

Clearwater 2016 Integrated Water Management Needs Analysis Verification for Regional Victoria – Summary

In September 2016, Clearwater undertook a series of targeted telephone surveys/interviews with regional stakeholders involved in Integrated Water Management (IWM) in order to identify capacity needs of Regional Victoria and verify the findings of a state-wide [Needs Analysis undertaken in 2014](#).

Participants were selected with the intent to provide a good geographic representation and mix of executive/management and officer-level respondents from each stakeholder group. In total, 46 surveys were completed across 8 stakeholder groups, as outlined in Table 1 below.

Table 1: 2016 Needs Analysis Verification survey respondents by stakeholder group

Stakeholder Group	Number of Respondents
Local Government – rural	7 (4 executives/managers and 3 officers)
Local Government – regional centres	7 (4 executives/managers and 3 officers)
Water Corporations	10 (7 executives/managers and 3 officers)
Catchment Management Authorities (CMAs)	6 (5 executives/managers and 1 officer)
Consultants	6
Development Industry	4
Contractors	4
Industry Groups not allocated to any group above	2
Total	46

The 2016 Needs Analysis Verification examined four key 'capacity spheres', consistent with the 2014 Needs Analysis: *Institutional Rules and Incentives*; *Inter-Organisational Capacity*; *Intra-Organisational Capacity* and *Individual Capacity*.

The 2016 Needs Analysis Verification was not intended to be an exhaustive survey. Rather, it provides a high-level indication of regional stakeholders' priority IWM capacity needs and a starting point to identify which capacity building initiatives will provide most value to the industry. While Clearwater has worked to ensure the results are representative of Regional Victoria, results should be interpreted with this in mind and with the following considerations:

- data was provided through self-assessment, typically by one representative for each organisation; and
- is likely that some relevant organisations and individuals have not had the opportunity to participate in providing data due to time constraints and a lack of contact information.

Overall, the 2016 IWM Needs Analysis Verification found that:

- The capacity needs identified in 2014 were robust and are still relevant to stakeholders in regional as well as rural Victoria in 2016;
- The need for improvement of the capacity elements varied slightly across stakeholder groups (refer to Table 2 below);
- Regional and rural stakeholders were generally positive about Clearwater's and DELWP's attention to building IWM capacity in their area, and keen to contribute further;
- The project was valuable in helping to connect with key contacts for engagement in future IWM capacity building initiatives; and
- Across all stakeholder groups, the highest priority capacity building needs were in the *Institutional Rules and Incentives* and *Inter-Organisational* spheres.

Table 2 provides a summary of the findings from the 2016 Needs Analysis Verification, including a comparison with the 2014 Needs Analysis findings (which was conducted Victoria-wide though data was predominantly offered from stakeholders based in metropolitan Melbourne). . A brief summary of key capacity needs for each stakeholder group is provided below:

- **Rural councils:** priority capacity needs were generally mixed across all spheres, with a particular focus on the need for: funding; improved leadership from, and partnership/collaboration with, State Government; and improved community engagement.
- **Regional centre councils:** priority capacity needs were fairly mixed across spheres with slightly more emphasis on *Institutional Rules and Incentives* than rural councils, and a particular focus on the need for: funding and staff resources; understanding the full costs and benefits of IWM; planning processes for IWM in new developments; asset handover and maintenance; and community engagement.
- **Water corporations:** priority capacity needs were focussed on *Institutional Rules and Incentives*, *Inter-Organisational Capacity* and funding, and included: establishing a clear vision of what IWM is for regional areas, through regional working groups; and improving 'soft' (people-focussed) skills, e.g. in communication, collaboration and systems thinking.
- **CMAs:** priority capacity needs were focussed on *Institutional Rules and Incentives* and *Inter-Organisational Capacity*, including: improving regional collaboration and integration; and better understanding organisational roles and responsibilities in IWM.
- **Consultants:** priority capacity needs focussed strongly on *Institutional Rules and Incentives* and *Inter-Organisational Capacity*, including: clear articulation of the vision, costs and benefits for IWM; improving collaboration between organisations; improving skills, understanding and commitment of the various authorities involved; and improving the comprehensiveness of planning controls to address current 'gaps' in regulations/processes.
- **Development industry:** priority capacity needs focussed strongly on funding, *Institutional Rules and Incentives* and *Inter-Organisational Capacity*, including: improving collaboration and coordination between organisations on preferred IWM options, particularly for councils; better understanding the costs and benefits of IWM; and community engagement.
- **Contractors:** priority capacity needs focussed on *Institutional Rules and Incentives* and *Inter-Organisational Capacity*, including funding, vision, regulations and community engagement but they generally considered that the capacity of their own organisations and individuals was satisfactory (although other stakeholder groups did not necessarily share this view).

Table 2: Priority IWM capacity building needs by stakeholder group with comparison to 2014 Needs Analysis Results (note the 2014 findings were not specific to regional Victoria)

Theme	Element	Local Gov't – Rural		Local Gov't - Regional Centres		Water Authorities		CMAs (no data in 2014)		Consultants		Development Industry		Contractors	
		2014	2016	2014	2016	2014	2016	2014	2016	2014	2016	2014	2016	2014	2016
Leadership	Clear definition of, & commitment to, IWM vision for VIC	✓	H	✓	H		H		H	✓	VH	✓	M		H
Community Engagement	Public awareness of water issues & IWM within VIC	✓	H	✓	H		M		H	✓	H	✓	H	✓	H
Policy and Legislation	Improved IWM legislation, regulations & policy tools	✓	M	✓	H		H		VH	✓	H	✓	M	✓	H
Costs/Funding	Funding mechanisms	✓	H	✓	H	✓	VH		H	✓	H	✓	VH	✓	VH
	Understanding full costs & benefits of IWM	✓	H	✓	VH	✓	VH		VH	✓	VH	✓	VH		VH
Roles and Responsibilities	Clear roles & responsibilities defined for all organisations	✓	M	✓	H		H		H	✓	H	✓	H		H
Communication, Engagement, Coordination	Clear mechanisms for communication, coordination & cooperation between organisations	✓	H	✓	M	✓	H		H		H	✓	H	✓	H
Communication and Collaboration	Good communication & collaboration within your organisation	✓	M	✓	M		M		M	✓	L	✓	M		L
Commitment/ Buy-in	Clear senior management support for IWM	✓	H	✓	H		M		L		L		L		M
	Strong policy framework for IWM within your org	✓	M	✓	H		M		M		M		L		M
Funding / Resources	Funding for IWM (both capital & ongoing costs)	✓	VH	✓	H		H		M	✓	M	✓	H	✓	M
	Adequate staffing to plan, implement & maintain IWM	✓	H	✓	VH		H		M	✓	M	✓	L	✓	M
Implementation	Clear roles & responsibilities defined within your org	✓	M	✓	H		M		L	✓	L	✓	VL		M
	Clear & efficient systems and processes	✓	M	✓	M		L		M	✓	M	✓	L		VL
	Access to tools, materials & resources for planning, implementation & maintenance of IWM assets	✓	M	✓	M		H		L	✓	M	✓	L		VL
Champion	Champion to lead & promote IWM in the org	✓	H	✓	H		M		M	✓	L	✓	M		M
Knowledge and Skills	Staff have skills & knowledge to undertake tasks	✓	M	✓	H		M		M	✓	M	✓	L		L
	Staff recognise IWM opportunities & can think laterally & exhibit innovation	✓	H	✓	H		H		M	✓	M	✓	M		H

Key: VH – Very High, H – High, M – Medium, L – Low, VL – Very Low, ✓ – identified capacity need in 2014

Red indicates a priority (H or VH) need identified in the 2016 verification, not identified as a key need in the 2014 Needs Analysis (i.e. increase in need)

Light blue indicates a key need identified in the 2014 Needs Analysis that was assessed as a low (or VL) need in the 2016 verification (i.e. reduction in need)

Grey indicates where the data set was too small for comparison