minister in the administration of the NRM Act, monitors the implementation of *Water for Good,* and has lead role in implementing many of *Water for Good’s* actions. DEWNR also leads and coordinates the preparation of RDSSs, provides science and knowledge support for the development of WAPs, and implements the State’s water licensing system. DEWNR also undertakes the Flood Hazard Leader role in accordance with South Australia’s emergency management arrangements.
* Regional Natural Resources Management Boards (NRMB) – eight regional NRMBs are established under the NRM Act. Each NRMB must prepare an NRM Plan for their region, including consideration of general water management arrangements relevant to their region, and must also prepare WAPs for any prescribed water resources in their region, for consideration and adoption by the Minister. The processes for preparing NRM Plans and WAPs are extensive with statutory requirements established under the NRM Act.
* Environment Protection Authority (EPA) – the EPA supports the Minister in the administration of the EP Act and the Environmental (Water Quality) Protection Policy under the Act. The EPA’s role includes the issuing of licences to ensure that wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) are managed in a way that minimises environmental harm; and licensing of aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) in Mount Gambier and in the Adelaide metropolitan area) for the discharge of stormwater from areas greater than 1 ha to aquifers.
* Department of Health and Aging – assists the Minister for Health in administering the *Safe Drinking Water Act 2011* (SDWA). The SDWA applies to all drinking water providers who supply water to the public including SA Water, operators of independent town supplies and supplies in rural and remote communities, water carters and providers of drinking water in facilities including hospitals, accommodation premises, child care and aged care centres. The SDWA does not apply to domestic use of rainwater tanks or other private supplies.
* Essential Services Commission of South Australia (ESCOSA) – under the WI Act, ESCOSA is responsible for the economic regulation of water and sewerage services in South Australia, which includes services provided by SA Water, Councils and private operators. The Commission’s role includes economic regulation, industry licensing, consumer protection, performance monitoring, compliance and retail pricing matters.
* Stormwater Management Authority (SMA) – a statutory body established under the *Local Government Act 1999* (LG Act), comprised of members nominated by State and Local Government. The SMA approves Stormwater Management Plans (SPMs) prepared by Local Councils, and has the power to issue orders a Local Council or Councils to prepare an SMP. The SMA may also contribute funding to the development and implementation of SMPs. Information on SMPs prepared by Councils is included in the SMA’s annual reports, with the most recently released report (2012–13) indicating the SMA had since September 2006 approved funding for flood plain mapping and planning for 38 metropolitan and regional projects, and towards 45 infrastructure projects in metropolitan and regional areas.
* Service providers: Drinking water – SA Water (Government owned corporation) provides public drinking water to a large proportion of the State’s population. However, some private enterprises also provide drinking water in areas not serviced by SA Water.
* Service providers: Wastewater – SA Water provides sewerage services to the majority of the State’s population. In addition, a number of South Australian Local Councils own community wastewater management schemes (CWMS) which provide wastewater treatment services to many areas of the State not serviced by SA Water sewerage systems. There are more than 170 CWMS schemes in South Australia.
* Stormwater: Local Councils are primarily responsible for planning and managing stormwater and they own the majority of built stormwater assets. Under the *Local Government Act 1999* (LG Act) Local Councils are to take measures to protect their areas from natural and other hazards (eg flood) and to mitigate the effects of such hazards. The State maintains some drains and other stormwater infrastructure. The key assets which the State manages are listed in a Stormwater Management Agreement which exists between State and Local Government. The State also provides funding assistance to Local Councils, through SMA, for the development and implementation of SMPs, via a long-term (30 year) funding agreement.

### Provide an outline of statutory requirements for urban water planning.

See 1.1. Also, under the WI Act, the Minister must prepare and maintain a State Water Supply and Demand Statement. The Statement must: assess the state of South Australia’s water resources and the extent of water supplies available within the State; assess current and future demand for water within the State; and outline policies, plans and strategies relevant to ensuring that the State’s water supplies are secure and reliable and are able to sustain economic growth. The Minister must also comprehensively review the Statement at least once in every five years.

### What (if any) non-statutory drivers inform and/or trigger urban water planning?

Refer above.

In addition, Water for Good sets requirements for urban water planning as it relates to the water sectors through RDSSs.

A number of documents support specific areas of water planning. For example, under South Australia’s planning system, the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide includes policies which promote water sensitive development and it identifies specific locations of potential major stormwater harvesting sites to be protected.

The South Australian Planning Policy Library (SAPPL) lists objectives and principles that Councils may use to incorporate into Local Development Plans. These include principles relating to water conservation, stormwater and wastewater management, and water sensitive design. Local Councils are encouraged to adopt relevant SAPPL modules into their local Development Plans, which enables the relevant development approval authority to consider the extent to which proposed developments are consistent with those parts of the local Development Plan.

The Stormwater Management Authority (see 1.1) is also required, under the LG Act, to issue guidelines for use by local councils when preparing SMPs within their areas. The LG Act requires that guidelines issued by the SMA have been endorsed by South Australia’s Natural Resources Management Council. Recent changes to the State-Local government Stormwater Management Agreement also provide that in future the Minister will also endorse guidelines issued by the SMA.

The State also has in place numerous policies, plans, strategies, guidelines and other instruments to support planning for safe and environmentally responsible development of water resources and to promote the long term financial sustainability of services.

For example, a State subsidy is available to Local Councils for new CWMS (prioritised via a process established between State and Local Government which assessed and prioritised council CWMS proposals based on grounds of public health, environment protection, regional and economic development, and social and community needs). A condition of funding (forming part of a funding agreement with Local Government) is that the relevant council will fund and maintain the CWMS at whole-of-life sustainable funding levels. The amount of subsidy available is based on council charges generating similar revenue to that that SA Water would realise from a sewerage scheme to the same property owners. These arrangements promote both the long term financial sustainability and equity over the full life cycle for users of CWMS systems and those who use and are charged for SA Water operated sewerage systems.

### What planning documents are currently in operation in your jurisdiction?

Water for Good, RDSSs, WAPs (discussed above).

The Planning Strategy for South Australia outlines the State Government’s direction for land use change. The 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide (a volume of the document), which sets out the state government’s vision for the growth and development of Greater Adelaide to 2036, includes a range of policies and targets relating to water sensitive urban design and protection of water supply catchments from inappropriate development. This and other volumes of the Planning Strategy are available from: <http://www.sa.gov.au/topics/housing-property-and-land/building-and-development/land-supply-and-planning-system/the-planning-strategy-for-south-australia/about-the-planning-strategy-for-south-australia>

Note: SA Water Long Term Plans are another form of planning document, prepared by SA Water (State Government owned service provider).

## Extent to which planning principles are used

### To what extent are the National Urban Water Planning Principles (the Principles) referred to in planning documents and processes?

While South Australia’s water planning processes do not explicitly refer to the Principles, where relevant the processes in place are generally consistent with the Principles (see below).

1. Deliver urban water supplies in accordance with agreed levels of service

Level of service provided largely reflects local circumstances, with planning processes being informed through engagement processes with local communities.

Nevertheless there are some common processes used to inform the basis of service delivery appropriate for local areas.

For example, State legislation (eg NRM Act, EP Act, SDWA) provide the basis for State regulation in a range of areas including the allocation of water, and public health and environmental regulation. Where relevant, the Australian Drinking Water Guidelines, Australian Water Recycling Guidelines, and other guidelines and policies of the National Water Quality Management Strategy, provide a consistent basis for assessing potential public health and environment risks and these help inform regulatory authorities in their assessment water augmentation proposals.

ESCOSA is responsible for the economic regulation of water and sewerage services in South Australia, which includes services provided by SA Water, Councils and private operators. Providers of retail water or sewerage services need to be licensed by ESCOSA. Licensees must comply with codes and guidelines developed by ESCOSA on matters such as customer contracts and minimum service standards, and need to participate in the water industry ombudsman scheme. ESCOSA is also responsible for the independent economic regulation of the water industry and is empowered to make determinations regulating prices, conditions relating to prices and price-fixing factors for retail services.

As previously mentioned, SA Water as the State’s major provider of water and sewerage services is establishing Long Term Plans for various areas in which it operates (see above). In addition, it monitors its operations, including for comparison against the performance of other water utilities or to demonstrate compliance with water quality guidelines. These arrangements include providing data for National Benchmarking reporting of Australia’s major urban water utilities, and annual publication of SA Water Drinking Water Quality Report showing SA Water’s performance against the Australian Drinking Water Guidelines and describing water quality initiatives and research undertaken by SA Water.

1. Base urban water planning on the best information available at the time and invest in acquiring information on an ongoing basis to continually improve the knowledge base

This principle is reflected through such processes as the development and annual review of RDSS; NRM Act requirements to develop and periodically update WAPs, and WI Act requirement for the Minister to prepare and maintain a State Water Supply and Demand Statement.

RDSSs are developed taking account of various scenarios of water availability. Data used in RDSSs is determined in consultation with key stakeholders (including stakeholders of the relevant region), and any relevant assumptions are documented as part of the process. Once an RDSS is prepared it is then annually reviewed by a committee including regional representatives.

SA Water’s Long Term Plans aim to ensure that its customers have a secure water supply and that its wastewater treatment plants have capacity to meet potential increases in demand. SA Water Long Term Plans are informed by the available information and taking into consideration various expected future influences such as population and climate change.

1. Adopt a partnership approach so that stakeholders are able to make an informed contribution to urban water planning, including consideration of the appropriate supply/demand balance

Government processes including statutory processes for the development of regional NRM Plans and WAPs by regional NRMBs (which have significant local membership), and processes established for the development of RDSS and SA Water Long Term Plans, have significant focus on engagement with local communities.

Local councils also place significant emphasis on local engagement in relation to the planning of their stormwater infrastructure and CWMS schemes. It is also a requirement for local councils preparing SMPs for consideration of the Stormwater Management Authority to engage with the relevant regional NRMB.

1. Manage water in the urban context on a whole-of-water-cycle basis

South Australia has a strong focus on whole-of-life cycle management, and is a leader in water resources use and management.

In metropolitan Adelaide, for example, in addition to traditional water sources of the Mount Lofty Ranges, River Murray, and groundwater, significant investments have been made in recent years in seawater desalination, stormwater harvesting and to increase capacity and use of recycled wastewater. A number of these investments, including many of the stormwater harvesting and reuse projects undertaken by local councils, have resulted from decisions by the Australian Government to provide funding assistance.

South Australia recognises a need for water services to be managed on a whole-of-water cycle basis. The State Government’s Stormwater Strategy (2011) provides for the preparation of an integrated urban water management plan for Greater Adelaide. This major initiative, which is currently under way, will be progressed in consultation with Local Government, industry, and other stakeholders.

Water Allocation Plans (WAP – refer 1.1), include not only provisions for the take and use of the naturally occurring waters (surface, groundwater and watercourse) but also provisions for the take and use of stormwater, effluent, and other form of imported water and roof runoff. This regime provides a means for managing all water resources within areas where WAPs are in place.

Further information on WAPs and links to current WAPs is available at <http://www.environment.sa.gov.au/managing-natural-resources/water-use/water-planning/water-allocation-plans>. In the Adelaide region for example, WAPs currently exist for:

* Western Mount Lofty Ranges Prescribed Water Resources Area – which extends from Gawler in the north, to Middleton and across to Cape Jervis on the south coast, and includes four watercourses across the Adelaide Plains (the Gawler, Little Para, Torrens and Onkaparinga rivers).
* Northern Adelaide Plains Prescribed Wells area – covers approximately 800 square kilometres of an area centred 30 kilometres to the north of Adelaide.
* McLaren Vale prescribed wells area – covers approximately 320 square kilometres, with the Onkaparinga River forming part of the northern boundary, while much of the south-eastern boundary follows the ridge of the Sellicks Range.

1. Consider the full portfolio of water supply and demand options

See above. South Australia, particularly Adelaide, has established a diverse portfolio of water infrastructure, with six major sources of drinking or ‘fit-for-purpose’ water. Risks associated with the various parts of the water cycle are managed through various statutory and non-statutory processes. Water quality of potable supplies is protected through a range of existing mechanisms and relevant stakeholders are actively engaged.

Generators of trade waste discharges need to comply with requirements of the WI Act.

Considerable importance is also placed on minimising risk to water resources available to Adelaide that are used for potable water, including the River Murray and the Mount Lofty Ranges Watershed.

The *River Murray Act 2003* (RM Act) provides for the protection and enhancement of the River Murray. Its objects include water quality objectives, including in order that nutrient levels within the River Murray system are managed so as to prevent or reduce the occurrence of algal blooms, and that the impact of potential pollutants, such as sediment and pesticides, on the environments constituted by the River Murray system is to be minimised.

In accordance with an action of Water for Good, the South Australian EPA is currently preparing a Mount Lofty Ranges Watershed Quality Improvement Plan, with its purpose being to develop a clear shared vision to improve water quality for potable water and aquatic ecosystems of the Mount Lofty Ranges (MLR) Watershed. This, together with the Western Mount Lofty Ranges WAP, will provide a comprehensive approach for managing water quality risk to water sourced from the MLR Watershed for use in Adelaide and surrounding areas.

The WI Act supports competition in the provision of water services in South Australia.

1. Develop and manage urban water supplies within sustainable limits

Refer above in relation to WAPs.

1. Use pricing and markets, where efficient and feasible, to help achieve planned urban water supply/demand balance

Section 35 of the WI Act empowers ESCOSA to make a determination under the [Essential Services Commission Act 2002](http://www.legislation.sa.gov.au/LZ/C/A/ESSENTIAL%20SERVICES%20COMMISSION%20ACT%202002.aspx) regulating prices, conditions relating to prices, and price-fixing factors for water retail services.

On 24 September 2012, the Treasurer of South Australia referred to ESCOSA an Inquiry into pricing reform for drinking water and sewerage retail services provided by SA Water. The Terms of Reference of the Inquiry include: the structure of drinking water tariffs, including supply charges; options for pricing sewerage services, including the removal of property-based charging; the impact of State-wide (postage-stamp) pricing on customers, and alternatives to this approach; reflecting water planning and management costs in SA Water’s process.

ESCOSA has released a series of issues papers to give all members of the community the opportunity to provide input on any issues that they believe should be taken into account by ESCOSA in this Inquiry. ESCOSA is to release a draft report from July 11 2014 and is required to provide its final report by 31 December 2014.

Further information is available at <http://www.escosa.sa.gov.au/water-overview/retail-pricing.aspx>

ESCOSA has also made a final decision for the Regulation of Minor and Intermediate Retailers of Water and Sewerage Services (Intermediate being licenses with greater than 500 connections up to 50,000 connections; Minor being licensees with up to 500 connections). The pricing decision specifies which NWI pricing principles are to be complied with by licensed retailers of drinking water, sewerage, recycled water and stormwater services, and for some other water services. Intermediate and Minor retailers of recycled water and stormwater services are required to demonstrate how they take into account NWI Principle 6: Integrated Waster Resource Planning (and other NWI Pricing Principles provided for in the final decision).

The initial regularly period covers 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2017. ESCOSA’s focus during the initial regulatory period will be on introducing greater transparency around current practices and understanding existing processes.

Further information is available at: <http://www.escosa.sa.gov.au/projects/182/economic-regulation-of-minor-and-intermediate-water-retailers.aspx>

1. Periodically review urban water plans

The State Water Supply and Demand Statement, required under the WI Act, is required to be comprehensively reviewed by the Minister at least once in every five years. Water for Good, regional NRM Plans, RDSSs, and WAPs provide an adaptive water planning framework. It should be noted that such plans are not limited in scope to urban water matters.

### What other guidelines/sources of information are considered in urban water planning processes?

*Planning Strategy for South Australia* – outlines State Government’s direction for land use change and development in South Australia. The strategy includes the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide, and various other volumes covering other geographic areas of the State.

*Water Sensitive Urban Design – Creating more liveable and water sensitive cities in South Australia* (Government of South Australia, 2013). South Australia’s water sensitive urban design policy, outlining the role of water sensitive urban design as part of integrated water cycle planning and management.

Stormwater Management Planning Guidelines (Stormwater Management Authority, 2007). Guidelines for South Australia Local Councils to use in preparing Stormwater Management Plans within their local areas.

### If applicable, outline the approach used to promote awareness of the Principles.

The Principles are applied generally in South Australia’s water planning framework (discussed above) and relevant organisations are generally aware of the principles (eg relevant State agencies, ESCOSA etc).

## Usefulness and relevance of planning principles

### Have the Principles been useful in guiding urban water planning?

The Principles are not known to be explicitly referenced in existing water planning documents, however, a range of established processes and additional actions in train are informed by and align with the Principles’ intent.

It should be noted that in general South Australia’s approach water planning and management is less concerned with ‘urban’ (and non-urban) but focuses more on the overall planning and management of natural water resources (eg surface water, groundwater, wastewater, stormwater etc).

### How useful are the Principles as a set of national guidelines?

The Principles provide a high-level, nationally consistent basis for water planning in Australian jurisdictions.

Flexible application of the Principles in South Australia and elsewhere is appropriate in order to maximise their relevance to local communities and local circumstances.

### Will the Principles continue to be as relevant as they were when they were introduced in 2008?

Yes, as far as currently understood.

## Planning principles’ role in new approaches to planning

### Please outline any requirements or forms of guidance in your jurisdiction regarding real options/risk or adaptive management planning; and/or water sensitive urban design/integrated urban water management.

There is an opportunity to enhance knowledge of jurisdictions approaches to water sensitive urban design (WSUD) and its contribution and connection with integrated urban water planning and management.

### Do the Principles provide sufficient guidance on the ‘new’ approaches to planning outlined above? Why or why not?

Generally yes, however it is important that the Principle are interpreted and are applied in a manner that is most relevant to local circumstances.

### If you think the Principles do NOT provide sufficient guidance on the ‘new’ approaches to planning, how should they be amended to better support/advance these issues?

N/A

### Do you have any suggestions for alternative ways (i.e. other than the Principles) to advance the ‘new’ approaches?

## Opportunities for improving the planning principles

### What recommendations would you provide for improving the Principles?

Recognition could be given to the need for the Principles to be able to be applied in a flexible way that is relevant to the specific circumstances of individual jurisdictions.

### Could communication of the Principles be improved and if so, how? Would any additional forms of guidance be useful?

# Tasmania

## Overview of planning arrangements

### Briefly describe the governance arrangements for urban water planning in your jurisdiction.

See 1.2 and 1.3 below.

### Provide an outline of statutory requirements for urban water planning.

Tasmania currently does not have statutory requirements applying to urban water planning *per se*.

### What (if any) non-statutory drivers inform and/or trigger urban water planning?

Water service providers that are regulated under the *Water and Sewerage Industry Act 2008* (Tas) are required by the Tasmanian Economic Regulator to prepare a Price and Service Plan as an input to the Regulator’s Price Determination, on a schedule determined by the Regulator – currently every three years.

The Price and Service Plan Guideline requires that a regulated entity include a section in its Price and Service Plan that addresses its water supply planning framework.

### What planning documents are currently in operation in your jurisdiction?

See 1.3 above.

## Extent to which planning principles are used

### To what extent are the National Urban Water Planning Principles (the Principles) referred to in planning documents and processes?

The Guideline referred to in 1.3 above does not explicitly reference the Planning Principles.

The ‘propose-respond’ process that is underpinned by the Guideline is largely consistent with the Planning Principles. Regulated entities are expected to propose service levels that are consistent with their regulated obligations and which take account of customer feedback obtained through appropriate consultation as part of the Price and Service Plan development process.

### What other guidelines/sources of information are considered in urban water planning processes?

Tasmania does not yet specify any other matters in relation to urban water planning processes.

### If applicable, outline the approach used to promote awareness of the Principles.

N/A.

## Usefulness and relevance of planning principles

### Have the Principles been useful in guiding urban water planning?

See the response to 2.1 above.

### How useful are the Principles as a set of national guidelines?

The Principles appear to be useful as a set of guidelines that can be adopted or referenced in Tasmania.

### Will the Principles continue to be as relevant as they were when they were introduced in 2008?

The Principles appear to be sufficiently broad to be interpreted in a way that will allow them to remain relevant over time.

## Planning principles’ role in new approaches to planning

### Please outline any requirements or forms of guidance in your jurisdiction regarding real options/risk or adaptive management planning; and/or water sensitive urban design/integrated urban water management.

There are currently no requirements for urban water planning to utilise real options or adaptive management processes and there are no requirements applying to the use of water sensitive urban design or integrated urban water management.

The Government has published guidelines on water sensitive urban design that are intended principally to inform stormwater drainage design.

### Do the Principles provide sufficient guidance on the ‘new’ approaches to planning outlined above? Why or why not?

The Principles address the issue of risk only in passing.

The Principles do not specifically mention the ‘new’ approaches to planning.

### If you think the Principles do NOT provide sufficient guidance on the ‘new’ approaches to planning, how should they be amended to better support/advance these issues?

It may be useful for the Principles to recommend that the various new approaches be considered as techniques or methodologies to be adopted when undertaking urban water planning.

### Do you have any suggestions for alternative ways (i.e. other than the Principles) to advance the ‘new’ approaches?

No suggestions.

## Opportunities for improving the planning principles

### What recommendations would you provide for improving the Principles?

Principle 7 is not strictly a planning principle, but is more a pricing principle. Although the objective of Principle 7 is a planning objective, pricing is the means of achieving it. Consideration should be given to either removing it or linking it to the Pricing Principles.

### Could communication of the Principles be improved and if so, how? Would any additional forms of guidance be useful?

The Principles have not been well communicated in the past. Given the reform effort in the urban water sector over the past decade or so, it is reasonable to expect that the industry could work through its peak bodies (WSAA and AWA) to further develop the Principles (if considered necessary) and establish relevant industry best practice and guidelines.

It would also be useful if the Principles were referenced in relevant planning documents and guides.

# Western Australia

## Overview of planning arrangements

### Briefly describe the governance arrangements for urban water planning in your jurisdiction.

As the state’s water resource manager the Department of Water provides technical and policy advice to the Minister for Water and Cabinet on both scheme and self-supplied water plans by water service providers and industry. DoW is largely responsible for the strategic planning and management of self-supplied water use in urban environments. DoW also provides urban water plans that integrate with land use planning processes.

Water supply planning that relates to urban scheme supplies is largely undertaken by the State Government-owned Water Corporation. Water Corp provides water and wastewater services to most of urban Western Australia, except Bunbury, Busselton, Rottnest Island, Dampier, Paraburdoo and Tom Price. Water service providers undertake water supply planning at various levels for different purposes. Water Corp develops water supply strategies such as Water Forever that takes into account overarching state or regional water security strategies or policies developed by the DoW. These are largely intended to inform the community of supply options and demand management to meet future growth in a drying climate.

Water service provides also undertake a range of more detailed water supply planning (5–10 year horizon) activities including to provide capital expenditure details for 0 to 5 years ahead to Treasury, via the Minister for Water, alongside their annual statement of corporate intent. This process constitutes the ‘normal capital works budget processes.

### Provide an outline of statutory requirements for urban water planning.

The regulatory structure for the water industry separates licensing and monitoring of water service provision (Economic Regulation Authority (ERA) / Dept of Health (DoH)) from water resource allocation, protection & licensing (DoW).

Water services are regulated under the *Water Services Act 2012*. Under this Act, water utilities are regulated by the ERA through licensing. Licence holders are required to meet water quality and customer service standards. Performance against licence conditions is monitored through a compliance and performance reporting regime, and through regular operational audits and asset management reviews.

The Department of Water issues licences for taking water under the *Rights in Water and Irrigation Act* *1914*. No statutory management plans have been developed despite provisions being included in the RIWI Act in 2001 so that the Minister may make regional, sub-regional and local area management plans for the management of water resources.

### What (if any) non-statutory drivers inform and/or trigger urban water planning?

Water allocation planning is mainly triggered for areas where water resources are approaching full allocation, are of strategic significance or have rapidly increasing water demand.

Regional and local water supply strategies are developed where major deficits in the supply-demand balance are forecast and competition for limited water supplies exists. They are developed to address possible constraints to local and regional development.

In several areas where land-use change is occurring or planned to occur, water is fully allocated and future demand levels cannot be met. Some existing water sources are subject to competing demands from industry, mining, agriculture and domestic water users. Far-sighted scenario planning and risk management is required to respond to these situations before they arise.

Application of the better urban water management framework (2008) is triggered in assessing new development to ensure the principles and practices of integrated water cycle management are incorporated into the design and development of new urban and redevelopment areas. This is undertaken by DoW staff when assessing if local and regional land use planning strategies, structure plans, schemes, subdivisions, strata subdivision and development applications take into account total water cycle management and water sensitive urban design principles.

### What planning documents are currently in operation in your jurisdiction?

The Department of Water has 23 non-statutory water allocation plans, which guide decisions to issue groundwater and surface water licenses required under the RIWI Act.

The Department of Water recently commenced developing regional and local water supply strategies. The Pilbara regional water supply strategy was published in 2013 with strategies for the Great Southern and Mid West regions due for completion in 2014.

DoW has responsibility for water planning that links to land use planning including drainage management plans, floodplain management plans and water source protection plans. There is currently no statutory requirement for land planning to have regard to these plans.

Better urban water management is a planning document jointly developed by Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts, WA Planning Commission, Department of Water, WA Local Government Association, (2008). This document identifies a framework for the implementation of integrated land and water planning which adopts the staged hierarchy of the state’s strategic and statutory land-use planning decision-making processes. DoW have developed a number of supplementary guidelines and decision support tools to assist land developers and decision-makers in the implementation Better urban water management.

## Extent to which planning principles are used

### To what extent are the National Urban Water Planning Principles (the Principles) referred to in planning documents and processes?

Allocation plans are consistent with the Principles 2, 3, 6 and 8 but they are not directly referenced.

Water supply strategies are consistent with Principles 2, 3, 5 and 8 but they are not directly referenced.

The better urban water management framework is consistent with Principle 4 but it is not directly referenced.

### What other guidelines/sources of information are considered in urban water planning processes?

Guideline for the approval of non-drinking water systems in Western Australia Urban developments, 2013

Guidelines for district water management strategies: guidelines for preparing a district water management strategy to support a region scheme amendment or district structure plan (2013)

Land Use Compatibility in Public Drinking Water Source Areas [Policy] (2004)

Protecting Public Drinking Water Source Areas in Western Australia, September 2005 [Policy]

Water allocation planning in Western Australia: a guide to our process, 2011

Framework for prioritising waterways for management in Western Australia, 2011

The State Waterways Initiative: strategic directions for the future, 2008

Decision process for stormwater management in WA 2009

Stormwater Management Manual for Western Australia 2004–07.

### If applicable, outline the approach used to promote awareness of the Principles.

N/A – not aware of any promotion of the principles

## Usefulness and relevance of planning principles

### Have the Principles been useful in guiding urban water planning?

No examples have been found where the principles have been used to guide urban water planning.

### How useful are the Principles as a set of national guidelines?

Collectively water service providers and government agencies in Western Australia have undertaken effective urban water planning without using the Principles. The Principles are a broad set of guidelines that can rationally be applied across all jurisdictions. Individual jurisdictions however will adapt and apply their own principles according to local objectives and circumstances. There is limited benefit to capture these local variations in a set of national principles.

### Will the Principles continue to be as relevant as they were when they were introduced in 2008?

Yes

## Planning principles’ role in new approaches to planning

### Please outline any requirements or forms of guidance in your jurisdiction regarding real options/risk or adaptive management planning; and/or water sensitive urban design/integrated urban water management.

Groundwater risk-based allocation planning process, 2011. Where there is limited knowledge of groundwater and limited competing demands for it, we have developed a risk-based groundwater allocation planning process to develop allocation limits and licensing rules within a shorter timeframe.

Modelling water demand versus supply is a fundamental activity of water supply planning at DoW to estimate the amount of water required from a new supply source to meet projected future demand. It provides a strategic overview of locations in the State where demand is likely to exceed supply, which enables prioritisation of the work we undertake as a department. As our basis for planning we assume water resource investigations should occur at least five years prior to a demand–supply gap occurring, detailed planning and negotiations three years prior and construction two years prior. We use the high growth water demand scenario to inform timeframes for planning decisions, such as the need for investigations, allocation planning or policy development, to ensure that water supply options can meet demand as needed. We use the medium growth scenario to inform the most likely timing for capital investment by Government and / or industry.

State Planning Policy 2.9 Water Resources (Government of WA, 2006), is designed to facilitate better management and use of our urban water resources by ensuring an appropriate level of consideration is given to the total water cycle at each stage of the planning system. The better urban water management framework and supporting documents provide guidance on implementing WSUD and integrated urban water management.

### Do the Principles provide sufficient guidance on the ‘new’ approaches to planning outlined above? Why or why not?

Yes.

There is limited benefit in providing detail on new approaches to planning in the Principles. An adequate level of contemporary knowledge and planning expertise exists in government and water service providers of the individual jurisdictions to adequately apply new and future approaches without referring to national guidelines.

### If you think the Principles do NOT provide sufficient guidance on the ‘new’ approaches to planning, how should they be amended to better support/advance these issues?

Principles do provide sufficient guidance on new approaches.

### Do you have any suggestions for alternative ways (i.e. other than the Principles) to advance the ‘new’ approaches?

Sites that demonstrate and promote application of WSUD.

Urban water planning policy within individual jurisdictions that refer to national principles and are customised to state settings.

## Opportunities for improving the planning principles

### What recommendations would you provide for improving the Principles?

Principles are adequate for their current level of use in Western Australia.

### Could communication of the Principles be improved and if so, how? Would any additional forms of guidance be useful?

Yes, communication of the Principles could be improved given the general lack of awareness or reference to them in urban water planning in Western Australia. Targeted promotion of the principles to urban water planners could be undertaken with rationale for how they can be used (given they are not linked to financial assistance or penalties) to achieve improved outcomes for urban water planning in Western Australia.

**Attachment A**

**TEMPLATE OF QUESTIONS SENT TO JURISDICTIONS**

**NOTE that the questions below relate to your jurisdiction’s own urban water planning activities AND the planning requirements that apply to urban water service providers in your jurisdiction.**

**Overview of planning arrangement**

1. Briefly describe the governance arrangements for urban water planning in your jurisdiction.
2. Please describe the entities involved in urban water planning and their roles, including the difference in roles and responsibilities between government agencies, utilities and local councils.
3. Provide an outline of statutory requirements for urban water planning.
4. For all entities involved in urban water planning, please provide an outline about relevant statutory requirements.
5. What (if any) non-statutory drivers inform and/or trigger urban water planning?
6. Please describe any non-statutory drivers that exist (eg guidelines) and explain their function in urban water planning processes.
7. What planning documents are currently in operation in your jurisdiction?
8. Please provide details of planning documents that are the responsibility of government agencies in your jurisdiction. You do NOT need to provide details of water service providers’ planning documents. Please include a short description of the purpose and function of each of these documents, and the timeframe under which they apply.

**Extent to which planning principles are used**

1. To what extent are the National Urban Water Planning Principles (the Principles) referred to in planning documents and processes?

In your response, please indicate whether your jurisdiction’s plans/planning processes:

* explicitly refer to the Principles
* are informed by or are consistent with the Principles, but not directly referenced
* do not reference and are not informed by the Principles

Please also include in your response details of your planning processes that relate to issues covered by the Principles (e.g. levels of service, stakeholder involvement, frequency of review).

1. What other guidelines/sources of information are considered in urban water planning processes?

This does not need to be an exhaustive list, but you should include the main sources of information and/or other forms of guidance that your jurisdiction uses in its own planning processes, or the planning requirements it issues for water service providers.

An example of other forms of guidance are the Queensland Planning Guidelines for Water and Sewerage, or the NSW Best Practice Management of Water Supply and Sewerage Guidelines.

1. If applicable, outline the approach used to promote awareness of the Principles.

The intent of this question is to gain an insight into the how the Principles are communicated in your jurisdiction. For example, are they referred to in any planning training/workshops, or learning and development material?

**Usefulness and relevance of planning principles**

1. Have the Principles been useful in guiding urban water planning?

Please provide any details about the different ways you believe the Principles have contributed to achieving optimal planning outcomes in your jurisdiction. You may wish to consider, but not be limited by, the following issues:

* is there a link between planning processes and capital or operational actions?
* to what extent have the Principles shaped the planning processes of urban water service providers in your jurisdiction?
* what is the role of the Principles in your government’s planning interactions with stakeholders?
* do you recommend the use of the Principles? Why or why not?

1. How useful are the Principles as a set of national guidelines?

In your view, is the current wording of the Principles at a broad enough level to cater to the range of urban water circumstances across Australia? Should they be amended to reflect geographical and/or governance differences?

1. Will the Principles continue to be as relevant as they were when they were introduced in 2008?

Are the Principles sufficiently robust to address potential future challenges of urban water planning? Is there a need to update any of the wording? Please provide relevant details.

Planning principles’ role in new approaches to planning

1. Please outline any requirements or forms of guidance in your jurisdiction regarding real options/risk or adaptive management planning; and/or water sensitive urban design/integrated urban water management.
2. Do the Principles provide sufficient guidance on the ‘new’ approaches to planning outlined above? Why or why not?

Where requirements/guidance on the ‘new’ approaches exist in your jurisdiction, or are intended to be incorporated in your jurisdiction’s planning processes, what has been the role of the Principles in advancing these approaches to planning? In particular, how useful are they in assisting jurisdictions to identify and mitigate the risks inherent to urban water planning?

1. If you think the Principles do NOT provide sufficient guidance on the ‘new’ approaches to planning, how should they be amended to better support/advance these issues?

One or more of the concepts associated with the above ‘new’ approaches are mentioned in the accompanying explanatory text of Principles 2, 4, 5 and 8. Does this provide sufficient guidance? Do the concepts associated with the ‘new’ approaches need to be more clearly addressed?

1. Do you have any suggestions for alternative ways (i.e. other than the Principles) to advance the ‘new’ approaches?

Please include in your response methods that you think have worked well in your jurisdiction to promote the take-up of the ‘new’ approaches, and/or any ideas of your own for alternative methods.

Opportunities for improving the planning principles

1. What recommendations would you provide for improving the Principles?

The intent of the question is to capture your ideas on possible improvements on the current set of Principles. Do any of the Principles require further development, clarification or deletion? Should any new principles be added?

1. Could communication of the Principles be improved and if so, how? Would any additional forms of guidance be useful?

This question is partly informed by the views of some of the participants in the Planning Principles review’s case studies project. For example, Water Corporation suggested using peak bodies such as the Water Services Association of Australia as a means to further develop the Principles.

1. The 2007 Guidelines provide a minor update to the 2004 NSW Guidelines. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For example refer to page 5 and pages 16 to 20 of the 2012–13 NSW Performance Monitoring Report. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)