

**Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group**  
**Summary Meeting 3** 6 July 2017 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

**Group Attendees**-Kerry DeGaris (Group chair proxy and member SENRM Board), Robert Mock - Tatiara DC, Jodie Carey - SA Water, David Edwards – Tatiara DC, Scott Manser - Lucerne Australia, Glyn Ashman – SA Water, Jeff Flint – Mundulla Vignerons, Richard Halliday – Livestock SA

**Apology**- Paul Leadbeter – Conservation Council, Scot Campbell – Lucerne Australia

**Staff Attendees**-Phil Elson (PE) - Senior Planning Officer NRSE, Jennifer Schilling (JS) - Team Leader Water Policy and Planning NRSE

Item	Notes
Welcome	Kerry DeGaris welcomed attendees
Previous meeting notes	<p><b>Action outcomes to note</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.4 JBS to be contacted along with other confined users to advise of the review of the Tatiara WAP and opportunities for input</li> <li>• 1.8The SE NRM Board determined that travel allowances will not be provided to the group</li> <li>• 2.19 Notes from each meeting will be reviewed by Tim Bond Manager Planning &amp; Evaluation NRSE and released as a draft to members and on the web site once reviewed – to the draft minutes will be tabled at the next SE NRM Board for noting.</li> </ul> <p><b>Outstanding action list items noted</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.9,1.12,1.13,2.3 incomplete</li> <li>• New action. <b>Action 3.1</b> – Clay spreading and its potential role as a recharge impacting activity to be included on issues list.</li> <li>• Resolution of Action 2.4. <b>Action 3.2</b> –Roger Cranswick (DEWNR Senior hydrogeologist) to be invited to a future meeting to discuss how the Groundwater model treats extraction and the return to the aquifer of the delivery supplement and the potential to model 140% use of all allocations</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendations</b></p> <p>1.1 At their 22 June meeting the SE NRM Board considered the recommendation of the SAG to amend the Groups Charter. The Proposed changes to SAG charter concerning SAG membership have been approved by the SE NRM Board – membership is open to new stakeholder group representatives but membership is capped at 13 – concerns over the inclusion of any further group members late during the process will be dealt with by the Advisory Group deciding on whether to recommend any new group member nominations to the Board at that point in the review process.</p> <p><b>Advisory Group member Tasks</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Members prefer receiving electronic copies of document</li> <li>• Members consulting with their respective stakeholder groups -still in progress</li> <li>• Stakeholder engagement table reviewed by group – no changes proposed</li> <li>• Summary of key engagement and conclusions from the LLC WAP Review engagement report reviewed by group – no changes proposed</li> </ul>

**Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group**  
**Summary Meeting 3** 6 July 2017 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

Item	Notes
	<p><b>Questions from the Advisory Group</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the role of the Board in the decision making process and what happens if they disagree with the group’s recommendation?</li> </ul> <p><b>Response</b> - The Board has the final say on any proposed amendments prior to the Plan being recommended to the Minister. The Board is required to provide a consultation report that indicates how the Board has dealt with different view on how the resource is managed. The group needs to provide the Board with enough information to support their recommendations The group should keep the Board informed of the groups progress and on how the group reached their decisions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could the LLC WAP Review be used as an example for the Tatiara WAP Review?</li> </ul> <p><b>Response</b> – The LLC WAP Review was a complex political process involving the forestry industry. The Tatiara WAP Review should be a simpler process.</p>
Ground rules	No points were raised by members in relation to the Ground Rules
Group charter	No points were raised by members in relation to the Ground Rules
Overview of current Tatiara WAP	<p>PowerPoint presentation by JS – Overview of Tatiara WAP – Summary of themes in each section continued (sections 7 to 12). The group continued its review of the provisions of the Tatiara WAP 2010 to discuss and better understand the content of the WAP and identify areas/ or issues that should be included in an issues list for incorporation into the WAP review document.</p> <p>Key points of discussion included:</p> <p><b>Section 7 - Transfer Criteria – Unconfined</b></p> <p>General comment Section 7 Transfer Criteria is complex and should be made simpler if possible. <b>Action 3.3</b> Add comment to issues list</p> <p>It was noted that the WAP precludes Transfer from the unconfined aquifer to the confined aquifer</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A question was posed around if not allowing transfer from the unconfined to the confined aquifer is an issue if looking for an alternative water source if the unconfined aquifer becomes unusable. Noting the provisions, discussion included the need for licensees to consider the cost of piping in water verses the cost of drilling down to the confined aquifer as an alternative water source.</li> <li>• The issue of if the transfer of allocations from the unconfined aquifer to the confined aquifer should not be allowed for the life of the revised plan was raised</li> <li>• It was noted that currently the Plan has a precautionary approach to using the confined aquifer</li> <li>• The group suggested that further investigation of the confined aquifer should be undertaken to determine its sustainability as an alternative resource</li> </ul> <p><b>Action 3.4</b> - Include review of if transfers from the unconfined to the confined aquifers should be allowed on the issues list</p>

**Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group**  
**Summary Meeting 3** 6 July 2017 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

Item	Notes
	<p>Request presentation on the confined aquifer at a future group meeting. <b>Action 3.5</b> – Organise Roger Cranswick to attend a future group meeting and provide a presentation on the confined aquifer</p> <p><b>Temporary transfers</b>  of unconfined allocations must stay within the same management area  Key points discussed included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When a temporary transfer ends the reference to the allotment to which the transfer is made is removed when the period of the temporary transfer is complete so that it does not impact on any hydrological assessments, this was noted as important from the context of the hydro assessment.</li> <li>• It was suggested that the provisions relating to the transfer between over allocated management areas require review.</li> <li>• Transfer between PWAS – potential exists to consider allowing transfers to Padthaway PWA (subject to Padthaway WAP provisions)</li> </ul> <p><b>Action 3.6</b> – Include a review of the transfer principles for the unconfined aquifer in the issues list</p> <p><b>75% rule</b>  The rule provides some flexibility for licensees to transfer water back to their properties within their management area while they are seeking to deal with the impacts of reductions to allocations.  Key points raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Now that the reductions have been completed a question was posed if these flexibility provisions still required if no further reductions are proposed in the amended WAP</li> <li>• That the 75% transfer provision has been quite beneficial to licensees in managing their businesses while dealing with reductions.</li> <li>• The rule has allowed for some licensees users to maintain their usage and therefore has not addressed the issue of pressure on the groundwater resource at those sites. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was suggested that licensees who fail a hydrological assessment may also use these provisions as a way around the assessment provisions</li> <li>• These provisions may still be useful to retain but require a balance between protecting the resource and business requirements , it was highlighted that the e hydrological assessment is in the plan for a reason</li> <li>• Investigation of the use of the 75% rule and the risks posed by this rule to the resource and landholders is required</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Action 3.7</b> – Include a review of the 75% transfer provisions in the issues list</p> <p>Comment – Need to have a closer look at allocation not usage. If allocation not used why shouldn't it be made available for use.  Comment – Should consider what the group wants out of the amendment of the Plan. Foundation philosophies and principles need to be determined are so that they can be used to guide the groups decision making process. JS indicated that once the group has</p>

**Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group**  
**Summary Meeting 3** 6 July 2017 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

Item	Notes
	<p>confirmed the issues to be considered as part of the amendment of the WAP the Group would be asked to think about the foundational principles for the amendment of the WAP</p> <p><b>Temporary transfers to manage seasonal variability-</b> allows for licensees to trading in and use up to an extra 20% of their allocation – without an hydrological assessment. Licensees must apply in writing to the Minister for these type of transfers</p> <p>Key points discussed included:</p> <p>there is a need to retain a balance between resource and business needs especially when the resource is under pressure</p> <p><b>Aquifer recharge</b> (provisions 100-104 and 126)</p> <p>Comment was made that it is apparent that Aquifer recharge transfer provisions are not being used and there is a potential to remove them from the plan. <b>Action 3.8</b> – Include a review of all of the aquifer recharge provisions in the plan in issues list.</p> <p>Hydrological effects and assessment</p> <p>Key points discussed</p> <p>Principle 129 concerning transfer approvals when resource condition triggers have been exceeded requires review. <b>Action 3.9</b> – Include the review of principle 129 in issues list.</p> <p><b>Section 8 – Allocation Criteria – Confined Aquifer</b></p> <p><b>Context</b></p> <p>The confined aquifer has variable salinity generally ranging from 1000Mg/L to 6000Mg/L. The Wirrega Confined aquifer management area crosses into the Lower Limestone Coast and Padthaway PWAs. There are only 3 licensees for the Confined aquifer in the Tatiara PWA, two licenses issued for meat processing and one for a school. The sustainable limits for the confined aquifer are set at the current allocation levels. The confined limit in Tatiara PWA for Wirrega management area is 225ML, the Confined aquifer limit in Lower Limestone Coast WAP for Wirrega management area is 700ML. The Confined aquifer rules do not allow for new allocations except for the purposes of public water supply.</p> <p><b>Key point discussed included:</b></p> <p>Comment was made that there is new data available relating to extraction that could be used to update table 4.2 of the WAP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was noted that no reductions were required for the confined aquifer in the current WAP but there is a sub-section on reductions in the confined allocation criteria section. It was suggested that this section is currently not required and could be removed to simplify the plan. <b>Action 3.10</b> – Include review of confined aquifer reduction principles in issues list.</li> </ul> <p><b>Transfer Rules confined aquifer</b></p> <p>Comment was made that transfer rules are very restrictive and currently unable to be used (due to an absence of options for transfer) .</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An observation was made that temporary trade cannot occur under current rules.</li> </ul>

**Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group**  
**Summary Meeting 3** 6 July 2017 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

Item	Notes
	<p>A suggestion was made to explore the potential to combine unconfined and confined temporary trade principles to simplify plan.</p> <p><b>Action 3.11</b> – Include review of both confined and unconfined temporary transfer principles in the issues list.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Action 3.12</b> – Include review of the concept of combining confined and unconfined principles with aim to simplify plan in issues list.</li> </ul> <p><b>Active and expeditious use principles</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was suggested that this policy requires review in relation to allocations for public water supply in principle 150.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action 3.13</b> – Include review of principle 150 provision relating to the active and expeditious use principles in the issues list.</p> <p>Discussion also included</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consideration of if principle 152 relating to hydrological effects and assessment required for the confined aquifer (in the context of no new allocations being allowed)? <b>Action 3.14</b> – Include review of principle 152 relating to hydrological effects and assessment in the issues list.</li> <li>• The potential to simplify the Plan by taking the opportunity to limit policy repetition for example if the content of principle 152 relating to hydrological effects and assessment be amended to have one section in the Plan on hydrological assessment rather than 2 separate sections? <b>Action 3.15</b> – Include review of principles relating to hydrological effects 152 and principle 59 with view to combining both in one policy section in the issues list. (Linked to Action 3.12)</li> <li>• Consideration of if principles 158 to 163 relating to active and expeditious use of water were still relevant? <b>Action 3.16</b> – Include review of principles 158 to 163 relating to active and expeditious use of water and their relevance (or redundancy) in issues list.</li> <li>• consider if retention of principles 164 and 165 relating to endorsement of certificates of title on licenses is required. <b>Action 3.17</b> – Include review of principles 164 and 165 relating to endorsement of certificates of title on licenses in issues list.</li> </ul> <p><b>Section 9 – Transfer Criteria – Confined</b></p> <p>Context :</p> <p>The transfer provisions for the confined are more limited than the unconfined and confined temporary transfer provisions slightly different to the unconfined provisions. The transfer of Industrial and public water supply allocations must be for the same purpose.</p> <p>Discussion included:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">the transfer provision relating to industrial and public water supply allocations appear to be limiting and require further consideration, it was suggested that it may be useful to examine the LLC WAP transfer provisions as part of this review (Covered by Action 3.11)</p> <p>Review needs to include the removal of redundant provisions. <b>Action 3.21</b> – Include removal of redundant provisions in issue list</p>

**Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group**  
**Summary Meeting 3** 6 July 2017 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

Item	Notes
	<p><b>Section 10 – Permits</b>  <b>Context</b> - The WAP includes objectives and Principles relating to well siting , construction and maintenance , Underground water access trenches (wedgeholes), Draining or discharging water into a well, managed aquifer recharge and the importation of water.  Discussion included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Permit provisions are largely standard provisions across each of the WAP for the region, and should stay the same unless there is something specific to the Tatiara PWA that requires non-standard provisions.</li> <li>• Wedge holes less than 2.5m do not require a Permit, however there are water quality issues associated with wedgeholes concerning contamination by stock.</li> <li>• The SE NRM Board has been asked by DEWNR to remove current wedgehole permit provisions from the NRM Plan and each of the WAPs as the Permit provisions for wedgeholes were reliant on regulations being enacted. DEWNR advised the Board that a regulation is now not considered as the approach to address the issue.</li> <li>• Comment was made that there are a number of landholders with centrifugal pumps in the bottom of wedge holes to enable appropriate values of water to be sourced. Also that some members suspect that many local wedgeholes are deeper than 2.5m.</li> <li>• It was concluded that wedgehole provisions require review.</li> </ul> <p><b>Action 3.18</b> - Include a review of the wedgehole provisions in the issues list.  <b>Action 3.19</b> – NRSE Staff to review permit provisions against state wide permit provisions.</p> <p><b>Section 11 – Monitoring, Evaluation &amp; Reporting</b>  Monitoring section requires review. <b>Action 3.20</b> – Include review of monitoring, evaluation &amp; reporting section of the WAP in the issues list.</p> <p><b>Section 12 – Consistency with other Plans</b>  No discussion undertaken.</p>
Review (Issues) paper	<p>PE provided a brief overview of the purpose of the review document. Phil highlighted that its purpose is to ensure that issues that will be considered as part of the amendment of the Tatiara WAP are documented. This will allow anyone with an interest in the WAP to understand what will be considered as part the work plan to amend the WAP.</p> <p>An over view was presented of the proposed structure of the review document. Sections proposed to be included :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction</li> <li>• Background</li> <li>• Matters for consideration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Status of resource <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Groundwater <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confined</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group**  
**Summary Meeting 3** 6 July 2017 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

Item	Notes
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unconfined               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Groundwater dependant ecosystem</li> <li>○ Amendments to the Act                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Unbundling</li> <li>▪ Consumptive pools</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Climate change</li> <li>○ Issues raised by the community &amp; other sources</li> <li>○ Conclusions</li> <li>○ Recommendations</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>It is proposed that in drafting the document that issues on the issues list that are the same or similar will be consolidated. The review document will provide a brief synopsis of the issue and how the issue will be explored as part of the amendment of the WAP. Advisory group members agreed that the success of the review requires good consultation.</p>
Engagement strategy	<p>Phil Elson provided a brief overview of the Tatiara WAP Review Community Engagement Strategy.</p> <p>The Engagement Strategy includes 6 phases (each phase is will be fleshed out in details as the process progresses).</p> <p>Phase 1 – Establish the Tatiara WAP Advisory Group</p> <p>Phase 2 – Review of the Tatiara WAP (Review Document)</p> <p>Phase 3 – Investigation of issues and development of recommendations</p> <p>Phase 4 – Produce 1<sup>st</sup> draft of revised WAP (Consultation)</p> <p>Phase 5 – Produce final draft of revised WAP (Consultation)</p> <p>Phase 6 - Adoption of revised WAP and implementation</p>
Additional Item – Lake Albert	<p>An item related to Lake Albert was raised by Robert Mock <b>for information only</b>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Robert highlighted that Lake Albert was the source of water for a prosperous local dairy industry. Since the millennium drought the lake is now quite saline with salinity levels at approx. 1700ppm.</li> <li>• The area west of the Tatiara and the Stirling management areas have groundwater salinities at levels that are higher than that of Lake Albert.</li> <li>• A proposal has been identified to pipe water from Lake Albert to the Stirling management area for use there.</li> <li>• Currently under the provisions of section 10.6 Importation of Water the piping of this water would not be permissible.</li> <li>• Due to the geography of the lake and its connectivity to the lower lakes system Lake Albert is not able to be refresh as the salt cannot be easily flushed out.</li> <li>• A revision of the current provisions relating to bringing in water and subsequent allocations would be required.</li> <li>• The example of other WAPs having a provision that allows the Minister to consider additional consumptive pools may help permit this type of activity if it was needed.</li> </ul>

**Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group**  
**Summary Meeting 3** 6 July 2017 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

Item	Notes
Summary of Discussion – Next Steps	Next meeting 27 <sup>th</sup> July 5.00pm NRSE Keith Office
Meeting Close	7.40pm

**Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group**  
**Summary Meeting 3** 6 July 2017 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

<b>Action</b>	<b>Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group Actions</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
1.1	That the Onion and Potato Grower Stakeholder organisations are written to again to seek nominations to the Advisory group, the letter should also seek their views on how they feel that can be more closely involved if they are unable to nominate a member.	Email sent 15.6.17 No response 6.7.17	
1.2	Positions for Onion and Potato Grower Organisations be held open for members if they are able to become involved as the planning process develops.	ongoing	Organisations may be represented at any stage of review
1.3	That the McKillop Farm Management Group is written to again to check if their views on nomination have changed and ask if they would now like to nominate. This letter should also advise them of the full membership of the group to check if they feel their members enterprises are adequately represented by the current group membership.	Email sent 15.6.17 No response 6.7.17	
1.4	Build in engagement of JBS into the Community Engagement Strategy	JBS to be contacted along with other confined users	
1.7	Set Ground Rules and the Charter as a standing meeting agenda item.	ongoing	Remain open for discussion & review
1.8	Clarification to be sought from the Board if there are provisions to support travel for those that are not funded by their employer.	Completed	No financial support for travel to be provided
1.9	Roger Cranswick to locate the study that examined the transition line between the Mallee Highland and the Coastal plains and share with the group	JS to obtain document from Nick McIntyre	
1.10	Detailed outline of the current Tatiara WAP its policies and how the policies are operating is to be included as an item on the agenda for meeting 2 of the group.	Complete	Group provided with outline of current WAP
1.12	The CSIRO salinity report prepared as part of the Padthaway project by Helen Cleugh be made available to the group. Kerry Degaris to source	JS to circulate document to group	
1.13	Impacts of clay spreading / delving requires greater understanding – Naracoorte ranges report to be located and communicated to the group	Dan Newson to be contacted to provide clay spreading presentation to group	
1.14	Work on consumptive pools and unbundling will need to be scheduled into the groups work plan / forward agenda programme	Discussion to be scheduled at a future meeting	
1.15	More information/ discussion needed on the basis for the transition line between the Highland and the Plains	See action 1.9	

**Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group**  
**Summary Meeting 3** 6 July 2017 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

<b>Action</b>	<b>Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group Actions</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
1.16	Next meeting will include stepping through the Policies of the WAP to assist in understanding how the WAP operates. PE to provide a web link to the group to access the WAP	Completed	Web link provided 15.6.17 Group provided with outline of current WAP
2.1	Dot point summary of meetings to be supplied to SAG members within 7 business days of each meeting	Ongoing	
2.2	Provide response to question 'How is drawdown limit of 0.5m measured?'	Completed	Response provided to group
2.3	Provide the 2015/16 Tatiara Groundwater Resource Condition report and the separate region wide Confined Aquifer Status report when ready	Still awaiting reports	
2.4	Raise question with SAG of how to deal with DS in modelling scenarios.	See action 3.2	
2.5	Provide response to question 'Are more users accessing the confined aquifer for stock and domestic?'	Completed	Response provided to group
2.6	DS for flood irrigation when applied by pivot, when delivery method changed or when applied in split systems to be included in issues paper	Completed	Will be considered as part of review
2.7	DS allocation permanent vs temporary to be included in issues paper	Completed	Will be considered as part of review
2.8	Propose that 140% usage be included in additional modelling scenarios	See action 3.2	
2.9	Provide response to question 'Are some users using their full allocation each year?'	Completed	Response provided to group
2.10	Provide response to question 'Should principle 46 be in the SPR section and is the timing in principle 46 deemed to be the use period?'	Completed	Response provided to group
2.11	New thinking on the way the hydro assessments are done to be included in issues paper	Completed	Will be considered as part of review
2.12	Provide response to question 'Piping of water 2.5km in channel vs pipe, what is permissible?'	Completed	Response provided to group
2.13	Provide response to question 'Principle 84 refers to principles 58 – 63 yet the reference in principle 76(b)(i) refers to principles 58 – 64 is this correct?'	Completed	Response provided to group
2.14	Provide response to question 'The contradiction between principles 78 and 86 which overrides which?'	Completed	Response provided to group
2.15	Correct current references in principles 89 & 91 referring to 55(a)(i) to 59(a)(i)	Completed	Included in corrections list

**Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group**  
**Summary Meeting 3** 6 July 2017 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

<b>Action</b>	<b>Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group Actions</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
2.16	Provide web site link to USE WAP Phase 1 Engagement Report to SAG members	Completed	Group provided with link
2.17	Provide current list of identified additional issues to SAG members	Completed	Group provided with list (version 30.6.17)
2.18	Provide summary of key engagement and conclusions from LLC WAP review engagement report to SAG members	Completed	Members informed
2.19	JS to seek direction on the placement of SAG meeting notes on the NRSE web site	Tim Bond to review notes and authorise release to web as draft	Draft notes available on NRSE web site
3.1	Clay spreading and its potential role as a recharge impacting activity to be included on issues list.	Completed	Will be considered as part of review
3.2	Roger Cranswick (DEWNR Senior hydrogeologist) to be invited to a future meeting to discuss how the Groundwater model treats extraction and the return to the aquifer of the delivery supplement and the potential to model 140% use of all allocations		
3.3	Section 7 Transfer Criteria is complex and should be made simpler if possible. Add to issues list.	Completed	Will be considered as part of review
3.4	Include review of if transfers from the unconfined to the confined aquifers should be allowed on the issues list	Completed	Will be considered as part of review
3.5	Organise Roger Cranswick to attend a future group meeting and provide a presentation on the confined aquifer		
3.6	Include a review of the unconfined transfer principles in the issues list.	Completed	Will be considered as part of review
3.7	Include a review of the 75% transfer provisions in the issues list.	Completed	Will be considered as part of review
3.8	Include a review of all of the aquifer recharge provisions in the plan in the issues list.	Completed	Will be considered as part of review
3.9	Include a review of principle 129 concerning transfer approvals in the issues list.	Completed	Will be considered as part of review
3.10	Include revision of all Confined Aquifer principles in issues list.	Completed	Will be considered as part of review
3.11	Include review of both confined and unconfined temporary transfer principles in the issues list.	Completed	Will be considered as part of review

**Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group**  
**Summary Meeting 3** 6 July 2017 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith

<b>Action</b>	<b>Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group Actions</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
3.12	Include review of the concept of combining confined and unconfined principles with aim to simplify plan in issues list.	Completed	Will be considered as part of review
3.13	Include review of principle 150 provision relating to the active and expeditious use principles in the issues list.	Completed	Will be considered as part of review
3.14	Include review of principle 152 relating to hydrological effects and assessment in the issues list.	Completed	Will be considered as part of review
3.15	Include review of principles relating to hydrological effects 152 and principle 59 with view to combining both in one policy section in the issues list. (Linked to Action 3.12)	Completed	Will be considered as part of review
3.16	– Include review of principles 158 to 163 relating to active and expeditious use of water and their relevance (or redundancy) in issues list.	Completed	Will be considered as part of review
3.17	Include review of principles 164 and 165 relating to endorsement of certificates of title on licenses in issues list.	Completed	Will be considered as part of review
3.18	Include a review of the wedge hole provisions in the issues list.	Completed	Will be considered as part of review
3.19	NRSE Staff to review permit provisions against state wide permit provisions.		
3.20	Include review of monitoring, evaluation & reporting section in issues list.	Completed	Will be considered as part of review
3.21	Include the removal of redundant provisions in issue list.	Completed	Will be considered as part of review

**Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group  
Summary Meeting 3 6 July 2017 – 5pm NRSE Office Keith**

**Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group  
Recommendation Table**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Board Decision</b>
1.1	The Group recommended that section 4 (membership ) of the charter be amended to enable the addition of other stakeholder groups to become members of the advisory Group with the consent permission of the SE NRM Board It was suggested that the removal of the number of members (13 ) would ensure that more groups could be added to the reference group	Group charter amendments as per the groups recommendation approved by the Board 22.6.17 Completed

**Tatiara WAP Stakeholder Advisory Group  
Members Task Table**

<b>Task No.</b>	<b>Task</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
1.3	Members are requested to provide advice on if they prefer hard copies of meeting materials or electronic copies.	Completed	Members prefer electronic copies
2.1	SAG members to consult with stakeholder organisations to identify any additional issues	Ongoing until 27.7.17	
2.2	SAG to review overview of proposed stakeholder engagement table and provide any feedback	Completed	No changes proposed
2.3	SAG to review the summary of key engagement and conclusions from LLC WAP review engagement report and provide any feedback	Completed	No changes proposed