

This project was approved prior to a change in the department's internal processes and templates

1. Purpose of this form

This form documents the socio-economic assessment of the project reference number 377618 submitted under the Water Efficiency Program (WEP).

The design of this form outlines information from the project proposal application form submitted by the delivery partner and facilitates the Commonwealth's own assessment and subsequent process of communicating with relevant stakeholders.

2. State's contact details

Detail	Description
Name	[REDACTED]
Position in organisation	[REDACTED]
Contact details	[REDACTED]

3. Project information

Applicant (Section B.1)	Reference Number 377618
Project Id (Section C)	S-On-0007-SAM-DEL
Project stream (Section C.5)	On-farm
Catchment/ region (Section C.7)	Zone 12 – River Murray Class 3 – All Purpose
Project name or project description? (Section C.8)	The project involves an upgrade to an inefficient surface drip irrigation system across 71.23 hectares. All works will occur on patches growing winegrapes. Water Savings – 14.2ML Total Project Area – 71.23ha Total Irrigation Area – 222ha (174ha – winegrapes; 48ha - almonds) Crop – Grape Vines (Wine) & Almonds Location – New Residence
Volume of water for the Cth (Section C.9)	14.2 ML

Estimated project cost (Section C.12) \$161,958.69 (GST exclusive) requested from the Commonwealth

4. Outcome of state’s socio-economic assessment

Pass or Fail

Brief Commonwealth overall comments

The Commonwealth believes there is merit in the proposal.

5. State’s assessment against socio-economic and environmental criteria

Criteria	Assessment	Comments
<p>1. Projects must be made public¹ 1d. Following in-principle government approval, non-sensitive information about project applications must be advertised to allow relevant stakeholders to make submissions to the proposal</p>	Not applicable	NA
<p>2. Projects do not negatively impact on social and environmental outcomes 2a. Projects are required to describe the expected socio-economic and environmental benefits. Partners must coordinate and communicate with local communities and community bodies on the project(s) and describe the expected socio-economic and environmental impacts of each project on the local community, region or state</p>	Meets requirement	The project does not have a negative impact on social or economic outcomes. This is because less water is used watering grapes due to replacement of a more efficient drip irrigation system.
<p>2b. Social values may include the amenity to local communities of weirs, storages and parks that may be affected by efficiency projects</p>	Meets requirement	The proposal will not directly impact on social values but will contribute on-going benefits to regional primary production support businesses and employment.
<p>2c. Large projects (total cost ≥ \$4 million) must describe the expected socio-economic outcomes and address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the anticipated socio-economic impacts to the local community, region or state • their project’s strategy for increasing the socio-economic benefit to participants and their communities (e.g. local sourcing of goods, services and labour) • if and how the project will contribute to regional investment and development in the geographic area 	Not applicable	N/A
<p>2d. Both Project and Delivery Partners are required to comply with all relevant laws including work health and safety laws. Each project must show an understanding of all relevant legislation or regulation (including environmental laws and regulations) that will require approval prior to works commencing.</p>	Meets requirement	No approvals are required to conduct the works as the works are occurring on private property and the activities will not have an adverse environmental impact on the property or surrounds.

¹ Criteria 1a to 1d do not apply to proponents

Commonwealth’s socio-economic assessment of project proposals under the Water Efficiency Program (WEP)

Criteria	Assessment	Comments
2e. Australian Government to fund facilitators to work with communities to develop proposals that have community support and positive social and economic outcomes	Not applicable	N/A
3. The project assessment for funding must be clear, timely, simple and transparent, and not unduly increase red tape	Not applicable	N/A
4. Projects need to demonstrate how they contribute to the current and future viability of proponent businesses and irrigation districts 4a. Proposals must consider how projects would contribute to the current and future financial viability of the irrigation district/ region where they would occur, including identification of potential irrigation network improvements	Meets requirement	This project does not have a negative impact on third parties.
4b. Proposals must avoid upgrading water supply infrastructure where the systems, or parts of the systems, are not going to be used in the future	Meets requirement	
4c. Proposals in irrigation districts must take account of relevant irrigation business strategies or plans	Meets requirement	
5. Programs or projects support regional economies 5a. Proposals must identify opportunities to support local industry and regional development	Meets requirement	The potential to increase production and possibly more employment of workers is identified.
5b. Proposals must focus on increasing water use efficiency in ways that address industry, network/ system and local/ regional priorities, future needs and risks	Meets requirement	
5c. Proposals in an irrigation district must not reduce the overall productive capacity of the relevant region	Meets requirement	
5d. Proposals must not impact negatively on regional jobs	Meets requirement	
6. Programs or projects do not have negative third party impacts on the irrigation system, water market or regional communities 6a. Where a project is located within an irrigation network, the proposal must provide evidence that the relevant network operator or water corporation is involved in or aware of the project	Meets requirement	This project supports the local economy with positive effects.

Criteria	Assessment	Comments
6b. Proponents must consult with relevant stakeholders, e.g. industry bodies, irrigation network operators, regional development organisations, on regional approaches to water efficiency projects that address industry/ network/ system and local/ regional priorities, future needs, and risks. Regional water efficiency approaches may include research and extension services	Meets requirement	
6c. Socio-economic assessments must consider impacts not just on participants, but for broader regions	Meets requirement	
<p>7. Projects need to be assessed for their potential to impact on the price of water</p> <p>7a. Proponents must only transfer water rights that they own at the time of application. They cannot receive funding to acquire water rights. A project cannot transfer more water than the project will save and the proposed quantity must be independently verified as being a conservative estimate of the resulting water savings. A proponent may keep any water savings beyond the amount transferred</p>	Meets requirement	This proposal has confirmed no impact on the price of water due to additional water savings retained by the proponent.
7b. Proponents applying for project funding would be required to provide evidence that the water entitlements have been held for a minimum of 3 years at the time of application	Meets requirement	
7c. Project proponents must ensure there is no direct impact on the reliability of water from cumulative implementation of projects	Meets requirement	
7d. Projects must not directly increase the price of water	Meets requirement	
<p>8. Any cultural impacts identified, protected or improved</p> <p>8a. Projects are required to describe the expected cultural benefits of their proposed project, with Partners required to coordinate and communicate with local communities and community bodies on projects and describe the expected cultural benefits of each project on the local community, region or state</p>	Meets requirement	Cultural impacts are negligible.

Criteria	Assessment	Comments
<p>8b. Projects must describe the expected cultural benefits of their proposal. In doing so, they must address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the anticipated cultural benefits to the local community, region or state their project's strategy for increasing the cultural benefit to participants and their communities (e.g. local sourcing of goods, services and labour) 	Meets requirement	
<p>8c. Projects over \$3 million must identify cultural heritage sites and manage any impacts in accordance with relevant Commonwealth and State laws.</p>	Not applicable	
<p>9. Program design should include close engagement with community and industry leaders</p> <p>9a. The proponent must consult with industry bodies, IIOs, local governments or regional development organisations, or investment corporations on relevant strategic regional projects, and consider community support</p>	Meets requirement	Stakeholder engagement has occurred.
<p>9b. The consultation should focus on increasing water use efficiency in ways that address industry, network/system and local/regional priorities, future needs and risks and may include research and extension services</p>	Meets requirement	
<p>10. Where practical, seek to develop and implement integrated implementation of efficiency measures to maximise benefits to the irrigation network and local enterprises</p> <p>10a. Programs or projects must focus on increasing water use efficiency in ways that address industry, network/system and local/regional priorities, future needs and risks and may include research and extension services. This would include integrated proposals</p>	Meets requirement	This criteria has been addressed in other areas – no areas of concern.
<p>11. Monitoring and evaluation, including of socio-economic outcomes, should be built into programs and used to regularly review and adapt programs as required</p> <p>11a. The Commonwealth will develop a monitoring and evaluation framework to assess the progress of projects in real time, post-approval</p>	Meets requirement	The MERI framework will apply.

Criteria	Assessment	Comments
<p>12. Projects must deliver real water savings and not result in profiteering or rorting 12a. Projects must not allow participants to individually profit without creating water savings</p>	<p>Meets requirement</p>	<p>This proposal does not result in profitability or rorts.</p>
<p>13. Projects should identify improved capacity to respond to changes in business environment including drought and climate resilience 13a. Provide information on how the project will improve resilience to climate variability</p>	<p>Meets requirement</p>	<p>This project provides greater flexibility to changes in the environment.</p>