



PRICE REVIEW 2013: REGIONAL  
URBAN WATER BUSINESSES  
DRAFT DECISION – APPENDICES

MARCH 2013

**An appropriate citation for this paper is:**

Essential Services Commission 2013, *Price Review 2013: Regional Urban Water Businesses — Draft Decision*, Appendices A to E, March

© ESSENTIAL SERVICES COMMISSION.

THIS PUBLICATION IS COPYRIGHT. NO PART MAY BE REPRODUCED BY ANY PROCESS  
EXCEPT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF THE COPYRIGHT ACT 1968 AND THE  
PERMISSION OF THE ESSENTIAL SERVICES COMMISSION.



# PRICE REVIEW 2013: REGIONAL URBAN WATER BUSINESSES

Draft Decision – Appendices

March 2013

# CONTENTS

<b>APPENDIX A — SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>APPENDIX B —SERVICE STANDARDS</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>APPENDIX C — GUARANTEED SERVICE LEVELS</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>APPENDIX D – NEW CUSTOMER CONTRIBUTIONS SUBMISSIONS</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>APPENDIX E – MISCELLANEOUS CHARGES</b>	<b>51</b>

# APPENDIX A — SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

The submissions in table A.1 are publicly available on the Commission’s website. Others were received but were requested to be kept confidential or commercial-in-confidence.

**TABLE A.1 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED TO SUMMARY PAPER**

<b>Date received</b>	<b>Name</b>
13/06/2012	Mohammad Chowdury
07/11/2012	Beverley Pocock
20/11/2012	David Matthews
21/11/2012	Merrilyn Whitecross
21/11/2012	Sue Kent
22/11/2012	Customer
23/11/2012	Deidre Christie
27/11/2012	Chris Podolinsky
29/11/2012	Caroline Trezise
01/12/2012	John Herring
03/12/12	Don Ward
03/12/2012	John Lenders MP
12/12/2012	Yanathan Development Group
17/12/2012	Australian Unity
18/12/2012	Alison Joseph
21/12/2012	Horsham Rural Council
06/01/2013	Meryl Birch
14/01/2013	Lower Murray Water supplementary submission to water plan
18/01/2013	Peter Galvin
19/01/2013	Water for Natimuk Committee
20/1/2013	William Brazel
21/01/2013	George Gordon

<b>Date received</b>	<b>Name</b>
21/1/2013	Cr Peter Cox, Whipstick Ward
21/1/2013	Barry McPhee
21/01/2013	Pat Horan
23/01/2013	John Barnes
23/01/2013	George Gordon
25/01/2013	Gippsland Resource Group
25/01/2013	Dr Craig Watkins
25/01/2013	Joint submission – Consumer Utilities Advocacy Centre, Consumer Action Law Centre, Financial & Consumer Rights Inc and Community Information & Support Victoria
25/01/2013	Victorian Farmers Federation
25/01/2013	PurplePipe Association Inc.
25/01/2013	Rodger Constructions
25/01/2013	Hardwick's Meatworks
25/01/2013	Joint submission – Property Council of Australia and Urban Development Institute of Australia (UDIA)
29/01/2013	Australian Industry Group
29/01/2013	ESC in response to Gippsland Resource Group submission
31/01/2013	GMMWater in response to John Herring submission
17/02/2013	Colin Fenton
26/02/2013	Victorian Council of Social Service

# APPENDIX B —SERVICE STANDARDS

**TABLE B.1 BARWON WATER**  
Business Justification

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Water</b>							
Unplanned water supply interruptions per 100km (number)	21.49	30	Reject	Variation between proposed target and 5-year historical average proposed target5-year	The water main renewal software was used to forecast the failure rates based on a policy of replacing water mains after 5 unplanned interruptions in a year. Further, proposed target is optimal because further relaxing of policy would set a target that results in a higher number of GSL payments	Reject	No adequate rationale provided adequate rationale
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 1) (minutes)	25.39	35	Reject	Variation between proposed target and 5-year historical average proposed target5-year	There are no tangible savings in easing the target from Water Plan 2. Early responses may be linked to extended interruption duration if a shutdown is commenced prior to worksite attendance by the follow up repair crew.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided adequate rationale
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 2) (minutes)	41.34	68	Reject	Variation between proposed target and 5-year historical average proposed target5-year	There are no tangible savings in easing the target from Water Plan 2. Early responses may be linked to extended interruption duration if a shutdown is commenced prior to worksite attendance by the follow up repair crew.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided adequate rationale
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 3) (minutes)	215.17	360	Reject	Variation between proposed target and 5-year historical average proposed target5-year Variation between submitted historical performance data and ESC audit data	There are no tangible savings in easing the target from Water Plan 2. Early responses may be linked to extended interruption duration if a shutdown is commenced prior to worksite attendance by the follow up repair crew.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided adequate rationale

Continued next page



**TABLE B.1 (CONTINUED)**

<b>Service standard</b>	<b>5-year average</b>	<b>Proposed target</b>	<b>Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Business response</b>	<b>Follow-up Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>
<b>Water (continued)</b>							
Unplanned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	96.81	96.5	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Planned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	88.73	80	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average	A shift to more conventional methods of excavation is expected. This will likely result in slightly increased repair/restoration timeframes but deliver net annual savings in the order of \$250,000	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Average unplanned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	16.14	20	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average	A shift to more conventional methods of excavation is expected. This will likely result in slightly increased repair/restoration timeframes but deliver net annual savings in the order of \$250,000	Accept	Adequate rationale provided.
Average planned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	40.03	46.2	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average	The 5-year average has remained consistent with Water Plan 2 target. Relaxing or not changing the target would not result in significant savings.	Reject	
Average frequency of unplanned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.15	0.18	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average	BW propose to decrease the Water Plan 2 target. CAPEX on renewals and milder climatic conditions, leading to less ground movement, in the past three years, has resulted in a 30 per cent reduction in the frequency of unplanned failures.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Average frequency of planned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.21	0.22	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average	One of the major causes of planned interruptions is air scouring and other proactive maintenance programs which are expected to continue in WP3.	Accept	Adequate rationale provided.

Continued next page

**TABLE B.1 (CONTINUED)**

<b>Service standard</b>	<b>5-year average</b>	<b>Proposed target</b>	<b>Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Business response</b>	<b>Follow-up Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>
<b>Water (continued)</b>							
Average duration of unplanned water supply interruptions (minutes)	107.22	110	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance	BW propose to decrease the Water Plan 2 target. CAPEX on renewals and milder climatic conditions, leading to less ground movement, in the past three years, has resulted in a 30 per cent reduction in the frequency of unplanned failures.		
Average duration of planned water supply interruptions (minutes)	188.6	210	Accept	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average	A shift to more conventional methods of excavation is expected. This will likely result in slightly increased repair/restoration timeframes but deliver net annual savings in the order of \$250,000	Accept	
Number of customers experiencing more than 5 unplanned water supply interruptions in a year (number)	32.8	150	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average Variation between submitted historical performance data and Commission audit data	The water main renewal software PARMS was used to forecast the failure rates based on a policy of replacing water mains after 5 unplanned interruptions in a year. This is considered optimal because further relaxing of policy would set a target that results in a higher number of GSL payments	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Unaccounted for water (per cent)	8.81		Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			

Continued next page

**TABLE B.1 (CONTINUED)**

<b>Service standard</b>	<b>5-year average</b>	<b>Proposed target</b>	<b>Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Business response</b>	<b>Follow-up Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>
<b>Sewer</b>							
Sewerage blockages per 100km (number)	34.86	43	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average	BW's prioritisation of planned preventative maintenance programs is driven by risk rather than trying to reduce the overall number of sewer blockages. BW still need to do the prescribed volume of maintenance in order to mitigate overall risk. Easing the targets will not have direct impact on planned maintenance expenditure.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Average time to attend sewer spills and blockages (minutes)	49.94	80	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average	The introduction of level 1 supervisory response to all unplanned events has been introduced to improve problem diagnosis, work prioritisation and resource scheduling, leading to a significant reduction in overtime costs. There are no further tangible savings in easing the target.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Average time to rectify a sewer blockage (minutes)	169.76	250	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average	Sewer blockages typically result in surcharged conditions and an increase in the risk of a sewage spill. BW was able to meet the target over Water Plan 2 through focused endeavours to mitigate the risk of spills.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Spills contained within five hours (per cent)	99.83	100	Accept	Proposed target represents an improved level of service			

Continued next page

**TABLE B.1 (CONTINUED)**

<b>Service standard</b>	<b>5-year average</b>	<b>Proposed target</b>	<b>Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Business response</b>	<b>Follow-up Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>
<b>Sewer (continued)</b>							
Number of customers experiencing more than 3 sewer blockages in a year (number)	0.4	3	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average Variation between submitted historical performance data and Commission audit data	Improved data and asset management tracking information has allowed the Water Plan 2 target to met and it is expected that this will continue into WP3. Relaxing or changing the target would not result in significant savings.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
<b>Customer Service</b>							
Complaints to EWOV (number per 1000 customers)	70	65	Accept	Proposed target represents an improved level of service	Inflationary pressures and utility prices will put pressure on customer disposable incomes; this may lead to complaints to EWOV about water bills and prices. Relaxing or changing the target would not result in significant savings.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Telephone calls within 30 seconds (per cent)	96.12	90	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average	This measure does not provide a reasonable measure of our customers experience when contacting our call centre.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided

**TABLE B.2 CENTRAL HIGHLANDS WATER**  
Business Justification

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Water</b>							
Unplanned water supply interruptions per 100km (number)	14.94	26.5	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Last 4 years lower interruptions due to drought conditions. Adopt 6 year average performance as target - 20.3	Accept	Adequate rationale provided.
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 1) (minutes)	40.13	45	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 2) (minutes)	68.64	90	Reject	Target consistent with historical performance.		Reject	No adequate rationale provided
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 3) (minutes)	163.29	720	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Revised target to 360 minutes. Allows for good business practises to continue and higher priority works to be completed.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided
Unplanned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	96.68	100	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Planned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	92.66	100	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Average unplanned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	12.66	18	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Exceptional circumstances of 2010-11 (two serious flooding events) resulted in an average time off supply in excess of all targets. Central Highlands Water proposes to retain the existing target of 18 minutes	Reject	No adequate rationale provided

Continued next page

**TABLE B.2 (CONTINUED)**

<b>Service standard</b>	<b>5-year average</b>	<b>Proposed target</b>	<b>Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Business response</b>	<b>Follow-up Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>
<b>Water (continued)</b>							
Average planned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	3.55	12	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Planned works always retain some unknown risks which can impact on times to complete works. Central Highlands Water HW proposes to retain the existing target of 12 minutes.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided
Average frequency of unplanned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.08	0.15	Reject	Variation between proposed target and 5 year historical average.	CHW proposes to adopt an improved target of 0.15	Reject	No adequate rationale provided
Average frequency of planned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.02	0.02	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average duration of unplanned water supply interruptions (minutes)	150.61	120	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	The result in 2010-11 differ significantly from the previous years due to factors including extreme wet weather events (accessibility issues due to flooding) and major water main bursts (bursts in distribution mains including Maryborough, Snake Valley and Geelong Road). Central Highlands Water proposes to retain the existing target of 120 minutes	Accept	Adequate rationale provided.
Average duration of planned water supply interruptions (minutes)	181.8	210	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	If the target is reduced to 200 minutes, CHW will be closer to the industry average target and will be more likely to achieve this target on average with continued business focus. CHW proposes to adopt an improved revised target of 200 minutes.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided

Continued next page

**TABLE B.2 (CONTINUED)**

<b>Service standard</b>	<b>5-year average</b>	<b>Proposed target</b>	<b>Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Business response</b>	<b>Follow-up Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>
<b>Water (continued)</b>							
Number of customers experiencing more than 5 unplanned water supply interruptions in a year (number)	9.6	0	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Unaccounted for water (per cent)	13.97	11	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
<b>Sewer</b>							
Sewerage blockages per 100km (number)	19.2	25.4	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average		Reject	No adequate rationale provided
Average time to attend sewer spills and blockages (minutes)	46.78	45	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Average time to rectify a sewer blockage (minutes)	117.79	120	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Spills contained within five hours (per cent)	100	100	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Number of customers experiencing more than 3 sewer blockages in a year (number)	0	0	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
<b>Customer Service</b>							
Complaints to EWOV (number per 1000 customers)	No Audit Data Available	0.6	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Telephone calls within 30 seconds (per cent)	No Audit Data Available	90	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			

**TABLE B.3 COLIBAN WATER**  
Business Justification

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Water</b>							
Unplanned water supply interruptions per 100km (number)	19.24	20	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 1) (minutes)	32.34	32	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 2) (minutes)	86.08	80	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 3) (minutes)	722.95	1440	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average	Due to easing of drought conditions and nature of this type of very minor leak (negligible impact on customers or environment), Coliban Water propose to lower target to reduce operating costs. Lowest priority breaks reported at close of business can be responded to the next day, reducing overtime costs	Accept	Adequate rationale provided.
Unplanned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	97.95	98	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Planned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	100	98	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average unplanned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	15.5	12	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			

Continued next page



**TABLE B.3 (CONTINUED)**

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Water (continued)</b>							
Average planned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	0.11	14	Accept	Adequate rationale provided – Coliban Water undertook less planned maintenance and has in place a policy in which no planned interruptions will occur. The 5-year average performance is thus misleading and Coliban Water will be reverting to the industry average.			
Average frequency of unplanned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.11	0.1	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average frequency of planned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0	0.1	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average duration of unplanned water supply interruptions (minutes)	140.2	120	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			

Continued next page

**TABLE B.3 (CONTINUED)**

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Water (continued)</b>							
Average duration of planned water supply interruptions (minutes)	31.87	140	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average Variation between submitted historical performance data and Commission audit data	Coliban Water have not had any planned interruptions since 2009 as temporary supply measures have been provided to customers prior to any water mains works being conducted. Very little mains flushing, scouring and planned works have been conducted. New focus on proactive water maintenance will allow customers to prepare in advance for when water supply will be interrupted. Proposed target will reduce costs that may otherwise be passed through to the business and customers	Accept	Adequate rationale provided.
Number of customers experiencing more than 5 unplanned water supply interruptions in a year (number)	3.8	5					
Unaccounted for water (per cent)	9.33	15					
<b>Sewer</b>							
Sewerage blockages per 100km (number)	50.89	53					
Average time to attend sewer spills and blockages (minutes)	30.86	30	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average time to rectify a sewer blockage (minutes)	78.4	80					

Continued next page

**TABLE B.3 (CONTINUED)**

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Sewer</b>							
Spills contained within five hours (per cent)	99.89	99	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Number of customers experiencing more than 3 sewer blockages in a year (number)	0.8	2					
<b>Customer Service</b>							
Complaints to EWOV (number per 1000 customers)	No Audit Data Available	2	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Telephone calls within 30 seconds (per cent)	No Audit Data Available	90	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			

**TABLE B.4 EAST GIPPSLAND WATER**  
Business Justification

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Water</b>							
Unplanned water supply interruptions per 100km (number)	8.81	10	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 1) (minutes)	6	30	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Commission's average has picked up years that have not had any priority 1 bursts and leaks which gives an innappropriate result.	Accept	Adequate rationale provided i.e. exclude years with no bursts
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 2) (minutes)	39.2	34	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 3) (minutes)	66.43	80	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	This target has been adjusted as a result of service rationalisation where non urgent and critical priority 3 leaks will be included in scheduled planned maintenance which will have an increased response time.	Accept	Adequate rationale provided i.e. program is efficient, reasonable to continue. They have clearly demonstrated what has changed in the business and why
Unplanned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	97.47	98	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Planned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	97.62	98	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average unplanned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	8.24	7	Accept	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.			

Continued next page

**TABLE B.4 (CONTINUED)**

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Water (continued)</b>							
Average planned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	30.37	28	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Average frequency of unplanned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.1	0.1	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Average frequency of planned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.21	0.3	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Adopt updated target based on 2 last 2 year average to better reflect performance following planned maintenance strategy	Accept	Adequate rationale provided. They have clearly demonstrated that previous data is not relevant and therefore excluded
Average duration of unplanned water supply interruptions (minutes)	82.07	75	Accept	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.			
Average duration of planned water supply interruptions (minutes)	137.26	170	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Target revised to reflect last 3 year average of 169 minutes where average duration of planned interruptions have increased due to greater frequency of planned maintenance.	Accept	Adequate rationale provided. They have clearly demonstrated that previous data is not relevant and therefore excluded
Number of customers experiencing more than 5 unplanned water supply interruptions in a year (number)	0	0	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Unaccounted for water (per cent)	14.66	11	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.	Adopt ESC audit average to match tighter fiscal constraints.	Accept	Revised proposal meets ESC audit 5-year average.

Continued next page

**TABLE B.4 (CONTINUED)**

<b>Service standard</b>	<b>5-year average</b>	<b>Proposed target</b>	<b>Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Business response</b>	<b>Follow-up Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>
<b>Sewer</b>							
Sewerage blockages per 100km (number)	11.92	15					
Average time to attend sewer spills and blockages (minutes)	42.03	40	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average time to rectify a sewer blockage (minutes)	97.44	80	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Spills contained within five hours (per cent)	98.94	100	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Number of customers experiencing more than 3 sewer blockages in a year (number)	0	0	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
<b>Customer Service</b>							
Complaints to EWOV (number per 1000 customers)	No Audit Data Available	0.06	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Telephone calls within 30 seconds (per cent)	No Audit Data Available	96	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			

**TABLE B.5 GIPPSLAND WATER**  
Business Justification

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Water</b>							
Unplanned water supply interruptions per 100km (number)	18.01	19.5	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 1) (minutes)	31.2	35	Accept	Slight increase due to level of expenditure on mains renewal			
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 2) (minutes)	144.84	138	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 3) (minutes)	1659.73	2000	Accept	Reflects current business practice of focus on priority one and 2 events			
Unplanned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	98.25	98	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Planned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	97.45	90	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Average unplanned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	8.82	10.8	Accept	Slight increase due to level of expenditure on mains renewal			
Average planned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	13.39	12	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Average frequency of unplanned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.11	0.12	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			

Continued next page

**TABLE B.5 (CONTINUED)**

<b>Service standard</b>	<b>5-year average</b>	<b>Proposed target</b>	<b>Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Business response</b>	<b>Follow-up Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>
<b>Water (continued)</b>							
Average frequency of planned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.09	0.08	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Average duration of unplanned water supply interruptions (minutes)	86.2	90	Accept	Slight increase due to level of expenditure on mains renewal			
Average duration of planned water supply interruptions (minutes)	149.83	150	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Number of customers experiencing more than 5 unplanned water supply interruptions in a year (number)	2	0	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Unaccounted for water (per cent)	10.6	12	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
<b>Sewer</b>							
Sewerage blockages per 100km (number)	15.21	18	Accept	Business used 06/07 - 10/11 average to exclude outlier.			
Average time to attend sewer spills and blockages (minutes)	115.35	40	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Average time to rectify a sewer blockage (minutes)	94.24	95	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Spills contained within five hours (per cent)	90.63	98	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Number of customers experiencing more than 3 sewer blockages in a year (number)	0	0	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			

Continued next page



**TABLE B.5 (CONTINUED)**

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Customer Service</b>							
Complaints to EWOV (number per 1000 customers)	No Audit Data Available	0.08	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Telephone calls within 30 seconds (per cent)	No Audit Data Available	84	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			

**TABLE B.6 GOULBURN VALLEY WATER**  
Business Justification

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Water</b>							
Unplanned water supply interruptions per 100km (number)	17.54	18.7	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 1) (minutes)	2.8	30	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Goulburn Valley Water has recorded very few Priority 1 bursts. Due to the limited data available, the existing target will be retained.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 2) (minutes)	35.36	60	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	The classification of Priority 2 bursts has been improved over the past 5 years. The last two years are considered the most representative of current performance.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 3) (minutes)	189.21	300	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Performance in 07/08 is considered to be an outlier in the historical data and does not reflect current practices for recording performance against this indicator. The long term average is similar to the existing Water Plan 2 target if 07/08 data is excluded. The existing target has been retained.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided
Unplanned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	99.02	98	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Planned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	99.22	99	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			

Continued next page

**TABLE B.6 (CONTINUED)**

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Water (continued)</b>							
Average unplanned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	11.99	13.6	Accept	Adequate rationale - performance in 2010/11 is considered an outlier due to high rainfall reducing soil movement and consequential water mains failures. Data from 2008/09 and 2009/10 is considered the most representative and the target is similar to the average of this period.			
Average planned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	4.43	6	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	The number of planned interruptions is influenced by the level of property development which declined over the past two years. The period from 03/04 to 08/09 is considered most representative of future development conditions. Average performance from 03/04 to 08/09 is similar to the Water Plan 2 target. The existing target has been retained.	Reject	No adequate explanation provided as to why current trend is not expected to continue
Average frequency of unplanned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.12	0.15	Accept	Adequate rationale - performance in 2010/11 is considered an outlier due to high rainfall reducing soil movement and consequential water mains failures. The long term average excluding 2010/11 data has been adopted as the target.			

Continued next page

**TABLE B.6 (CONTINUED)**

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Water (continued)</b>							
Average frequency of planned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.04	0.05	Accept	Adequate rationale - the period from 2003/04 to 2008/09 is considered most representative of future development conditions. The average performance has been adopted as the target.			
Average duration of unplanned water supply interruptions (minutes)	100.1	100	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average duration of planned water supply interruptions (minutes)	95.52	110	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	The number of planned interruptions is influenced by the level of development which has declined over the past two years. The period from 03/04 to 08/09 is considered most representative of future development conditions. Average performance from 03/04 to 08/09 is 109 minutes. A target of 110 minutes has been adopted.	Reject	No adequate explanation provided as to why current trend is not expected to continue
Number of customers experiencing more than 5 unplanned water supply interruptions in a year (number)	0	85	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Unaccounted for water (per cent)	8.92	9.1	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			

Continued next page

**TABLE B.6 (CONTINUED)**

<b>Service standard</b>	<b>5-year average</b>	<b>Proposed target</b>	<b>Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Business response</b>	<b>Follow-up Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>
<b>Sewer</b>							
Sewerage blockages per 100km (number)	21.79	23.6	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average time to attend sewer spills and blockages (minutes)	45.61	60	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	The average for the past 5 years has been less than the Water Plan 2 target. The longer term average (8 years) is 54 minutes. Due to the travel distances between Goulburn Valley Water towns the existing target of 60 minutes remains appropriate and has been retained.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided
Average time to rectify a sewer blockage (minutes)	119.13	150	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	The average for the past 5 years has been less than the Water Plan 2 target. The longer term average (8 years) is 158 minutes. Due to the travel distances between Goulburn Valley Water towns, the existing target of 150 minutes remains appropriate and has been retained.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided
Spills contained within five hours (per cent)	99	100	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Number of customers experiencing more than 3 sewer blockages in a year (number)	0.2	0	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
<b>Customer Service</b>							
Complaints to EWOV (number per 1000 customers)	No Audit Data Available	0.68	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Telephone calls within 30 seconds (per cent)	No Audit Data Available	97	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			

**TABLE B.7 GWMWATER**  
Business Justification

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Water</b>							
Unplanned water supply interruptions per 100km (number)	29.38	30	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 1) (minutes)	24.48	30	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Business proposes to maintain existing level of response time	Reject	No adequate rationale provided
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 2) (minutes)	26.33	40	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Target can be reduced without additional expenditure to reflect current practice	Reject	No adequate rationale provided
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 3) (minutes)	31.76	40	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Target can be reduced without additional expenditure to reflect current practice	Reject	No adequate rationale provided
Unplanned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	98.31	97	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Planned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	98.63	97	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average unplanned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	15.93	20	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Level of service consistent with Victorian water industry	Reject	No adequate rationale provided
Average planned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	39.3	30	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average frequency of unplanned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.19	0.2	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			

Continued next page

**TABLE B.7 (CONTINUED)**

<b>Service standard</b>	<b>5-year average</b>	<b>Proposed target</b>	<b>Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Business response</b>	<b>Follow-up Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>
<b>Water (continued)</b>							
Average frequency of planned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.26	0.3	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average duration of unplanned water supply interruptions (minutes)	83.05	100	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Level of service consistent with Victorian water industry	Reject	No adequate rationale provided
Average duration of planned water supply interruptions (minutes)	144.44	180	Accept	Adequate rationale provided. The increase may be explained by the increase in cleaning water mains to improve water quality			
Number of customers experiencing more than 5 unplanned water supply interruptions in a year (number)	0	0	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Unaccounted for water (per cent)	11.1	12	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
<b>Sewer</b>							
Sewerage blockages per 100km (number)	31.26	36	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average time to attend sewer spills and blockages (minutes)	21.54	30	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Response time is acceptable	Reject	No adequate rationale provided
Average time to rectify a sewer blockage (minutes)	113.09	130	Reject		The times taken to rectify sewer blockages are acceptable across the industry.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided
Spills contained within five hours (per cent)	98.68	98	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			

Continued next page

**TABLE B.7 (CONTINUED)**

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Sewer (continued)</b>							
Number of customers experiencing more than 3 sewer blockages in a year (number)	0	0	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
<b>Customer Service</b>							
Complaints to EWOV (number per 1000 customers)	No Audit Data Available	0.9	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Telephone calls within 30 seconds (per cent)	No Audit Data Available	80	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			



**TABLE B.8 LOWER MURRAY WATER**  
Business Justification

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Water</b>							
Unplanned water supply interruptions per 100km (number)	48.22	51.34	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 1) (minutes)	17.49	20	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 2) (minutes)	15.57	20	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 3) (minutes)	13.88	20	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Unplanned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	99.63	99.48	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Planned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	99.29	98	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average unplanned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	11.32	13.36	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average planned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	36.27	3.11	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Average frequency of unplanned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.19	0.21	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			

Continued next page

**TABLE B.8 (CONTNUED)**

<b>Service standard</b>	<b>5-year average</b>	<b>Proposed target</b>	<b>Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Business response</b>	<b>Follow-up Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>
<b>Water (continued)</b>							
Average frequency of planned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.23	0.06	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Average duration of unplanned water supply interruptions (minutes)	59.33	63.73	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average duration of planned water supply interruptions (minutes)	82.41	56.88	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Number of customers experiencing more than 5 unplanned water supply interruptions in a year (number)	9.6	15	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Unaccounted for water (per cent)	8.85	15	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
<b>Sewer</b>							
Sewerage blockages per 100km (number)	19.47	22.6	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average time to attend sewer spills and blockages (minutes)	20.38	18.01	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Average time to rectify a sewer blockage (minutes)	100.99	1.66	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Spills contained within five hours (per cent)	97.01	97	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Number of customers experiencing more than 3 sewer blockages in a year (number)	0.2	0	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			

Continued next page

**TABLE B.8 (CONTINUED)**

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Customer Service</b>							
Complaints to EWOV (number per 1000 customers)	No Audit Data Available	3	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Telephone calls within 30 seconds (per cent)	No Audit Data Available	85	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			

**TABLE B.9 NORTH EAST WATER**  
Business Justification

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Water</b>							
Unplanned water supply interruptions per 100km (number)	11.91	14	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Consistently maintained low water supply interruption rates in the last five years. Interruptions have been increasing. Propose to retain target.	Reject	Unclear rationale. Does not clearly explain why interruptions have been increasing.
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 1) (minutes)	16.43	23	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average Variation between submitted historical performance data and ESC audit data	Target based on 3 year average for the years 2008-09 to 2010-11. NEW propose to retain target as this represent this high point of 2 years in the last 5-years. Variance due to differing time period plus variation between submitted and audited data for 2010-11	Reject	Unclear rationale provided.
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 2) (minutes)	22.52	23	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 3) (minutes)	26.1	60	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average Variation between submitted historical performance data and ESC audit data	Target based on 5-year average for the years 2006-07 to 2010-11. NEW propose to revise target to 31 to reflect high point of the last 5-years. Variance due to differing time period and variation between submitted and audited data for 2007-08	Reject	Unclear rationale provided.
Unplanned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	97.72	98	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Planned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	98.44	100	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			

Continued next page

**TABLE B.8 (CONTINUED)**

<b>Service standard</b>	<b>5-year average</b>	<b>Proposed target</b>	<b>Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Business response</b>	<b>Follow-up Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>
<b>Water (continued)</b>							
Average unplanned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	9.45	6.2	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Average planned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	3.03	4	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average	Target based on 1 plus the average for the 5-year period ending 2010-11.	Reject	Unclear rationale provided.
Average frequency of unplanned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.08	0.1	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average Variation between submitted historical performance data and ESC audit data	Target based on 5-year average to 2010-11 Variance due to differing time period	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Average frequency of planned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.03	0.1	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average	Northeast Water propose to retain target.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Average duration of unplanned water supply interruptions (minutes)	110.17	95	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Average duration of planned water supply interruptions (minutes)	96.05	95	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Number of customers experiencing more than 5 unplanned water supply interruptions in a year (number)	374	375	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Unaccounted for water (per cent)	8.64	11	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average Variation between submitted historical performance data and Commission audit data	Recalculation result 9.3 per cent. Northeast Water believes this is reasonable and consistent with most recent actual result.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.

Continued next page

**TABLE B.8 (CONTINUED)**

<b>Service standard</b>	<b>5-year average</b>	<b>Proposed target</b>	<b>Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Business response</b>	<b>Follow-up Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>
<b>Sewer</b>							
Sewerage blockages per 100km (number)	11.12	12	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Average time to attend sewer spills and blockages (minutes)	24.04	24	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Average time to rectify a sewer blockage (minutes)	138.23	140	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Spills contained within five hours (per cent)	97.79	100	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Number of customers experiencing more than 3 sewer blockages in a year (number)	14	30	Reject	Variation between proposed target and 5 year historical average		Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
<b>Customer Service</b>							
Complaints to EWOV (number per 1000 customers)	No Audit Data Available	0.4	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Telephone calls within 30 seconds (per cent)	No Audit Data Available	95	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			

**TABLE B.9 SOUTH GIPPSLAND WATER**  
Business Justification

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Water</b>							
Unplanned water supply interruptions per 100km (number)	24.05	25	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 1) (minutes)	45.1	30	Accept	Proposed target represents an improved level of service		Accept	
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 2) (minutes)	21.35	40	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average	South Gippsland Water is prepared to vary the target from 40 minutes to 35 minutes. There needs to be a differentiation between priority 1 and priority 2 burst and leaks.	Accept	Adequate rationale provided
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 3) (minutes)	374.44	600	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average	South Gippsland Water cannot reconcile the ESC audit data. South Gippsland Water believes the proposed target of 600 minutes is still appropriate.	Reject	Inadequate rationale provided.
Unplanned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	99.51	99	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Planned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	98.24	99	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			

Continued next page

**TABLE B.9 (CONTINUED)**

<b>Service standard</b>	<b>5-year average</b>	<b>Proposed target</b>	<b>Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Business response</b>	<b>Follow-up Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>
<b>Water (continued)</b>							
Average unplanned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	22.11	30	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average	This standard can heavily depend on climatic conditions during the year and location of the work.	Reject	No adequate rationale provided
Average planned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	53.82	100	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average	Planned interruptions are mostly due to air scouring activities. In the last five years, air scouring was suspended during the drought years. From 2013, there is an increased focus on air scouring in order to reduce water quality complaints	Accept	Adequate rationale provided.
Average frequency of unplanned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.22	0.3	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average	This standard can heavily depend on climatic conditions during the year and location of the work. The average is skewed by 2011-12, a wet year.	Accept	Adequate rationale provided
Average frequency of planned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.24	0.4	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average	Planned interruptions are mostly due to air scouring activities. In the last five years, air scouring was suspended during the drought years. From 2013, there is an increased focus on air scouring in order to reduce water quality complaints	Accept	Adequate rationale provided
Average duration of unplanned water supply interruptions (minutes)	97.56	100	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Average duration of planned water supply interruptions (minutes)	220.79	250	Reject	Variation between proposed target and 5 year historical average	Given historical results is still an appropriate target	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Number of customers experiencing more than 5 unplanned water supply interruptions in a year (number)	0	0	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			

Continued next page



**TABLE B.9 (CONTINUED)**

<b>Service standard</b>	<b>5-year average</b>	<b>Proposed target</b>	<b>Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Business response</b>	<b>Follow-up Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>
<b>Water (continued)</b>							
Unaccounted for water (per cent)	16.35	16	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
<b>Sewer</b>							
Sewerage blockages per 100km (number)	17.13	18	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Average time to attend sewer spills and blockages (minutes)	30.32	30	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Average time to rectify a sewer blockage (minutes)	111.71	120	Accept				
Spills contained within five hours (per cent)	100	100	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Number of customers experiencing more than 3 sewer blockages in a year (number)	0	0	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
<b>Customer Service</b>							
Complaints to EWOV (number per 1000 customers)	No Audit Data Available	1.1	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			
Telephone calls within 30 seconds (per cent)	No Audit Data Available	98	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance			

**TABLE B.10 WANNON WATER**  
Business Justification

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Water</b>							
Unplanned water supply interruptions per 100km (number)	7.54	9.2	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 1) (minutes)	19.68	21	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 2) (minutes)	28.51	40	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Calculated average of five years performance and added (or deducted) one standard deviation	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 3) (minutes)	82.31	118	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Calculated average of five years performance and added (or deducted) one standard deviation	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Unplanned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	98.48	97	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Calculated average of five years performance and added (or deducted) one standard deviation	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Planned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	96.63	93	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Calculated average of five years performance and added (or deducted) one standard deviation	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Average unplanned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	4.34	6.3	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Calculated average of five years performance and added (or deducted) one standard deviation	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Average planned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	1.92	3.8	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Calculated average of five years performance and added (or deducted) one standard deviation	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Average frequency of unplanned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.06	0.07	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Calculated average of five years performance and added (or deducted) one standard deviation	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.

Continued next page

**TABLE B.10 (CONTINUED)**

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Water (continued)</b>							
Average frequency of planned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.02	0.03	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Calculated average of five years performance and added (or deducted) one standard deviation	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Average duration of unplanned water supply interruptions (minutes)	74.49	91	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Calculated average of five years performance and added (or deducted) one standard deviation	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Average duration of planned water supply interruptions (minutes)	132.07	166	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Calculated average of five years performance and added (or deducted) one standard deviation	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Number of customers experiencing more than 5 unplanned water supply interruptions in a year (number)	0	0	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Unaccounted for water (per cent)	15.45	14	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
<b>Sewer</b>							
Sewerage blockages per 100km (number)	11.24	22	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Calculated average of five years performance and added (or deducted) one standard deviation	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Average time to attend sewer spills and blockages (minutes)	38.03	62	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Calculated average of five years performance and added (or deducted) one standard deviation	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Average time to rectify a sewer blockage (minutes)	100.22	127	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Calculated average of five years performance and added (or deducted) one standard deviation	Reject	No adequate rationale provided.
Spills contained within five hours (per cent)	99.84	99	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Number of customers experiencing more than 3 sewer blockages in a year (number)	0	0	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			

Continued next page

**TABLE B.10 (CONTINUED)**

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Customer Service</b>							
Complaints to EWOV (number per 1000 customers)	No Audit Data Available	0.6	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Telephone calls within 30 seconds (per cent)	No Audit Data Available	98.9	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			

**TABLE B.11 WESTERNPORT WATER**  
Business Justification

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Water</b>							
Unplanned water supply interruptions per 100km (number)	34.79	40	Accept				
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 1) (minutes)	12.85	30	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average	Average response times are reflecting instances where WPW staff reported priority 1 bursts at the time of completing maintenance works. ESC target impractical. Propose to retain Proposed target.	Accept	Adequate rationale i.e. exclude instances where staff were already present on site.
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 2) (minutes)	68.51	100	Accept				
Average time taken to attend bursts and leaks (Priority 3) (minutes)	224.78	450	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average	Allows for overnight calls. If customer is agreeable then work is scheduled for next business day. This represents a business efficiency and good customer service.	Accept	Adequate rationale i.e. allowing for more efficient use of resources.
Unplanned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	97.82	100	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Planned water supply interruptions restored within five hours (per cent)	93.95	100	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Average unplanned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	63.05	50	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Average planned customer minutes off water supply (minutes)	98.03	90	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			

Continued next page

**TABLE B.11 (CONTINUED)**

<b>Service standard</b>	<b>5-year average</b>	<b>Proposed target</b>	<b>Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Business response</b>	<b>Follow-up Accept/Reject</b>	<b>Reason</b>
<b>Water (continued)</b>							
Average frequency of unplanned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.53	0.3	Reject	Variation between Proposed target and 5-year historical average.	Changed to reflect ESC audit data	Accept	Changed to close to 5-year average performance.
Average frequency of planned water supply interruptions (number per customer per year)	0.54	0.5	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average duration of unplanned water supply interruptions (minutes)	114.72	120	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Average duration of planned water supply interruptions (minutes)	179.07	120	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Number of customers experiencing more than 5 unplanned water supply interruptions in a year (number)	0	1500	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Unaccounted for water (per cent)	9.29	10	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
<b>Sewer</b>							
Sewerage blockages per 100km (number)	6.4	10.8	Reject	Variation between proposed target and 5 year historical average		Reject	No adequate rationale provided
Average time to attend sewer spills and blockages (minutes)	137.78	90	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Average time to rectify a sewer blockage (minutes)	236.21	200	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			
Spills contained within five hours (per cent)	90.71	100	Accept	Target represents an improved level of service.			

Continued next page

**TABLE B.11 (CONTINUED)**

Service standard	5-year average	Proposed target	Accept/Reject	Reason	Business response	Follow-up Accept/Reject	Reason
<b>Sewer (continued)</b>							
Number of customers experiencing more than 3 sewer blockages in a year (number)	0	0	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
<b>Customer Service</b>							
Complaints to EWOV (number per 1000 customers)	No Audit Data Available	1.1	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			
Telephone calls within 30 seconds (per cent)	No Audit Data Available	90	Accept	Target consistent with historical performance.			



# APPENDIX C — GUARANTEED SERVICE LEVELS

**TABLE C.1 GSL'S BY BUSINESS**

<b>Water Business</b>	<b>GSLs Proposed (in addition to the hardship-related GSL)</b>	<b>WP2 Payment \$</b>	<b>WP3 Payment \$</b>	<b>New or existing</b>
Barwon Water	No more than two sewer spills on a customer's property per year	500 <sup>a</sup>	553	Amended
	No more than five unplanned water supply interruptions per customer per year	65	72	Existing
	No more than three unplanned sewerage service interruptions to a customer's property per year	65	72	Existing
Central Highlands Water	Rectifying any unplanned interruption to a customer's water supply within five hours of CHW becoming aware of the interruption	25	50	Existing
	Not more than five water supply interruptions for each customer in any 12 month period.	25	50	Existing
	If a water service pipe, for which CHW has responsibilities to maintain under the Customer Charter, is leaking, CHW will fix it within five business days of becoming aware of the leak	25	50	Existing
	Rectifying any interruption to a customer's sewerage service within five hours of CHW becoming aware of the interruption	25	50	Existing
	Not exceeding three sewerage service interruptions for each customer in any 12 month period	25	50	Existing
Coliban Water	More than five unplanned supply interruptions in 12 months		50	New
	More than three sewer interruptions in 12 months		50	New
	Sewer spill in a house not contained in one hour		1 000	New
East Gippsland Water	Planned interruption to water supply exceeds delay specified in notice		65	New
	Response to customer contact within 10 working days, if required.		30	New
	Failure to update billing details		30	New
	Sewage spill caused by business within house		1 000	New
Gippsland Water	<b>No GSL scheme proposed</b>			

Continued next page

**TABLE C.1 (CONTINUED)**

<b>Water Business</b>	<b>GSLs Proposed (in addition to the hardship-related GSL)</b>	<b>WP2 Payment \$</b>	<b>WP3 Payment \$</b>	<b>New or existing</b>
Goulburn Valley Water	More than five unplanned water interruptions within any 12 month period		50	New
	Sewage spills in a house contained within one hour of notification		1 000	New
	Water interruptions not restored within five hours of notification		50	New
	More than three sewerage interruptions within any 12 month period		50	New
GWMWater	Unplanned water interruptions not restored within five hours of notification		50	New
	Planned interruption longer than notification		50	New
	Sewer interruption not restored within five hours of notification		50	New
	Sewer spill within house, caused by failure of system, not contained within one hour		1 000	New
Lower Murray Water	More than five unplanned water interruptions in a year		75	New
	More than three sewer blockages in a year		75	New
	Priority 1 and 2 sewerage spills not contained within five hours		500	New
North East Water	More than five unplanned water interruptions within 12 month period		50	New
	Sewage spills in a house not contained within one hour of notification		1 000	New
South Gippsland Water	Unplanned water interruptions not restored within five hours of notification.		75	New
	Unplanned interruptions to sewer service not rectified within five hours of notification		75	New
	Sewage spill within house caused by business.		1 000	New
Wannon Water	More than five unplanned water supply interruptions to a property within 12 month period	50	50	Existing
	Sewer spill within residential property not contained within one hour of notification.	500	500	Existing
Westernport Water	Unplanned water interruption not restored within five hours of notification		50	New
	Sewage spills within a house not contained within one hour of notification		500	New
	Sewage spill not contained within five hours of notification		250	New

<sup>a</sup> Guaranteed service level has been amended, see volume II for details

# APPENDIX D – NEW CUSTOMER CONTRIBUTIONS SUBMISSIONS

## D.1 RODGER CONSTRUCTIONS

Rodger Constructions of Warrnambool engaged an expert third party consultant to analyse how Wannon Water calculated standard NCC. Its submission stated that the consultant asserted that Wannon Water had not calculated standard NCC in a way that is consistent with the Commission’s NCC pricing principles. In particular Wannon Water had incorrectly:

- used average operating costs instead of incremental operating costs in its calculations
- accounted for tax effects. Wannon Water should set its tax rate to zero in the model. This is because it does not pay tax and is not likely to do so for a significant period of time
- included depreciation in the calculation of NCC

### Commission response

The Commission engaged Sinclair Knight Merz (SKM) to review the expenditure forecasts used by Wannon Water in its calculation of standard NCC.

SKM found Wannon Water had adopted a simplistic approach to estimate incremental operating costs. Under this approach:

- Incremental cost is equal to current operating costs divided by total number of megalitres supplied and or treated. This average cost is then assumed to be the incremental cost per additional megalitre treated and/or supplied – for the next planning period. SKM assessed this approach to estimating incremental costs reasonable.

SKM assessed that this approach to estimate incremental costs to be reasonable for the calculation of NCC under the new regime. The Commission accepted its finding.

The Commission considers the water businesses should include a tax rate in the model only for the years it expects to pay tax. For this reason, it does not propose to accept Wannon Water's position with regard to tax effects. It requires Wannon Water to forecast the year it expects to pay tax and adjust the tax rates in the model to reflect that timing.

Further, the Commission considers costs included in the calculation should be cash costs. So, it does not propose to accept Wannon Water's proposed use of depreciation in its NCC calculation. It requires Wannon Water to remove depreciation amounts from its NCC calculation.

#### **D.1.2 JOHN BARNES**

John Barnes of Brown Hill issued a submission about Central Highlands Water's proposed NCC framework, namely:

- when the negotiating framework applies
- eligibility criteria for \$0 NCC
- the reasons for a \$0 NCC
- Central Highlands Water's internal processes for managing NCC

#### **Commission response**

The negotiating framework should apply in all situations when a property owner requests connection to a water business's network, which Central Highlands Water explains in clause 3.2 of its negotiating framework. However, this is inconsistent with Central Highlands Water's description in clause 3.1 which states:

*"CHW intends to adopt the ESC's negotiating framework, as outlined in the ESC guidance paper, as the standard framework by which NCC's will be negotiated with connection applicants. CHW will apply the framework to 'Greenfield' and significant in-fill developments within CHW's area of operations".*

The Commission considers Central Highlands Water should clarify with all stakeholders that the NCC negotiating framework applies in all situations where

an application is made to connect to water business's water, sewerage and recycled water networks.

### **Reasons for a \$0 NCC**

In the 2012 NCC guidance paper the Commission asked water businesses to consult on standard NCC. This consultation should include provide an overview of the cost drivers in the NCC calculation and describe the eligibility criteria that relate to the NCC. The Commission requires Central Highlands Water to confirm its NCC proposal and explain to stakeholders the reasons for a \$0 NCC or any amended NCC.

### **Eligibility criteria for \$0 NCC**

Central Highlands Water's propose a standard NCC of \$0 per lot for water and sewerage. But it noted a NCC may still apply when significant capital expenditure is required to service new development, or in the case of out of sequence development.

Central Highlands Water must define the areas where the \$0 per lot NCC applies and define the threshold above which it will levy a NCC.

### **Central Highlands Water's internal processes for managing NCC**

The Commission does not have a role in stipulating the internal processes that a water business should adopt to manage NCC.

# APPENDIX E – MISCELLANEOUS CHARGES

**TABLE E.1 BARWON WATER**

Miscellaneous Charge <sup>a</sup>	Definition	Charge
Information Statement	Information statements are certificates issued by Barwon Water that provide rate and encumbrance information to solicitors or conveyances. When the sale of a property occurs, we receive a request from the conveyance or solicitor representing the purchaser asking Barwon Water to provide the most current information about charges outstanding and the relevant encumbrances on the property. The solicitors and conveyances then use the information at settlement of the property to adjust charges between the vendor and purchaser	\$22.42
Tenancy meter reading	This fee is charged to the landlord/owner for each new tenancy. It covers both the cost to read the meter on occupancy and again when the tenant vacates.	\$26.13
Application for the processing of Sewer Connection - Sewer Application Fee - New (includes block plan charge)	This fee is charged to the applicant. This includes a consent number, blockplan & customer package.	\$80.70
Dumping of Effluent (per kL)	This fee is charged for the acceptance, treating and testing of septic waste.	\$21.34
Developer Works Process Fees Initial Construction Audit Fee, >20 lots – Sewer	This fee is charged to the applicant. This includes on-site construction audit of sewer assets for land development lots greater than 20 lots developer funded.	\$1 523.65
Meter Connection Fee	This fee is charged to the applicant for each meter placed at the property by Barwon Water.	\$45.31
Sale of Meter (per meter) 20mm	This fee is charged for the provision of a 20mm meter.	\$54.43
Dual pipe application - includes 20mm meter recycled water meter and assembly	This fee is charged to the applicant for each recycled water meter placed.	\$252.38
Special meter reading	When the sale of a property occurs a special meter reading needs to be applied for. This is used to calculate the charges that are due at the time of settlement.	\$12.52
Dual pipe application-includes 20mm meter drinking water meter and assembly	This fee is charged to the applicant for each drinking water meter placed.	\$200.09

<sup>a</sup> based on forecast revenue

**TABLE E.2 CENTRAL HIGHLANDS WATER**

Miscellaneous Charge	Definition	Charge
----------------------	------------	--------



Plumbing Consents	Cost to review/assess and consent to plumbing changes for a property	\$111.75
Special Meter Reads	Meter reads (out of billing cycle sequence) for tenants / owners vacating a property	\$24.88
Meter Cost - 20mm (per item)	Cost to provide a new water meter	\$99.30
Meter Installation	The installation of a meter	\$70.00
Water Tapping Fee - std 20mm	Cost to provide a new connection into CHW water mains	\$211.08
Meter Connection Fee	This fee is charged to the applicant for each meter placed at the property by Barwon Water.	\$45.31

**TABLE E.3 COLIBAN WATER**

Miscellaneous Charge	Definition	Charge
Not provided		

**TABLE E.4 EAST GIPPSLAND WATER**

<b>Miscellaneous Charge</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Charge</b>
Farm Operations	Leasing/rental charges applied to farm operations/houses are determined by market demand. Farming Leases go through a tender process and rental of Corporation houses are managed by property agents.	
Water connection fee 20mm - connection cost including materials	This includes full tapping and water meter installation to the property boundary.	\$385.00
Water connection fee 25mm - connection cost including materials	As above	\$862.00
Water connection fee >50mm - connection cost including materials	As above	Actual cost plus 25%
Water connection fee 20mm - complete connection cost to meter	The tapping into the water main and water meter have been combined into one single charge called water connection. The fee is based on the effort and material to connect to the water main and the size of the pipes ranging from 20mm to 50mm. This charge involves the customer's plumber preparing the location and installation of the meter.	\$385.00
Water connection fee 25mm - complete connection cost to meter	As above	\$510.00
Water connection fee 32mm - complete connection cost to meter	As above	\$825.00
Water connection fee 40mm - complete connection cost to meter	As above	\$925.00
Water connection fee 50mm - complete connection cost to meter	As above	\$1 350.00
Water connection fee >50mm - complete connection cost to meter	As above	Actual cost plus 25%
Materials for connection only (includes meter, stop tap, nuts and tails, ferrule bend) - 20mm	Price for materials only, necessary for connection	\$230.00
Materials for connection only (includes meter, stop tap, nuts and tails, ferrule bend) - 25mm	As above	\$355.00
Materials for connection only (includes meter, stop tap, nuts and tails, ferrule bend) - 32mm	As above	\$680.00

Continued next page

**TABLE E.4 (CONTINUED)**

<b>Miscellaneous Charge</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Charge</b>
Materials for connection only (includes meter, stop tap, nuts and tails, ferrule bend) - 40mm	As above	\$770
Materials for connection only (includes meter, stop tap, nuts and tails, ferrule bend) - 50mm	As above	\$1 195.00
Materials for connection only (includes meter, stop tap, nuts and tails, ferrule bend) - >50mm	As above	Actual cost plus 25%
Meter only - 20mm	Price of meter only	\$57.00
Meter only - 25mm	As above	\$144.00
Meter only - 32mm	As above	\$411.00
Meter only - 40mm	As above	\$486.00
Meter only - 50mm	As above	\$717.00
Meter only - >50mm	As above	Actual cost plus 25%
Meter with Remote Reader - 20mm	Non-residential property owners will be required to install a meter with a device that enable remote reading capability. Designated residential areas will also be required to install meters that have remote reading capability. Where this is a requirement customers will only be charged the meter reader at cost without on costs.	\$177.00
Meter with Remote Reader - 25mm	As above	\$264.00
Meter with Remote Reader - 32mm	As above	\$531.00
Meter with Remote Reader - 40mm	As above	\$606.00
Meter with Remote Reader - 50mm	As above	\$837.00
Meter with Remote Reader - >50mm	As above	Actual cost plus 25% on meter only
Road under bore	Where an under road/street bore is required for complete water connection, only the actual cost will be charged to the customer.	Actual cost
Water Meter Connection Rebooking Fee	A water meter connection rebooking fee of \$60 will be charged where a customer or their plumber has not honoured an agreed meeting time which requires a revisit.	\$60.00
Sewerage Connection/Cut & Seal/Alteration/Disconnection Application	This fee \$155 is charged for checking sewer availability and issuing a Plumbing Industry Commission (PIC) consent number.	

Continued next page

**TABLE E.4 (CONTINUED)**

Miscellaneous Charge	Definition	Charge
Road under bore	Where an under road/street bore is required for complete water connection, only the actual cost will be charged to the customer.	Actual cost
Water Meter Connection Rebooking Fee	A water meter connection rebooking fee of \$60 will be charged where a customer or their plumber has not honoured an agreed meeting time which requires a revisit.	\$60.00
Sewerage Connection/Cut & Seal/Alteration/Disconnection Application	This fee \$155 is charged for checking sewer availability and issuing a Plumbing Industry Commission (PIC) consent number.	\$155.00
Standard Information Certificate	This fee is charged to provide details regarding outstanding charges and tariffs and any other conditions/encumbrances that may apply to a property title by the Corporation. Information statements are requested for transfer of property transactions. Details are provided as an information certificate/statement defined by the <i>Water Act (1989)</i> . Customers will be offered a choice for this service: (a) Standard Information Certificate based on providing information statements within 5 days as per approved ESC KPIS; (b) Premium Information Certificate provides customers with a quicker 1-2 day turnaround time for information statements at 1.5 times the standard price.	\$50.00
Premium Information Certificate	As above	\$75.00
Rental/Lease Charges	Rental charges for use of Corporation owned land are largely determined by market demand. Rent/lease payments for use of land are determined by market demand. Residential property is managed independently using local real estate agents and fees are adjusted as recommended by the agent. Charges for leasing telecommunication sites are market driven and reviewed on expiry of leases.	
Legal Fees Recovered	Actual legal costs incurred for debt recovery or dishonoured payments are directly charged back to customers for full cost recovery as approved by the ESC. No overheads or Corporation costs are on these charges.	Actual legal costs
Metered Hydrant	A comprehensive assessment of the cost to administer this system was undertaken. Management are confident that the administration cost of \$250 per annum is within the Corporation's pricing principles to ensure backflow and calibration requirements are met as well as billing administration and hydrant depreciation.	\$500.00 Refundable deposit to be issued with metered hydrant \$250.00 Annual administration fee Advertised customer service price per kL

Continued next page

**TABLE E.4 (CONTINUED)**

Miscellaneous Charge	Definition	Charge
Standpipe Water Token (per kL)	Tokens are sold to customers for access to any of the Corporation's four standpipes. One token = 1 kilolitre of fully treated water. Tokens are to be based on the advertised customer service price per kilolitre of water x 200 per cent to cover fixed costs of servicing and providing standpipe infrastructure.	
Meter Reading Fee	A \$60 fee is charged to read meters outside of the normal meter reading cycle, normally in conjunction with an Information Statement or where there is a change of tenant/owner. This fee is for a meter reading and does include an information statement.	\$60.00
Meter Fee Access Fee	This \$60 fee is charged when a property owner does not provide appropriate access for water meter reading and following third official written warning notification and where a revisit is required, plus \$10 extra for each further written request.	\$60.00 plus \$10.00 for for each further written request
DHS Fee for Administration of Water Charge Concessions	Fee for the Corporation to process concession claims determined by DHS.	
Scrap Asset Sales	Revenue from disposal of damaged or obsolete fittings as required.	
Septic Tank Disposal Fee (per kL)	This fee is charged to dispose of domestic (residential household) septic tank waste at the Corporation's Sewerage Treatment Plants. Fee based on cost recovery for administration, treatment and provision of access to dispose waste.	\$20.00
Fire Services Application Fee (per kL)	Where a customer has, or requests, a fire service to be provided to their property the appropriate fees indicated for water connection apply. The fire services application fee is additional and includes sealing and recording of fire service details on the customer information system.	\$63.00
Resealing Fire Hose	A fee is charged to reseal a fire service hose. Broken seal suggests unauthorised water use and customers are charged a resealing fee to replace the seal, use of water and as a penalty and deterrent to ensure that fire hoses remain available for emergency fire fighting only. Industry average charge of \$135 is applied for the first resealing, second resealing charged at \$200.	\$135.00 First Resealing \$200 Second Resealing
Water Flow Test	A test that checks the water flow (litres per minute) at the customer meter. Customers can request this test if they believe they have low water flow that does not meet EGW flow rate standards of 20 litres per minute (20mm water connection). Water flow testing comprises travel to property, carrying out a water measure test and written report back to customer.	\$75.00
AS2419 Compliance Flow and Pressure Test for Fire Hydrant Installation	A more comprehensive pressure and flow test per section 3.3 of AS2419 2005 Fire Hydrant installation may also be carried out on request at a cost of \$205.	\$205.00

Continued next page

**TABLE E.4 (CONTINUED)**

Miscellaneous Charge	Definition	Charge
Water Quality Test	<p>This test checks the water quality from the customer meter. Customers can request this test if they believe that water quality does not meet approved service standards. The test consists of collecting a water sample, sending sample to an independent testing laboratory and associated administration.</p> <p>The Customer Charter allows the Corporation to charge for the test if the water quality is found to meet approved water quality standards.</p>	Actual cost plus 25%
Testing Water Meters	<p>"This test is carried out on the customer water meter to check its accuracy. EGW's Customer Charter provides ability for customers to request a water meter test to ascertain its accuracy within +/- 5% of acceptable industry standards.</p> <p>If the test demonstrates that a meter is reading higher than accepted industry tolerance levels, EGW will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) repair or replace the inaccurate meter;</li> <li>(b) pay the cost of the test; and</li> <li>(c) adjust the usage account accordingly" </li></ul>	Actual cost plus 25%
Account/Billing History Information (per hour)	<p>At the customer's request, EGW will provide the customer with account and usage history for the preceding 3 years within 10 business days without charge. The Corporation will charge \$40 per hour (labour plus 25% oncost) to provide billing information in excess of 3 years.</p>	\$40.00
Tender Printing	<p>Printing tender documents, staff labour, printing and photocopying shall be charged at \$40 per hour plus 20 cents per page. No charge to be applied for emailing of tender documents. Tenders stored and sent on CD or memory stick will be charged a flat administration fee of \$10 plus \$5 for the IT peripherals.</p>	\$40.00 per hour plus 20 cents per page
Freedom of Information	<p>Fees for provision of FOI as provided by the FOI Act 1982. A fee for investigation, collating, photocopying and postage if applicable will be charged for providing this service. Fee for information shall be charges as determined by the FOI Act 1982 and monetary units gazetted from time to time.</p>	
Build Over Easement Agreements	<p>A charge of \$85 based on the average time to check the plan to determine whether the building is suitable for build over and does not interfere with water or sewerage infrastructure.</p>	\$85.00
Recoverable Sundry Works Costs	<p>These costs are charged for damage(s) caused by external parties to Corporation owned infrastructure or for Sundry works requested by third parties. Costs are charged to cover construction, alteration or repair of assets due to damage caused by third parties.</p>	
Plug Off/Tapping Relocation Fee	<p>This fee of \$110 is charged when an existing water service is disconnected or when a meter is relocated together with a new tapping (new water connection less the cost of the meter)</p>	\$110.00

Continued next page

**TABLE E.4 (CONTINUED)**

Miscellaneous Charge	Definition	Charge
Backflow Prevention Device Application Fee	Customers are required under Plumbing Regulations to install testable backflow protection device(s) at the property boundary in circumstances where there are risks of cross contamination in the Corporation's water supply system. Backflow devices are required to undergo annual testing to ensure operability. An application fee is applicable where the backflow prevention device is fitted to a new service.	\$100.00
Backflow Prevention Device Inspection Fee	Backflow prevention devices are to be regularly inspected to ensure that they meet compliance to prevent any backflow of water into the Corporation's water system.	\$70.00
Administrator developer fee - project costs less than \$5000		\$350.00
Administrator developer fee - project costs \$5001 to \$50000		\$900 or 6%
Administrator developer fee - project costs \$50001 to \$100000		\$3 500 or 5%
Administrator developer fee - project costs greater than \$100001		\$5 500 or 4%
Low Pressure Sewer Pump Fees	Customers connecting low pressure sewer pumps to the Corporation's system will be charged a supervision and administration fee of \$420 for arranging pump installation. Cost of the pump units or full installation costs will be actual cost plus 25% of indirect costs and oncosts.	\$420 plus actual cost plus 25% of indirect costs and oncosts

**TABLE E.5 GIPPSLAND WATER**

Miscellaneous Charge	Definition	Charge
<b>Meter Installation (per meter)</b>		
Installation/Supply of 20mm Meter (Inc Couplings)	This charge provides for GW contractor to attend site and fit a standard 20mm water meter assembly.	At cost
Installation/Supply of 25mm Meter (Inc Couplings)	This charge provides for GW contractor to attend site and fit a standard 25mm water meter assembly.	At cost
<b>Meter Assembly Fee for Pre-Tapped Properties (per meter)</b>		
Pre-tapped connection of 20mm meter (Installation of 20mm meter to pre-tapped buried water service)	This charge provides for GW contractor to attend site, to raise the buried water service and to fit a standard water meter assembly. A standard meter assembly is an apparatus consisting of water meter, stop valve, strainer, additional valves (if fitted) and unions required to connect these components together and to connect the water supply pipe work. It does not include any backflow prevention device or pressure reduction device installed downstream of the outlet of the meter.	At cost
<b>Special Meter Reads (each)</b>		
Special meter read at the commencement of a tenancy and at the termination of a tenancy	This charge is for an out of the ordinary meter read at commencement and termination of an occupancy for incoming and outgoing customers.	At cost
<b>Information Statements (each)</b>		
Preparation of a Property Information Statement, inclusive of a Special Meter Reading performed on a settlement date	Information Statement is provided on request. This certificate details outstanding rates and encumbrances in accordance with Section 158 of the <i>Water Act (1989)</i> .	\$66.77
<b>Application for Connection to Waste Water Main (each)</b>		
Standard residential connection into wastewater connection point	This wastewater connection application charge provides for processing of an application for a standard residential sewer connection. Once the application has been approved a Plumbing Industry Commission (PIC) number will be issued to the plumber. Note that the application charge does not include any Plumbing Industry Commission fees.	\$119.40
Minor repairs/alterations requiring P.I.C number	This minor repairs / alterations application charge provides for processing of an application for a sewer alteration within the property. Once the application has been approved a Plumbing Industry Commission (PIC) number will be issued to the plumber. Note that the application charge does not include any Plumbing Industry Commission fees.	\$44.25

Continued next page



**TABLE E.5 (CONTINUED)**

<b>Miscellaneous Charge</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Charge</b>
Small industrial/commercial connection	This wastewater connection application charge provides for processing of an application for a sewer connection for a small industrial or commercial development. Once the application has been approved a Plumbing Industry Commission (PIC) number will be issued to the plumber. Note that the application charge does not include Plumbing Industry Commission fees.	\$156.57
Provision of wastewater connection point to existing wastewater main by accredited pipelayer	This charge is an audit fee ONLY. The charge is for GW personnel to attend the site at the time of construction of a sewer property connection by an accredited pipelayer	\$74.46
<b>Application to Build over Gippsland Water's Assets and/or Easements (each)</b>		
Fees for Application to Build over Gippsland Water's Assets and/or Easements	This is a charge for processing an application for a property owner who wishes to construct a structure over or adjacent to a Gippsland Water asset and / or easement.	\$29.52
<b>Land Development Fees</b>		
Application Fee including water supply and wastewater (each) 11-20 lots in subdivision	This is a charge where an extension to Gippsland Water services for land arises from subdivision of land. The owner of the land is liable for all costs associated with the provision of the works and must enter into an Owners Cost Agreement and pay an application fee based on the number of lots in a subdivision. This fee pertains to a 11-20 lot subdivision.	\$560.16
Offer Acceptance Fee including water supply and wastewater (each) 11-20 lots in subdivision	This is a charge where the developer is accepting the offer outlined in the Owners Cost Agreement. This charge is to receipt monies and process the start works notice etc upon acceptance by developer of owners cost work agreements. This fee pertains to a 11-20 lot subdivision.	\$1 244.98

**TABLE E.6 GOULBURN VALLEY WATER**

Miscellaneous Charge	Definition	Charge
Water Sales via Standpipes (per kL)	This service provides water to Water Cartage contractors via standpipes. Water is then delivered by the Cartage Contractor to Rural properties and other users including road making.	\$2.28
Information Statement (per item)	The provision of property information to solicitors and others to assist with property conveyancing.	\$45.30
Meter Fee - 20mm meter (per read)	The supply of a meter for the connection of a new property or to replace a damaged meter.	\$148.00
Sewer Connection Fee (per connection)	Application fee to connect a new property to sewer reticulation.	\$139.00
Special Meter Read Fee (per read)	Meter read requested by property owner to facilitate property conveyancing or tenancy changes.	\$24.70
Septic Tank Waste Receival Fee (per litre)	Fee to receive, treat & dispose of septic tank waste received from contractors	\$0.06
Grease Trap Waste Receival Fee (per litre)	Fee to receive, treat and dispose of grease trap waste received from contractors	\$0.16

**TABLE E.7 GWMWATER**

Miscellaneous Charge	Definition	Charge
Groundwater and Surface Water	Application for a Take and Use Licence (s51) other than Domestic and Stock	\$935.00
Groundwater and Surface Water	Permanent Transfer to New Licence / per Transaction (s62)	\$935.00
Surface Water	Construct Dam or Other Works on a Waterway	\$512.00
Groundwater	Application for a Licence to Construct or Alter a Bore (s67)	\$395.00
Groundwater	Application for Approval to Dispose of Matter Underground by Means of a Bore (s76)	\$395.00
Trade Waste	Application to discharge Trade Waste - Category 1 and 2	\$345.00
Groundwater and Surface Water	Application for a Renewal of Take and Use Licence (s53) other than Annual Licence	\$312.00
Wastewater	Wastewater Connection Charges - Large Industrial	\$303.00
Urban Water and Rural Pipeline	Water – Tapping/Connection Charge (tapping size 20 mm) <sup>a</sup>	\$293.00
Groundwater	Application for a Licence to Construct or Alter a Bore – Data Collection Only	\$234.00

<sup>a</sup> Higher charge for larger size tappings. Based on actual costs.

**TABLE E.8 LOWER MURRAY WATER**

Miscellaneous Charge	Definition	Charge
<b>Information Statement</b>		
Information Statement Fee (includes one meter reading)	"Sec 158(i) of the <i>Water Act (1989)</i> states that any person may apply to LMW for an information statement in relation to any land that is within a district of the LMW or its area of interest.	
These are requested as part of the sale of properties for information LMW has relating to a particular property. The fee includes one meter reading."	\$81.00	
<b>Fire Service Charge</b>		
	The fire service charge is an access charge for private fire services. LMW maintains the service point which includes the annual re-sealing of service program.	
<b>Fire Service Tapping Fee</b>		
Fire Service Tapping 32mm 100 Dia AC Pipe	As above	\$362.00
Fire Service Tapping 40mm 100 Dia AC Pipe	As above	\$416.00
Fire Service Tapping 50mm 100 Dia AC Pipe	As above	\$668.00
Fire Service Tapping 80mm 100 Dia AC Pipe	As above	\$1 241.00
Fire Service Tapping 100mm 100 Dia AC Pipe	As above	\$1 284.00
Fire Service Tapping 25mm 150 Dia AC Pipe	As above	\$282.00
Fire Service Tapping 32mm 150 Dia AC Pipe	As above	\$372.00
Fire Service Tapping 40mm 150 Dia AC Pipe	As above	\$420.00
Fire Service Tapping 50mm 150 Dia AC Pipe	As above	\$680.00
Fire Service Tapping 80mm 150 Dia AC Pipe	As above	\$1 381.00
Fire Service Tapping 100mm 150 Dia AC Pipe	As above	\$1 419.00
Fire Service Tapping 25mm 100 Dia UPVC Pipe	As above	\$277.00
Fire Service Tapping 32mm 100 Dia UPVC Pipe	As above	\$362.00
Fire Service Tapping 40mm 100 Dia UPVC Pipe	As above	\$416.00

Continued next page

**TABLE E.8 (CONTINUED)**

<b>Miscellaneous Charge</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Charge</b>
Fire Service Tapping 50mm 100 Dia UPVC Pipe	As above	\$668.00
Fire Service Tapping 80mm 100 Dia UPVC Pipe	As above	\$1 343.00
Fire Service Tapping 100mm 100 Dia UPVC Pipe	As above	\$1 392.00
Fire Service Tapping 25mm 150 Dia UPVC Pipe	As above	\$282.00
Fire Service Tapping 32mm 150 Dia UPVC Pipe	As above	\$372.00
Fire Service Tapping 40mm 150 Dia UPVC Pipe	As above	\$420.00
Fire Service Tapping 50mm 150 Dia UPVC Pipe	As above	\$680.00
Fire Service Tapping 80mm 150 Dia UPVC Pipe	As above	\$1 381.00
Fire Service Tapping 100mm 150 Dia UPVC Pipe	As above	\$1 413.00
<b>Fire Service Information</b>		
Fire Service Information Fee	Provision of flow and pressure data.	\$243.00
<b>Special Meter Read</b>		
Special Meter Read Fee	The fee is payable for any meter reading in addition to LMW's normal four scheduled readings i.e. Residential Tenancies and Solicitor Readings	\$40.60
<b>Connection</b>		
New Connection Standard Residential	This is an administration fee for handling the administration of organising the connection, creating the property file etc.	\$127.60
New Connection Non Standard Residential	As above	\$174.00
New Connection Small Industrial/Commercial	As above	\$174.00
New Connection Large Industrial/Commercial	As above	\$348.00
<b>Tapping</b>		
Tappings 20mm Meter	This fee covers the installation of a tapping band and ferrule to LMW system. The plumber is required to excavate around LMW's main with adequate clearance to enable LMW to install a tapping band and ferrule. The plumber is responsible for backfilling, road opening fees and permits and safety of the site.	\$348.00

Continued next page

**TABLE E.8 (CONTINUED)**

<b>Miscellaneous Charge</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Charge</b>
Tappings 25mm Meter	As above	\$522.00
Tappings 32mm Meter	As above	\$928.00
Tappings 40mm Meter	As above	\$1 044.00
Tappings 50mm Meter	As above	\$1 334.00
Tappings >50mm	As above	Actual cost
Subdivision Processing		
Subdivision Processing Fee - Water/Sewerage	This is an administration fee for investigation, correspondence and administration associated with the compliance of processing a subdivision, including setting requirements and conditions for the subdivision to occur.	\$16.40
Subdivision Processing Fee - Overall	As above	\$34.50
Sewer Point Construction		
	Provision of an additional sewer point as a result of subdivision.	
Inspection		
Inspection Fee	Inspection of connections to LMW infrastructure by contractors.	\$58.00

**TABLE E.9 NORTH EAST WATER**

<b>Miscellaneous Charge</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Charge</b>
Information Statements	Provides information on rates and encumbrances on the requested property, this is usually requested at the time of a property settlement or change in commercial lease.	\$55.70
Special meter readings - tenants	Incurred when the meter is required to be read when a tenant moves out of a property, outside of our scheduled meter reads.	\$27.85
Septic disposal charge (per kL)	Incurred on a per kL basis for receiving, treating and disposal of residential wastewater.	\$27.85
Septic disposal charge - portable	Incurred for receiving, treating and disposal of wastewater per portable toilet	\$22.10
Wastewater connection - standard residential	Cost associated with the connection of a single residence to the sewer reticulated network.	\$176.10
Wastewater connection - other	Cost associated with the connection of other residences to the sewer reticulated network, such as a block of units.	\$231.10
Wastewater connection alterations	Incurred as a result of changing a drainage plan on an existing residential dwelling.	\$153.90
Water tapping fee - 20mm service	This fee is charged for the physical connection of a 20mm pipe to our reticulated water network.	\$64.30
Water tapping fee - 25mm service	This fee is charged for the physical connection of a 20mm pipe to our reticulated water network.	\$75.00
Water connection fee - 20mm service	This cost is charged when a customer first connects to our network, is established on our billing system and includes the cost of the water meter.	\$182.00
Water connection fee - 25mm service	This cost is charged when a customer first connects to our network, is established on our billing system and includes the cost of the water meter.	\$321.30

**TABLE E.10 SOUTH GIPPSLAND WATER**

<b>Miscellaneous Charge</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Charge</b>
Property Information Statements (per application)	Fee imposed for providing a certificate issued in accordance with Section 158 of the, <i>Water Act (1989)</i> .	\$46.00
Special Meter Readings (per application)	Fee imposed for providing a certificate which indicates water usage charges up to a specified date. Generally provided, on application, for property sales.	\$23.50
Administration Developer Fee	Fee charged to cover administration costs for time spent on processing new developer funded applications.	Fee at 6.5% of cost of works excluding GST
As Constructed Charge (per allotment)	Fee for preparing as constructed asset information from the field then transferring to maps, for both water and sewerage systems.	\$63.50
20mm Tapping Fee (per tapping)	Fee imposed for meter and labour associated in providing a tapping to the water main.	\$349.50
Plumbing Industry Commission (PIC) Fee (per application)	Fee imposed for providing sewer plans and processing applications to connect or modify plumbing.	\$196.50
Standpipe Water Sales	Fee imposed for the sale of water via a metered standpipe.	300% of uniform volumetric rate per kL for registered users, 400% of uniform volumetric rate per kL for unregistered users
Septic Tank Waste Receptival (per kL)	Fee imposed on septic tank waste carters, for the disposing of sewage and/or other acceptable waste.	\$23.50

**TABLE E.11 WANNON WATER**

Miscellaneous Charge	Definition	Charge
Water Tapping Fee, Including Fire Services (per tapping)		
Water Tapping - 20mm connection	This charge provides for the attendance of Wannon Water personnel to the site to complete an under pressure water tapping of the water main. The excavation is to be prepared by the customer's plumber to the standards specified by Wannon Water to ensure safe access by Wannon Water personnel to the water main. The charge includes the provision of a tapping band, ferrule and ferrule bend (where required). The same charge applies for fire service tappings.	\$244.00
Water Tapping - 25mm connection	As above	\$275.00
Water Meters (per meter)		
Water Meter - 20mm	This charge provides for a standard water meter in perpetuity. It does not include back flow prevention devices. Larger diameter meters of 50mm and greater will be an electronic type meter at the discretion of Wannon Water. The fitting of the water meter is the responsibility of the customer's plumber. The meter will be issued on site.	\$108.00
Water Meter - 25mm	As above	\$168.00
Water Disconnection Fee (per disconnection)		
Water Disconnection - all sizes	This charge applies where a water service is no longer required and the tapping is to be decommissioned. The charge provides for the attendance of Wannon Water personnel to the site to decommission the water service. The excavation is to be prepared by the customer's plumber to the standards specified by Wannon Water to ensure safe access by Wannon Water personnel to the water main. The charge includes all materials and fittings and is set below cost to encourage customers to disconnect services where they are no longer required.	\$215.00
Sewer Cut In 150mm and below	The sewer cut in charge provides for the attendance of Wannon Water personnel to the site to complete a cut into a sewerage main for the purposes of making a new connection. The excavation is to be prepared by the customer's plumber to the standards specified by Wannon Water to ensure safe access by Wannon Water personnel. Included in the charge is the provision of a fitting on the sewer main which enables the customer's plumber to connect the property drain to.	\$635.00
Sewer Cut In 225mm and below	As above	\$745.00
Sewer Connection Application (per application)		

Continued next page



**TABLE E.11 (CONTINUED)**

Miscellaneous Charge	Definition	Charge
Sewer Connection Application Residential	The sewer connection application charge provides for processing of an application for a sewer connection or alteration. To cater for emergency situations, plumbers are able to request that a residential application be processed in less than one business day. Once the application has been approved a Plumbing Industry Commission (PIC) number will be issued.	\$96.00
Sewer Connection Application Residential < 1 Business Day	As above	\$195.00
Sewer Connection Application Non-Residential	As above	\$132.00
Sewer Disconnection Application (per application)		
Sewer Disconnection Application - all sizes	Where a sewerage connection is no longer required, the connection point needs to be decommissioned. The charge provides for the attendance of Wannan Water personnel to the site to seal the connection point. The excavation is to be prepared by the customer's plumber to the standards specified by Wannan Water to ensure safe access by Wannan Water personnel. The charge includes all materials and is for a single connection, multiple disconnections receive multiple charges. The charge is set below cost to encourage customers to disconnect services where they are no longer required.	\$127.00
Information Statement (per statement)		
Information Statement Request	Wannan Water is required by law to prepare and issue information statements where requested. The charge includes undertaking a special meter reading and provision of an asset location plan where required. The asset location plan includes details on the location of Wannan Water's water and sewerage assets. It does not include details on the locations of the customer's internal water or sewerage assets.	\$68.00
Information Statement Request < 1 Business Day	As above	\$132.00
Meter Reading (per read)		
Meter Reading Fee (applies to both Tenant and Special Readings)	Wannan Water is required in a number of circumstances to attend a property to undertake a special read of the water meter to establish the water use at a specific point in time. Requests are typically made by customers who believe the most recent regular meter reading is incorrect. The fee is waived where it is shown that Wannan Water has recorded an incorrect meter reading. This charge applies in all circumstances except where a tenant commences a new tenancy at a property. In this case the fee is charged to the property owner. The fee reflects Wannan Water's time to attend the site and record a meter reading.	\$40.00

**TABLE E.12 WESTERNPORT WATER**

<b>Miscellaneous Charge</b>	<b>Definition</b>	<b>Charge</b>
Water Connection Fees		
Standard 20mm Dry Tapping	The cost includes the provision of the meter and stop tap to be installed by the plumber, the administration of setting up the account for the new meter, inspection of the meter to ensure it accords with the standards and all future maintenance of the meter.	\$240.95
Standard 20mm Wet Tapping	The cost includes the provision of the meter, tapping band, ball valve, elbow and stop tap to be installed by the plumber, the actual tapping of the water main by WPW personnel, the administration of setting up the account for the new meter, inspection of the meter to ensure it accords with the standards and all future maintenance of the meter.	\$303.80
25mm - fittings supplied by Westernport Water	The cost includes the provision of the meter, tapping band, ball valve, elbow and stop tap to be installed by the plumber, the actual tapping of the water main by WPW personnel where WPW have the appropriate equipment, contractors costs for larger sizes, the administration of setting up the account for the new meter, inspection of the meter to ensure it accords with the standards and all future maintenance of the meter. The cost of fittings is to cover the actual cost of the fittings required for the different sized water mains throughout the reticulation system.	\$440.05
32mm - fittings supplied by Westernport Water	As above	\$995.45
40mm - fittings supplied by Westernport Water	As above	\$1 309.90
50mm (plus cost of fittings)	As above	\$2 096.00
80mm (plus cost of fittings)	As above	\$2 724.80
100m (plus cost of fittings)	As above	\$3 510.80
150mm (plus cost of fittings)	As above	\$3 772.80
250mm (plus cost of fittings)	As above	\$5 742.65
Water Disconnection/Plug Up Fees		
20mm to 50mm	To inspect the removal of all fittings and to ensure the tapping is completely sealed so no water leaks from the disused tapping.	\$104.75
Larger than 50mm	The actual cost is to cover the actual cost of the fittings (blank ends or repair clamps) required for the different sized water mains throughout the reticulation system.	Actual cost

Continued next page

**TABLE E.12 (CONTINUED)**

Miscellaneous Charge	Definition	Charge
Wastewater Connection Fees		
Plan of sewer connection per A4 page	This fee is for the production of a plan that shows the location of the point of connection for our wastewater system. It provides the depth, chainage and off set data required for connection.	\$31.40
Consent to connect - standard residential	This fee covers the processing of an application and payment for connection to our wastewater system for a standard house connection. It also includes lodging the application with the Plumbing Industry Commission (PIC) and the updating and maintenance of customer details held within corporate systems such as billing and document management.	\$104.80
Consent to connect - residential other	As per above and also includes the assessment of the building plans by our Assets department to determine any requirements for additional sewer connection points to our system or the adequacy of any proposed private wastewater system within a larger/multi-unit development.	\$157.10
Consent to connect - industrial/commercial	This fee covers the processing of an application and payment for connection to our wastewater system for a standard commercial connection and also includes the assessment of the building plans by our Assets department to determine any requirements for additional sewer connection points to our system.	\$157.10
Consent to connect - industrial/commercial other	This fee covers the processing of an application and payment for connection to our wastewater system for a non-standard commercial connection and also includes the assessment of the building plans by our Assets department to determine any requirements for additional sewer connection points to our system.	\$314.35
As Constructed Drawing per A4 page	This is an administration fee to cover the entry and maintenance of data (supplied by the plumber post connection to our wastewater system) in our corporate systems including asset management, GIS and document management.	\$31.40
Backflow Preventer		
Assessment of application (per assessment)	This fee is for the time and administration in assessing an application for backflow prevention on a water service in a commercial or industrial application according to the AS3500 Plumbers Code.	\$146.65
Annual agreement renewal fee (per annum)	This is the annual fee for testable backflow devices to ensure that the owners have had the backflow prevention device tested as per AS3500 Plumbers Code. This fee is to cover receipt and recording of test certificate and reminder letters to owners to have the device tested.	\$62.85

Continued next page

**TABLE E.12 (CONTINUED)**

Miscellaneous Charge	Definition	Charge
Private Fire Service		
Information fee	This fee is for additional information required for the installation of a private fire service as required by the CFA for commercial or industrial developments. This fee would cover expert staff advice on the installation of the fire service and any additional advice to gain acceptance by the CFA for the fire service.	\$209.55
Annual inspection fee	This is the annual inspection fee to inspect private fire services to ensure they have not been used for private use. Fire services are sealed by plastic or wire and lead seals to ensure fire hoses or reels are not used for internal water supply as this service is generally not metered.	\$52.35
Sealing fire house tap (per seal)	Initial fee for inspection and sealing of a fire service once the service is installed on new installations.	\$52.35
Resealing fire hose tap	This fee is to have a new inspection and to reseal the fire service if it is discovered that illegal water use has occurred with the fire service.	\$209.55
Per additional tap fee	This is to seal additional taps or outlets while initially sealing or resealing the fire service. First tap or outlet is included in sealing and resealing fee but may be multiple outlets on major installations. Cost is to cover the time and seals used.	\$5.15
Testing		
Water quality	This fee is charged when a customer requests testing of their non mains water supply. It involves the taking of the sample from the customer's supply (by WPW personnel) and couriering of the sample to a NATA accredited laboratory in Melbourne for testing and subsequent reporting back to the customer.	Actual cost
Water meters smaller than 32mm	This fee is charged upon a customer request for pressure and/or calibration testing of the meter at the customer's premises. A staff member attends the premises, conducts the test, prepares a report for the customer and records the results on the customer's file within our document management system.	\$73.30
Water meters larger than 32mm	This fee is charged upon a customer request for pressure and/or calibration testing of the meter at the customer's premises. A staff member attends the premises, conducts the test, prepares a report for the customer and records the results on the customer's file within our document management system.	Actual cost

Continued next page

**TABLE E.12 (CONTINUED)**

Miscellaneous Charge	Definition	Charge
Statements		
Information statement - standard (each)	<p>"This fee is charged for the processing and production of the information statement. The Statement contains details of:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Charges affecting the property annually and per period eg.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Melbourne Water</li> <li>o Sewer</li> <li>o Water fixed and usage</li> <li>o Recycled Water fixed and usage</li> <li>o Trade Waste fixed and usage</li> <li>o Fees attached for legal action or restriction</li> <li>o Schemes</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Connected meters and the date the meter was last read</li> <li>• Any relevant information in relation to the property (eg. Prime file, recycled water zone)</li> </ul> <p>We also produce a copy of our asset locations which is attached to the information statement. This application has a 5 day limit on processing and returning to customer."</p>	\$46.30
Information statement - priority (each)	A priority Information Statement is produced as per the standard Information Statement as above but has a guaranteed 24 hour turn-around time.	\$92.60
Pressure flow statement - per test (each)	This is to provide written pressure and flow information on the water supply system so consultants can design the water supply or fire services to developments. The test may be completed on site by using testing equipment or provided from calibrated computer models of the water supply system. This cost is to cover time and set up of equipment or calibration and upgrades to the computer model.	\$158.75
Account and usage history (in excess of 3 years)	This is to provide an account statement for the customer (and to process payment) for the account summary for the period required by the customer. It is produced from our billing system and includes data such as brought forward balance by billing period, the current charges for that billing period (broken down by charge type), any additional charges for example interest or restrictor removal fees and the total outstanding per period and a total for the period required.	\$69.80
Special meter reading (per reading)	This fee is for the processing of the special meter reading application. A meter reader attends the property and takes the read which is entered into the billing system. An administration officer calculates the read and produces a special meter reading document. The special meter reading document contains any outstanding balances, current balance, totals and details of the reading.	\$52.85

Continued next page

**TABLE E.12 (CONTINUED)**

Miscellaneous Charge	Definition	Charge
Restrictor removal (each)	The restrictor removal fee is charged when a restrictor is fitted to the property following non-payment of a debt (and in accordance with the requirement of the ESC Customer Service Code). We charge the fee to cover the cost of a staff member attending the property to remove the restrictor from the meter. This involves earthing the pipes either side of the meter, detaching the meter from the tapping pipe, removing the restrictor and reattaching the meter to the tapping pipe. The flow is then checked to ensure that it is operating correctly. We attach a flow tester to a garden tap and measure how much water is coming through the pipe per minute to ensure the flow has been restored.	\$57.70
Galvanised iron property service pipe replacement	Old services from water main to meter where the material used was galvanised iron are to be replaced with longer lasting material. The galvanised iron was a cheaper and shorter lasting alternative for owners when owners provided the maintenance for the main to meter. As Westernport Water now provides for all future maintenance for this main to meter a contribution from the owner for the substandard pipework is required.	Actual cost
Build over permit (per application)	This fee is for the administration of providing an agreement to be signed by the owner and to provide information and inspection on the building that is to be built over or close to the Corporations assets.	\$102.85
Dishonoured payment charge	This is a fee that is passed onto the customer when we are charged by our bank or Australia Post for a dishonoured payment from a customer. Only the amount that has been charged by our bank or Australia Post is recovered from the customer.	Bank charge
Cutting in to sewer fee	This is to provide a new connection point to a sewer main where no sewer point was constructed when the original sewer was laid. This would be due to newly subdivided land or to new developments requiring a larger connection point than standard.	Actual cost
Works agreement - engineering, administration, supervision	The works agreements are for larger developments usually subdivisions where consultants provide the design for the services to the new lots and these services or assets are gifted to the Corporation. The fees cover the cost of providing the as constructed information of location, invert levels, diameters, depths and grades of the existing services and the engineering advice on the design. The checking of the plans to ensure they comply with Australians Standards, Water Services Association of Australia (WSAA) and local standards. The cost of administration for providing an agreement and cost estimates for the development. Supervision of the construction of the services to ensure safety and compliance with the standards and plans. Checking of the as constructed information of the service including loading this information into the GIS and mapping base.	Actual cost