

T.M.C.
10 July 2000

MDBC Form 0530
Corr. Id. 15378

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, are 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: *JAMES. H. NEARY.*

CONTACT DETAILS: *R.M.B. 2150 MURMUNJEE VIA BEECHWORTH VIC. 3747 PHONE/FAX 0357271327*

DATE: *6th July 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>THIS IS TRUE FOR SOME OF THE FREDER RIVER'S, BUT FOR SOME OF THE UNREGULATED RIVER'S AND STREAMS IN HIGH RAINFALL HIGH CATCHMENT AREAS I BELIEVE WE CAN DO QUIET WELL WITHOUT THE CAP IMPOSITION ON THESE SYSTEM'S.</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. 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. It is likely that such refinements may lead to the lowering of the level of the Cap in some valleys. 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>IF ALL THE DIVERSION'S ALLOCATION'S ARE NOT USED DURING THE IRRIGATION SEASON. WHAT IS NOT USED THIS YEAR SHOULD BE ABLE TO BE ^{USED} NEXT YEAR, INSTEAD OF IN SOME CASE'S AT THE END OF THE SEASON THIS UNUSED WATER IS NEARLY GIVEN AWAY SO AS TO KEEP THEIR ALLOCATED AMOUNT.</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.	THIS IS NOT TRUE. IT HAS PUT PEOPLE OUT OF WORK AND HAS STOPPED SOME VERY GOOD ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS AND FARM PRODUCTIVITY.
	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.	I BELIEVE MANY NEW DAMS OF ONE HUNDRED MEGALITRES WOULD HAVE TO BE BUILT TO HAVE ANY IMPACT AT ALL
	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.	WHAT IS HIGH VALUE AGRICULTURE TODAY IN 10 YEARS TIME COULD BE OF NO VALUE AT ALL. SO WHY ARE AGRICULTURE PRODUCTS THAT HAVE LOST VALUE MADE TO PAY HIGH RATES FOR WATER OR MAYBE NOT ABLE TO GET WATER FOR NEW PRODUCTION
	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.	IT HAS PUT A BIG COST INTO BEING ABLE TO STORE WATER ON YOUR FARM
	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.	IT HAS TO REFORM WATER TRADING TO A MORE ECONOMIC BASE FOR THE AGRICULTURE PRODUCTION THAT WATER IS NEEDED FOR.

	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>QUEENSLAND AND ACT SHOULD HAVE TOED THE LINE LIKE VIC. TREE PLANTATIONS AND 100 MEGALITRES FARM DAMS IN HIGH RAIN FALL AREA'S WILL HAVE A VERY SMALL IMPACT.</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>"SLEEPER OR DOZER" LICENSE'S SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO BE KEPT, BECAUSE AT THE END OF THE YEAR THEY HAVE NOT USED ANY WATER. IF THERE IS SPARE WATER BECAUSE THEY DID NOT USE IT ALL THE MORE IN STORE FOR NEXT DRY YEAR.</p>

Implementation and Compliance	Cap Project Board Position	Comment
	<p>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.</p>	
	<p>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.</p>	<p>I WOULD NOT HANG MY HAT ON SOME ^{OF} THOSE MODELS.</p>
	<p>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.</p>	<p>VIC + SOUTH AUST. SHOULD HAVE BEEN ABLE TO CONTINUE LIKE QUEENSLAND AND ACT TILL EVERYONE WAS TOLD TO STOP AT THE ONE TIME.</p>

	Cap Project Board Position	Comment
Schedule F to the Murray-Darling Basin Agreement	<p>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.</p>	
	<p>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:</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removal of references to end-of-valley flows as a method for Cap compliance. 	
	<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 "to ensure that cumulative diversions are brought back into balance with the cap". 	<p>AGREE</p>
	<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. 	

	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. 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>REGULAR SUSTAINABLE RIVER'S AUDITS WOULD BE FAR TO COSTLY TO BE DONE. ONE AUDIT DONE OVER A FIVE YEAR TIME FRAME MAY BE THE WAY TO GO.</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>NO.</p>