

Understand NSW's approach on how we get to 2019 given we have a cap model that is only approved to 2015.

NSW understands that this is an MDBA decision. The auditor makes their recommendations and MDBA choose how they want to progress.

NSW to consider what it could do for the model.

S.47F

They are happy with the model as it is, more or less, with a few changes that they could fix up.

They have done an internal review and have flagged a few areas that could be fixed up. There were a few errors that they noticed and are working to clean up.

They are not interested in redoing the whole model. It's one of their first Source models.

Have gone through auditor's recommendations and are happy to go through each of them.

S.47F

– is this going to be a new model, or the cap one?

Three types of models: current, a cap and a water sharing plan compliant version.

P - Is the cap model the same as what was given – reflecting all the extra components?

They are not the same representation. One of the themes to S.47F report is that the flow information isn't precise. NSW view is that this doesn't impact on being Cap compliant. Fundamentally, they don't know what the exact numbers (eg Menindee inflows) and changing the numbers is such a large task. This was part of the reasoning for going to Source.

They are trying to align all three of their models to ensure there is consistency between the models.

NSW plan for way forward is Cap model is in care and maintenance. Bugs will be fixed, but major reworking won't be done.

IQMM model is going to be done at the moment.

Source development is going on at the moment. Looking at all the gaps and developing specs for future work. This is going to be used for a water sharing plan version.

P - MDBA publish long-term cap for Barwon Darling. If this number is different to what is coming out of the water sharing plan, then there is a problem. We won't be able to publish two lots of numbers that are very different.

A – licences have been reissued when water sharing plan came in. These have been changed to the Cap number, but there is a rolling 3 year average. This means this should be very close to the Cap number, but the valley will be a bit less because of this. If the numbers are very different, then we need to do something about it.

Can the WSP model be switched to using instead of the Cap model? It's an option if the numbers work out the same.

Principle of cap is to say what diversion would have been under 1993-94, and then say what was actually used to ensure there was no water use above the Cap. If we start recording diversions that are higher than what the cap is, then we have obviously done the modelling wrong and this needs to be corrected.

Issues – wanted to update sacramento – not going to do

Next one – done

Update flow calibration – not going to do

Metered diversions –

Signification portion of mace meters were installed incorrectly, and there is a metering program going on where they are installing

Don't want to redo calibration. As new meters are installed then they will be run in parallel to mace and time and event, to go back and scale old reading to point of truth. All this does is change the Cap – it's just an accounting change.

Wanted onfarm storage and seepage – not going to do this b/c this would entail meters on all storages and they have no legal xx to d this. They are not concerned with how they use it anyway. This will be done for some under Healthy Floodplains projects.

Include town water supplies explicitly – these are in there as part of the loss, but these are not relevant to Sch E, because it is not expected to grow. It will be done is Source. Not a priority.

Harmonise Colly farms – not going to do this. The nodes are about how they are going to behave in one system, they are not concerned with impact on other systems.

Intersecting Streams can go into Barwon Darling, it's not worth putting it into it's own model. 3GL is not worth it.

5.221 – Cmwth has a strong interest in northern Basin, so all accounting is important. We will share information if the number turns out to be larger than 3GL. This is a separate conversation that we could have, but not now.

As far as cap is concerned, NSW is going to keep it in care and maintenance model. Also, creating new IQQM model and a new Source model based on current WSP and forecasting WSP requirements. Future changes required under WRPing will occur over time.

Andrew – in terms of BD for BP, there is a flow target at, there isn't a huge amount of change unless they institute some kind of shepherding. BD is really just a conduit for BP, but there is not much going on.

Many issues that need to be fixed to input data into Source.

NSW have signed up to Impl Agreement to try to use Source. But concerns about the timesframes. IQQM will be their backup WRP compliant model. Can't see the Source model being ready for at least a couple of years. Most work to date has been done around diversion behaviour. Next major effort will be on recalibrating flow information for a year or so, trying to match the Menindee inflow sequence from bottom up. Hope by then Source will be ready to pull over.

Ongoing cap model – accredited to Dec 2015 – what is NSW approach between 2015 and 2019 for Cap purposes.

5.471 - They would like to hand over to MDBA a modelling report that outlines bugs and fixes and a similar version. MDBA would then come back with proposed changes and then mutual agreement reached and then this is approved to 2019.

Cap numbers are difficult to push through.

Problem lies in adopting WSP model as a BDL model.


5.471 – just b/c the outcomes were the same, doesn't mean the Cap and BDL models are the same. Overall numbers are the same, but who is taking the water and when will change throughout the year, so we can't just use the Cap version. We need a separate BDL model.

5.471 – and we need to show that the two models correspond to each other.

WSP model might be ready by the end of the year.

Aim at the end of the day is to show to the public that there is an accredited model and that the numbers are consistent with all the conditions.

NSW want the best Cap model that can be built, but whether MDBA choose to accredit it is up to them.

 – if NSW put forward a model and MDBA might choose to accredit it for the remaining of the time.

MDBA think there should be processes to change models – you can't just change them.

NSW want to identify and fix bugs and then come to MDBA with updated model and proposals for fixes.

MDBA wants to be able to report to the other states what is happening in this space and that we are happy with this.

If this isn't available for 2016 reporting year, MDBA can what will we do???

NSW priorities – source development, WSP then Cap model. MDBA happy with this.