

REVIEW OF THE OPERATION OF THE CAP

RESPONSE SHEET FOR COMMENTS ON DRAFT REPORT

The March 2000 draft report on the **Review of the Operation of the Cap** by the Cap Project Board to the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council is now available for public comment. Comments on the draft report are due by **10 July 2000**.



The draft report, and further copies of this response sheet, is available from the Murray-Darling Basin Commission and from the Commission's web site:

www.mdbc.gov.au

If you wish, you may use this form to tell us what you think about the position of the Cap Project Board in their report on the Review of the Operation of the Cap. If there is insufficient space on the form, you may add additional sheets or write a separate submission.

The draft report will be modified to reflect comments received and a final report on the Review of the Operation of the Cap will be presented to Ministerial Council Meeting 29 in August 2000.

Those who provide comments will receive a copy of the final Report once it has been approved by the Ministerial Council.

COMMENTS BY: [Lindsay Jarvis](#)

CONTACT DETAILS: ['Riverview' Kergunyah 3691](#)

DATE: 6/7/2000

The deadline for comment is **10 July 2000**.

Comments (by e-mail if possible – this response sheet is available electronically on the Commission's web site) should be directed to:

- Review of the Operation of the Cap
Murray-Darling Basin Commission
GPO Box 409
CANBERRA ACT 2601

Attn: Dr Tony McLeod, Project Manager
Tel: 02 6279 0144
Fax: 02 6230 7579
Email: tony.mcleod@mdbc.gov.au

- or your local member of the Community Advisory Committee (CAC). Those comments made via the CAC that are received prior to **Friday 16 June 2000** will be considered at CAC Meeting 24 – 27 June 2000.

	Cap Project Board Position	Comment
Ecological Sustainability of Rivers	<p>The Project Board has concluded that the Cap has been an essential first step in providing for the environmental sustainability of the river system of the Basin. Without the Cap, there would have been a significantly increased risk that the environmental degradation of the river system of the Murray-Darling Basin would have been worse.</p>	<p>I agree with this conclusion It also is necessary to review progress, and note that all jurisdictions have not made the same progress</p> <p>Five Years is a short time to expect to see results.</p>
	<p>However, the Project Board has concluded that there is no certainty that the Cap on diversions at its current level represents a sustainable level of diversions – the level at which it is set being that which existed at the time when it was decided to introduce a Cap.</p> <p>Further, the Project Board recommends that as better information informs our management of the Basin’s resources, the level at which the Cap is set should continue to be refined to reflect our increased understanding.</p> <p>It is likely that such refinements may lead to the lowering of the level of the Cap in some valleys.</p> <p>Indeed, some jurisdictions have already increased the environment’s share, via access restrictions in addition to that required by the Cap, as part of their longer-term direction of improved water management.</p>	<p>I Agree It is important that if a reduction of the cap is contemplated No further licenses should be issued. Water now issued by authorities (off quota and sales) should not be issued as further entitlements until the Cap volume is confirmed.</p>

	Cap Project Board Position	Comment
Economic and Social Impacts	The Project Board considers that there is compelling evidence that the Cap has already delivered significant economic and social benefits to the Basin community and that the net benefit will increase over time.	The cap has added to the Security of existing entitlements The security of entitlements will become of more importance over time.
	The results of research conducted for the Review make it clear that, in the absence of the Cap, the erosion of security of supply for irrigators and other users would have been significant. These analyses were performed on several systems across the Basin reflecting diverse agricultural practices and climatic conditions.	This is true, I Repeat. The cap has added to the Security of existing entitlements The security of entitlements will become of more importance over time.
	Through guaranteeing security of water supply at the valley level, the Project Board views the Cap as having provided a more certain climate for long-term investment and development, particularly in high value agriculture and value adding processing, as well as providing benefits to the environment.	It is to early to make such claims Until all states comply with the cap the States that comply are being disadvantaged
	The Project Board considers that the Cap has provided a mechanism for restraining, in an orderly fashion, growth in diversions while enabling economic development to proceed.	The Cap has not been complied with in all jurisdictions
	The Project Board recognises that this strong positive conclusion will not be the perception of every stakeholder in the Basin. However, the Project Board concludes that the overall benefit of the Cap, especially from ensuring security of supply at a valley level and providing an environment within which water trading and related reforms could be developed, has been a positive one.	The Cap must be finalized and the method of accounting given authority.

	Cap Project Board Position	Comment
Equity	<p>The Project Board identified several equity issues (notably Cap arrangements for Queensland and the ACT) of longstanding duration that require urgent resolution. In addition there are several more recently identified equity issues (floodplain and overland flows and diversions, farm dams and tree plantations) also requiring attention. The effective management of these issues will necessitate a total catchment management approach to water management that embraces both surface and groundwater resources.</p>	<p>The Queensland issue must be finalized. The Floodplain and overland flow issues are important the Farm dams issue in Victoria is being addressed.</p> <p>The issue is essentially a conflict between Section 8 of the Water Act which includes a ‘right’ that if activated may reduce the ‘sales water’ right that is included in G M W’s Bulk entitlement. This double claim for water has been subject to several inquires.</p> <p>The Baxter, Hill, and Heaps reports all trying to find the elusive ‘Equity’</p> <p>I believe that a suitable compromise can be achieved but this is not the forum to promote it.</p>
	<p>The Project Board focused on equity issues arising from the implementation of the Cap between jurisdictions and between river valleys within States. In several cases, the submissions received by the Review of the Operation of the Cap raised equity issues that are about the details of implementation within valleys which are outside the jurisdiction of the Murray-Darling Basin Commission and Ministerial Council processes. The vast majority of such issues related to the recognition of licensed entitlement versus history of use, specifically in New South Wales (the “sleeper/dozer” issue). Such issues need to be dealt with by the particular jurisdiction concerned. In order that all submissions receive appropriate attention, these submissions and that of the CAC have been referred to the appropriate Government for consideration and reply.</p>	<p>Whilst it is true that most issues should be solved within jurisdictions. Issues such as the interstate trade that does not match. N S W with ‘unders and overs’ and Victoria without.</p> <p>There is a need for a structure to discuss and propose solutions to these problems.</p>

	Cap Project Board Position	Comment
Implementation and Compliance	The work of the Independent Audit Group (IAG) on the ongoing implementation of the Cap and compliance of actual diversions with Cap target diversions has provided a clear direction for the finalisation of the implementation phase of the Cap. The Project Board generally supports the IAG recommendations.	I support the I A G but they may need more support / power to achieve their objectives.
	Significantly, effective compliance tools (computer simulation models used to determine Cap target diversions) have not yet been developed and the Project Board recommends that a high priority be given to the finalisation of these models.	I Find it incomprehensible that such tools are not fully developed. They must be to ensure Cap Compliance!!
	The Review has found that Victoria and South Australia have complied with the Cap, while Queensland and ACT are yet to complete the establishment of their respective Caps. Nevertheless, it is apparent that in Queensland there has been significant growth in storage which will impact on the water available for alternative consumptive and environmental uses. In New South Wales, the Cap has been breached in the Barwon-Darling system, with other valleys being within Cap limits.	The whole concept of a CAP depends on ALL States treating this matter seriously. Support in Victoria will wane rapidly unless there is progress in the other States!!!

	Cap Project Board Position	Comment
Schedule F to the Murray-Darling Basin Agreement	The most important challenge in Cap implementation is to finalise the arrangements under “Schedule F – Cap on Diversions” to the <i>Murray-Darling Basin Agreement</i> . This schedule is the primary tool for defining Cap arrangements especially those concerned with assessing compliance and its consequences.	I Totally Agree
	With the intent of improving the operation of the Cap through the development of fair and meaningful compliance arrangements, the Project Board invites comments on the following modifications to Schedule F which have been recommended by the IAG:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of references to end-of-valley flows as a method for Cap compliance. 	End of Valley Flows may be retained as a check of how accurate the metering arrangements are
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arrangements for remedial actions in the case of Cap exceedence. The recommendation of the IAG is that States be required “<i>to ensure that cumulative diversions are brought back into balance with the cap</i>”. 	‘Continuous accounting’ is the only way the Cap will work as the ‘Cap volume’ will not be confirmed until after the event.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> re-setting the commencement date for accounting for diversions under the Cap to start with the 2000/01 water year. 	I believe Victoria may accept this compromise if an agreed position can be negotiated with all states. I E Volumes and dates.

	Cap Project Board Position	Comment
Sustainable Rivers Audit	<p>With the implementation of the Cap nearing completion in most jurisdictions, there is now the opportunity to take the “next step” and to consider the environmental outcomes of the Cap from a whole of Basin perspective. The Project Board supports the introduction of a regular Sustainable Rivers Audit which would cast the Cap as an input to Basin health, rather than an outcome in itself.</p> <p>Whereas the Cap is seen as the first step towards achieving the longer-term objective of the <i>Initiative</i>, a Sustainable Rivers Audit can be viewed as the next step in the process of achieving this objective.</p>	<p>The ‘Sustainable Rivers Audit’ program is one of many projects that aim to evaluate environmental outcomes. There is huge diversity in the M D Basin it is important that whatever program we measure by it is important to establish benchmark data that we can build upon to measure change.</p>

	Cap Project Board Position	Comment
Any Other Issues	<p>Are there any other issues raised in the draft report that you wish to comment upon?</p>	<p>A friend remarked to me today don’t forget that the ‘natural environment’ of the Murray Darling Basin was one of the harshest in the world.</p> <p>When we seek to ‘improve’ the natural environment we must meet the challenge of recognizing the effects of our changes to the natural environment.</p>