LEAD ASSET MANAGEMENT

Suite 3, Level 11, 111 St Georges Tce, Perth, WA 6000
www.leadassetmanagement.com.au
ABN: 17 657 211 562
ACN: 657 211 562

Harvey Water

Water Services Licence (WL31)
2026 Asset Management System Review

Final report

August 2026

Suite 3, Level 11, 111 St Georges Tce, Perth, WA 6000
www.leadassetmanagement.com.au
ABN: 17 657 211 562
ACN: 657 211 562

18 May 2026

Alison Ovenden
Senior Regulatory Officer
Economic Regulation Authority
Level 4, Albert Facey House
469 Wellington Street
PERTH WA 6000

Dear Alison

Water Service Licence (WL31) – 2025 Asset Management System Review report

We have completed the Water Services Licence Asset Management System Review for Harvey Water for the period 1 December 2022 to 30 November 2025 and are pleased to submit our report to you.

I confirm that this report is an accurate presentation of the findings and conclusions from our review procedures.

If you have any questions or wish to discuss anything raised in the report, please contact Joey Fu at joey@leadassetmanagement.com.au or myself at daniel@leadassetmanagement.com.au.

Yours sincerely,

Lead Asset Management

[redacted]

Daniel Rivera
Managing Director
www.leadassetmanagement.com.au

LEAD ASSET MANAGEMENT

Table of Contents

1. Independent auditor's assurance report 4
2. Executive Summary 6
2.1 Introduction and Background 6
2.2 Findings 6
2.3 Harvey Water's response to previous review recommendations 7
2.4 Recommendations to Address Current Asset System Deficiencies 7
3. Scope of the Review 9
3.1 Scope and objectives 9
3.2 Review Approach and Work Schedule 10
4. Summary of Ratings 12
5. Detailed findings, recommendations and action plans 15
5.1 Asset Planning 16
5.2 Asset Creation and Acquisition 24
5.3 Asset Disposal 27
5.4 Operating Environment 29
5.5 Asset Operations 33
5.6 Asset Maintenance 40
5.7 Asset Management Information System 49
5.8 Risk Management 58
5.9 Contingency Planning 61
5.10 Financial Planning 62
5.11 Capital Expenditure Planning 66
5.12 Review of Asset Management System 69
6. Status of recommendations addressing asset system deficiencies from the previous review 72
Appendix A – Review Plan 74
Appendix B – References 75

1. Independent auditor's assurance report

Limited assurance conclusion

We have undertaken a limited assurance engagement on the effectiveness of Harvey Water's Asset Management System (AMS), relating to its Water Services Licence WL31 (the Licence), for the period 1 December 2022 to 30 November 2025. Our evaluation was made against the asset management system effectiveness criteria in the Economic Regulation Authority's Audit and Review Guidelines for Water Licences (2025) and in accordance with the approved Audit and Review Plan.

Based on the procedures we have performed and the evidence we have obtained, nothing has come to our attention that causes us to believe that Harvey Water has not established and maintained, in all material respects, an effective Asset Management System for the licensed services covered by Water Services Licence WL31 during the period 1 December 2022 to 30 November 2025.

The review identified improvement opportunities to strengthen implementation, integration, governance and maturity across several asset management processes. These matters are described in this report and are not considered to prevent an unmodified limited assurance conclusion.

Basis for conclusion

We conducted our engagement in accordance with Standard on Assurance Engagements ASAE 3500 Performance Engagements, the ERA's Audit and Review Guidelines for Water Licences (2025), and the approved Audit and Review Plan.

We believe that the evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our conclusion.

Harvey Water's responsibility for the AMS

Harvey Water is responsible for ensuring that it has:

- Complied in all material respects with the requirements of the Licence as specified by the Review Guidelines.
- Established and maintained an effective AMS for assets subject to the Licence, as measured by the effectiveness criteria detailed in the Guidelines.

Our independence and quality control

Lead Asset Management has complied with applicable independence requirements relevant to this engagement.

We confirm that Lead Asset Management, and the personnel involved in performing this review, are independent of Harvey Water and have no relationships or interests that would impair objectivity in undertaking the Asset Management System Review.

Lead Asset Management applies internal quality management processes designed to provide reasonable assurance that engagements are performed in accordance with applicable professional standards, regulatory requirements, and internal policies. These processes include engagement planning, supervision, review of work performed, and review of the final report prior to issue.

The review was conducted by personnel with appropriate experience and competence in asset management systems, operational performance, maintenance management, governance, and assurance reviews.

Our responsibilities

Our responsibility is to express a limited assurance conclusion on the effectiveness of Harvey Water's Asset Management System for Water Licence WL31 based on the procedures performed.

The review was undertaken in accordance with the Economic Regulation Authority's Audit and Review Guidelines: Water Licences (2025) and the scope approved in the Audit and Review Plan.

A limited assurance engagement involves performing procedures, primarily consisting of enquiries, interviews, observation, analytical review, examination of documents and records, and selective testing of relevant controls and practices. The procedures performed are less extensive than those required for a reasonable assurance engagement and therefore provide a lower level of assurance.

Our procedures were designed to assess whether Harvey Water had established and maintained an Asset Management System that is generally effective in supporting the delivery of licensed services and whether opportunities for improvement exist across the prescribed asset management processes.

Inherent Limitations

Because of the inherent limitations of any review, together with the internal control structure of an organisation, it is possible that deficiencies may exist that were not detected by our procedures.

A limited assurance engagement relating to the period from 1 December 2022 to 30 November 2025 does not provide assurance on whether the effectiveness of Harvey Water's AMS for assets subject to the Licence will continue in the future.

Restricted use

This report has been prepared for use by the intended users as specified in Section 25 of the Water Services Act 2012 for the purpose of expressing a limited assurance conclusion on the effectiveness of Harvey Water's AMS for assets subject to the Licence for the period 1 December 2022 to 30 November 2025. We disclaim any assumption of responsibility for any reliance on this report to any person other than the intended users as specified in Section 25 of the Water Services Act 2012, or for any purpose other than that for which it was prepared.

Lead Asset Management



Daniel Rivera
Managing Director
18 May 2026

2. Executive Summary

2.1 Introduction and Background

The Economic Regulation Authority (the **ERA**) has under the provisions of the Water Services Act 2012 (the **Act**), issued to Harvey Water (the **Licence**) a Water Services Licence (WL31). The Licence authorises Harvey Water to provide water services in its licensed operating area.

Harvey Water is a water services licensee operating in the Southwest region of Western Australia. Its core business is the delivery of non-potable water supply and irrigation services to customers in the Harvey, Waroona and Collie areas. Harvey Water operates channel and piped irrigation delivery systems that serve approximately 1,000 irrigators. The Licence also includes the provision of potable water supply to the Albemarle potable water supply customer.

The assets reviewed as part of this Asset Management System Review are those used by Harvey Water to provide the licensed services under WL31. These assets include open channels, piped distribution networks, pump stations, bores, electrical infrastructure, control systems, water treatment assets, potable water supply infrastructure associated with the Albemarle supply, and supporting operational assets. The review considered these assets in the context of Harvey Water's Asset Management System, including the planning, operation, maintenance, renewal, risk management, financial planning, information systems and governance processes that support their management.

Based on the information reviewed and discussions with Harvey Water personnel, no substantial changes to the nature of Harvey Water's licensed business or the overall asset base were identified since the previous review. Harvey Water has continued to operate and maintain the assets required to provide its licensed services. The review did, however, identify ongoing changes and improvement activities relevant to the maturity of the Asset Management System, including continued development of the Asset Management Plan, operational oversight and reporting, risk management processes, future information system enhancements, and investment in asset replacement and renewal activities.

Section 25 of the Act requires Harvey Water to provide to the ERA an asset management system review (the review) report conducted by an independent expert acceptable to the ERA at least once in every 24-month period unless otherwise approved by the ERA. With the ERA's approval, Lead Asset Management was appointed to conduct this review for the period 1 December 2022 to 30 November 2025 (**review period**).

This review has been conducted to assess the effectiveness of Harvey Water's Asset Management System for the assets subject to Water Services Licence WL31. The review was undertaken in accordance with the ERA's 2025 Audit and Review Guidelines for Water Licences (Review Guidelines), which require the review to assess the adequacy and effectiveness of the Asset Management System against the 12 asset management processes and associated effectiveness criteria set out in the Guidelines.

2.2 Findings

The review found that Harvey Water has established the core elements of an Asset Management System and continues to operate and maintain assets necessary to provide licensed services under Water Licence WL31.

Key elements identified include:

- an Asset Management Plan
- operational and maintenance practices
- budgeting and financial planning processes
- supporting information systems
- a developing risk management framework
- management oversight of key asset matters.

Harvey Water uses an asset and maintenance management system referred to as AMS. The system includes an equipment hierarchy, asset records and fields for asset details, work orders, work order history, and functionality to generate preventive maintenance work orders. For the purposes of this report, a Computerised Maintenance Management System (CMMS) refers to a computerised system used to plan, schedule, record and monitor maintenance activities, work orders, asset maintenance history and related maintenance information.

The review noted that Harvey Water's AMS includes CMMS-type functionality. However, the preventive maintenance work order generation functionality was not active at the time of the review. Harvey Water advised that this functionality had previously been used to trigger preventive maintenance work orders. As a result, while the system capability exists, preventive maintenance planning and scheduling is not currently being fully systematised through the AMS.

Notwithstanding the above, the review identified a number of opportunities to further strengthen the effectiveness, integration, and maturity of the Asset Management System.

The principal findings were:

- The Asset Management Plan is not yet fully embedded into day-to-day operational decision-making across all areas.
- Maintenance planning and preventive maintenance processes are not fully systematised, despite the AMS having functionality to support work orders, work order history and preventive maintenance triggers.
- The asset register and supporting systems could be improved to provide greater asset-level visibility, completeness and consistency of asset information.
- Asset management and financial systems are not fully integrated for asset-level cost reporting.
- User access controls and governance of asset management information systems could be strengthened.
- Performance indicators are not consistently formalised and applied across the asset base.
- The risk management framework is still being embedded into operational and maintenance decision-making.
- A formal periodic review process for the Asset Management System is not yet established.

Overall, Harvey Water's Asset Management System is generally established; however, a number of improvement opportunities exist to strengthen implementation, governance, and long-term maturity. In particular, better use of the AMS maintenance management functionality would support more structured preventive maintenance planning, improved maintenance history, and stronger asset-level decision-making.

2.3 Harvey Water's response to previous review recommendations

The previous Asset Management System Review for Harvey Water was completed in 2022. The current review considered the status of recommendations arising from that previous review, including actions taken by Harvey Water during the current review period and whether any matters remain unresolved.

Harvey Water has undertaken actions to address recommendations from the previous review, including continued development of the Asset Management Plan, improvements to operational oversight and reporting, further development of risk management processes, identification of future information system enhancements, and continued investment in asset replacement and renewal activities.

A detailed assessment of the status of recommendations from the previous review is provided in section 6 of this report. The assessment identifies recommendations resolved during the current review period and any recommendations unresolved at the end of the current review period.

2.4 Recommendations to Address Current Asset System Deficiencies

A. Resolved during current review period

Nil.

B. Unresolved at end of current review period

The findings have been translated into 11 discrete recommendations in Section 2.4 to support incorporation into Harvey Water's Post-Review Implementation Plan and tracking by the ERA.

The current review recommendations are set out below.

Recommendation Reference	Asset Management Process	Matter	Auditor Recommendation
01/2026	Asset Maintenance	Preventive maintenance planning	Enable and maintain preventive maintenance functionality in the CMMS for relevant asset classes, with documented schedules, responsibilities and completion monitoring.
02/2026	Asset Maintenance	Maintenance KPIs and reporting	Establish maintenance KPIs such as preventive maintenance compliance, corrective backlog, priority work completion, downtime and repeat failures, and report them periodically to management.
03/2026	Asset Maintenance	Failure analysis	Define responsibilities and thresholds for failure analysis and ensure significant or recurring failures result in documented changes to inspection, maintenance, renewal or operating plans.

Recommendation Reference	Asset Management Process	Matter	Auditor Recommendation
04/2026	Asset Management Information System	User access controls	As part of the AMS upgrade or interim access control arrangements, replace shared AMS / CMMS user access with named accounts or equivalent controls that provide individual authentication, accountability and traceability of data changes and work order actions.
05/2026	Asset Management Information System	Data completeness and reporting	Define required asset data fields and data quality checks for the CMMS and establish periodic management reporting to monitor data completeness, asset performance and licence-relevant obligations.
06/2026	Asset Management Information System	System integration roadmap	Prepare or update an implementation roadmap for AMS and finance system integration, including requirements for asset hierarchy, work order costing, reporting and access controls, named user access, user access review and traceability of changes to asset management data, and progress the roadmap through Harvey Water's IT strategy or equivalent improvement program.
07/2026	Review of AMS	Periodic AMS review	Implement a structured periodic AMS review process covering the AMP, asset information, operations, maintenance, risk, financial planning, performance reporting and improvement actions.
08/2026	Review of AMS	Independent review / internal audit	Establish periodic independent review or internal audit of selected AMS components between ERA review cycles, including defined scope, frequency, reviewer independence, reporting of findings, recommendations and action tracking, to support proactive identification and resolution of AMS deficiencies.

Implementation of these recommendations would support a more structured, data-driven, and risk-based approach to managing Harvey Water's assets and licensed services.

3. Scope of the Review

3.1 Scope and objectives

We have conducted a limited assurance engagement in order to state whether, in our opinion, based on our procedures, Harvey Water has established and maintained, in all material respects, an effective AMS for assets subject to the Licence during the period 1 December 2022 to 30 November 2025.

The review was undertaken in accordance with the Economic Regulation Authority's Audit and Review Guidelines: Water Licences (2025).

There were no deviations from the approved Audit and Review Plan.

The procedures we performed are described in more detail in section 3.2 below.

In accordance with the Review Guidelines, the review considered the effectiveness of Harvey Water's existing control procedures within the following 12 key processes in the asset management life cycle:

Key Processes	Effectiveness Criteria
1. Asset Planning	1.1. Asset management plan covers the processes in this table
	1.2. Planning process and objectives reflect the needs of all stakeholders and are integrated with business planning
	1.3. Service levels are defined in the asset management plan
	1.4. Non-asset options (e.g. demand management) are considered
	1.5. Lifecycle costs of owning and operating assets are assessed
	1.6. Funding options are evaluated
	1.7. Costs are justified and cost drivers identified
	1.8. Likelihood and consequences of asset failure are predicted
	1.9. Asset management plan is regularly reviewed and updated
2. Asset Creation and Acquisition	2.1. Full project evaluations are undertaken for new assets, including comparative assessment of non-asset options
	2.2. Evaluations include all life-cycle costs
	2.3. Projects reflect sound engineering and business decisions
	2.4. Commissioning tests are documented and completed
	2.5. Ongoing legal / environmental / safety obligations of the asset owner are assigned and understood
3. Asset Disposal	3.1. Under-utilised and under-performing assets are identified as part of a regular systematic review process
	3.2. The reasons for under-utilisation or poor performance are critically examined and corrective action or disposal undertaken
	3.3. Disposal alternatives are evaluated
	3.4. There is a replacement strategy for assets
4. Operating Environment	4.1. Opportunities and threats in the asset management system environment are assessed
	4.2. Performance standards (availability of service, capacity, continuity, emergency response, etc.) are measured and achieved
	4.3. Compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements
	4.4. Service standard (customer service levels etc) are measured and achieved
5. Asset Operations	5.1. Operational policies and procedures are documented and linked to service levels
	5.2. Risk management is applied to prioritise operations tasks
	5.3. Assets are documented in an asset register including asset type, location, material, plans of components, and an assessment of assets' physical/structural condition
	5.4. Accounting data is documented for assets
	5.5. Operational costs are measured and monitored
	5.6. Staff resources are adequate and staff receive training commensurate with their responsibilities
6. Asset Maintenance	6.1. Maintenance policies and procedures are documented and linked to service levels required
	6.2. Regular inspections are undertaken of asset performance and condition
	6.3. Maintenance plans (emergency, corrective and preventative) are documented and completed on schedule
	6.4. Failures are analysed and operational/maintenance plans adjusted where necessary
	6.5. Risk management is applied to prioritise maintenance tasks
	6.6. Maintenance costs are measured and monitored

Key Processes	Effectiveness Criteria
7. Asset Management Information System	7.1. Adequate system documentation for users and IT operators
	7.2. Input controls include suitable verification and validation of data entered into the system
	7.3. Security access controls appear adequate, such as passwords
	7.4. Physical security access controls appear adequate
	7.5. Data backup procedures appear adequate and backups are tested
	7.6. Computations for licensee performance reporting are accurate
	7.7. Management reports appear adequate for the licensee to monitor licence obligations
	7.8. Adequate measures to protect asset management data from unauthorised access or theft by persons outside the organisation
8. Risk Management	8.1. Risk management policies and procedures exist and are applied to minimise internal and external risks
	8.2. Risks are documented in a risk register and treatment plans are implemented and monitored
	8.3. Probability and consequences of asset failure are regularly assessed
9. Contingency planning	9.1. Contingency plans are documented, understood and tested to confirm their operability and to cover higher risks
10. Financial Planning	10.1. The financial plan states the financial objectives and identifies strategies and actions to achieve those
	10.2. The financial plan identifies the source of funds for capital expenditure and recurrent costs
	10.3. The financial plan provides projections of operating statements (profit and loss) and statement of financial position (balance sheets)
	10.4. The financial plan provides firm predictions on income for the next five years and reasonable predictions beyond this period
	10.5. The financial plan provides for the operations and maintenance, administration and capital expenditure requirements of the services
	10.6. Large variances in actual/budget income and expenses are identified and corrective action taken where necessary
11. Capital Expenditure Planning	11.1. There is a capital expenditure plan covering works to be undertaken, actions proposed, responsibilities and dates
	11.2. The capital expenditure plan provides reasons for capital expenditure and timing of expenditure
	11.3. The capital expenditure plan is consistent with the asset life and condition identified in the asset management plan
	11.4. There is an adequate process to ensure the capital expenditure plan is regularly updated and implemented
12. Review of AMS	12.1. A review process is in place to ensure the asset management plan and the asset management system described in it remain current
	12.2. Independent reviews (e.g. internal audit) are performed of the asset management system

Each key process and effectiveness criterion is applicable to Harvey Water's Licence and as such was individually considered as part of the review. The Review Plan, set out at Appendix A, details the risk assessments made for and review priority assigned to each key process and effectiveness criterion.

3.2 Review Approach and Work Schedule

Our approach for this review involved the following activities, undertaken during the period February to March 2026 by audit team members Daniel Rivera (Lead Auditor – Asset Management System Review) and Joey Fu (Lead Auditor – Operational Audit). Refer to Appendix B for the licensee personnel interviewed and key documents reviewed.

- Used the Guidelines to develop a risk assessment, including discussions with key staff and review of documents to undertake a preliminary assessment of relevant controls.
- Developed a Review Plan (see Appendix A) for approval by the ERA, and an associated work program.
- Correspondence and interviews with relevant Harvey Water representatives to gain an understanding of process controls in place (see Appendix B for staff involved).
- Site visit to Harvey Water's operations with a focus on understanding the assets, their function, normal mode of operation, age and an assessment of the facilities against the AMS review criteria.
- Review of documents, processes and controls to assess the overall effectiveness of Harvey Water's AMS (see Appendix B for reference listing).

- Obtained representations from Harvey Water staff regarding the occurrence of activities related to asset management processes and sub-criteria assessed by this review.
- Consideration of the resourcing applied to maintaining those controls and processes.
- Validated observations and draft findings with Harvey Water staff.

Review fieldwork was performed through a combination of a site visit to Harvey Water's operations in the Harvey region of WA and remotely via email exchange and Microsoft Teams calls.

A site visit was conducted to Harvey Water's offices and operational facilities including the Stirling Dam, channel and pipe distribution network, and Albemarle potable water supply infrastructure. Inspections were undertaken to validate operational practices and asset condition.

4. Summary of Ratings

In accordance with the Guidelines, the assessment of both the process and policy definition adequacy rating (refer to Table 1) and the performance rating (refer to Table 2) for each of the key AMS processes was performed using the below ratings.

Table 1: Process and policy rating scale

Rating	Description	Criteria
A	Adequately defined	• Processes and policies are documented. • Processes and policies adequately document the required performance of the assets. • Processes and policies are subject to regular reviews, and updated where necessary. • The asset management information system(s) are adequate in relation to the assets being managed.
B	Requires some improvement	• Processes and policies require improvement. • Processes and policies do not adequately document the required performance of the assets. • Reviews of processes and policies are not conducted regularly enough. • The asset management information system(s) requires minor improvements (taking into consideration the assets being managed).
C	Requires substantial improvement	• Processes and policies are incomplete or require substantial improvement. • Processes and policies do not document the required performance of the assets. • Processes and policies are considerably out of date. • The asset management information system(s) requires substantial improvements (taking into consideration the assets being managed).
D	Inadequate	• Processes and policies are not documented. • The asset management information system(s) is not fit for purpose (taking into consideration the assets being managed).

Table 2: Performance rating scale

Rating	Description	Criteria
1	Performing effectively	• The performance of the process meets or exceeds the required levels of performance. • Process effectiveness is regularly assessed and corrective action taken where necessary.
2	Improvement required	• The performance of the process requires some improvement to meet the required level. • Process effectiveness reviews are not performed regularly enough. • Recommended process improvements are not implemented.
3	Corrective action required	• The performance of the process requires substantial improvement to meet the required level. • Process effectiveness reviews are performed irregularly, or not at all. • Recommended process improvements are not implemented.
4	Serious action required	• Process is not performed, or the performance is so poor the process is considered to be ineffective.

This report provides:

- A breakdown of each function of the AMS into sub-components as described in the Guidelines. This approach is taken to enable a more thorough review of key processes where individual components within a larger process can be of greater risk to the business therefore requiring different review treatment.
- A summary of the ratings applied by the review (Table 3) for each of:
  - Asset management process and policy rating.
  - Asset management performance rating.
- Detailed findings, including relevant observations and recommendations (Section 5). Descriptions of the effectiveness criteria can be found in section 5 and the Review Plan at Appendix A.

Table 3: AMS effectiveness summary

Asset Management Process and Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Ratings	
		Process and policy	Performance
1. **Asset Planning**	**2**	**B**	**2**
1.1. Asset management plan covers the processes in this table	2	B	2
1.2. Planning process and objectives reflect the needs of all stakeholders and are integrated with business planning	2	B	2
1.3. Service levels are defined in the asset management plan	2	B	2
1.4. Non-asset options (e.g. demand management) are considered	3	B	2
1.5. Lifecycle costs of owning and operating assets are assessed	2	B	2
1.6. Funding options are evaluated	2	A	1
1.7. Costs are justified and cost drivers identified	2	B	2
1.8. Likelihood and consequences of asset failure are predicted	2	B	2
1.9. Asset management plan is regularly reviewed and updated	2	B	2
2. Asset Creation and Acquisition	**3**	**B**	**2**
2.1. Full project evaluations are undertaken for new assets, including comparative assessment of non-asset options	3	B	2
2.2. Evaluations include all life-cycle costs	3	B	2
2.3. Projects reflect sound engineering and business decisions	3	B	2
2.4. Commissioning tests are documented and completed	3	B	2
2.5. Ongoing legal / environmental / safety obligations of the asset owner are assigned and understood	1	A	1
3. Asset Disposal	**5**	**B**	**2**
3.1. Under-utilised and under-performing assets are identified as part of a regular systematic review process	5	A	1
3.2. The reasons for under-utilisation or poor performance are critically examined and corrective action or disposal undertaken	5	A	1
3.3. Disposal alternatives are evaluated	5	A	1
3.4. There is a replacement strategy for assets	4	B	2
4. Operating Environment	**2**	**B**	**2**
4.1. Opportunities and threats in the asset management system environment are assessed	2	B	2
4.2. Performance standards (availability of service, capacity, continuity, emergency response, etc.) are measured and achieved	2	B	2
4.3. Compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements	1	A	2
4.4. Service standard (customer service levels etc) are measured and achieved	2	B	2
5. Asset Operations	**1**	**C**	**2**
5.1. Operational policies and procedures are documented and linked to service levels	2	B	2
5.2. Risk management is applied to prioritise operations tasks	2	B	2
5.3. Assets are documented in an asset register including asset type, location, material, plans of components, and an assessment of assets' physical/structural condition	1	B	2
5.4. Accounting data is documented for assets	2	B	2
5.5. Operational costs are measured and monitored	2	B	2
5.6. Staff resources are adequate and staff receive training commensurate with their responsibilities	2	B	2
6. Asset Maintenance	**1**	**C**	**3**
6.1. Maintenance policies and procedures are documented and linked to service levels required	2	B	2
6.2. Regular inspections are undertaken of asset performance and condition	2	C	3
6.3. Maintenance plans (emergency, corrective and preventative) are documented and completed on schedule	1	C	3
6.4. Failures are analysed and operational/maintenance plans adjusted where necessary	1	C	3
6.5. Risk management is applied to prioritise maintenance tasks	1	B	2
6.6. Maintenance costs are measured and monitored	2	B	2
7. Asset Management Information System	**1**	**C**	**3**
7.1. Adequate system documentation for users and IT operators	2	B	2

Asset Management Process and Effectiveness Criteria	Review Priority	Ratings	
		Process and policy	Performance
7.2. Input controls include suitable verification and validation of data entered into the system	2	C	2
7.3. Security access controls appear adequate, such as passwords	1	C	3
7.4. Physical security access controls appear adequate	2	A	1
7.5. Data backup procedures appear adequate and backups are tested	2	A	1
7.6. Computations for licensee performance reporting are accurate	2	A	1
7.7. Management reports appear adequate for the licensee to monitor licence obligations	1	B	2
7.8. Adequate measures to protect asset management data from unauthorised access or theft by persons outside the organisation	1	C	2
8. Risk Management	**2**	**B**	**2**
8.1. Risk management policies and procedures exist and are applied to minimise internal and external risks	2	B	2
8.2. Risks are documented in a risk register and treatment plans are implemented and monitored	2	B	2
8.3. Probability and consequences of asset failure are regularly assessed	2	B	2
9. Contingency planning	**1**	**A**	**1**
9.1. Contingency plans are documented, understood and tested to confirm their operability and to cover higher risks	1	A	1
10. Financial Planning	**3**	**B**	**2**
10.1. The financial plan states the financial objectives and identifies strategies and actions to achieve those	3	A	1
10.2. The financial plan identifies the source of funds for capital expenditure and recurrent costs	3	A	1
10.3. The financial plan provides projections of operating statements (profit and loss) and statement of financial position (balance sheets)	3	A	1
10.4. The financial plan provides firm predictions on income for the next five years and reasonable predictions beyond this period	3	B	2
10.5. The financial plan provides for the operations and maintenance, administration and capital expenditure requirements of the services	3	A	1
10.6. Large variances in actual/budget income and expenses are identified and corrective action taken where necessary	3	A	1
11. Capital Expenditure Planning	**3**	**B**	**2**
11.1. There is a capital expenditure plan covering works to be undertaken, actions proposed, responsibilities and dates	3	B	2
11.2. The capital expenditure plan provides reasons for capital expenditure and timing of expenditure	3	B	2
11.3. The capital expenditure plan is consistent with the asset life and condition identified in the asset management plan	3	B	2
11.4. There is an adequate process to ensure the capital expenditure plan is regularly updated and implemented	3	B	2
12. Review of AMS	**2**	**C**	**2**
12.1. A review process is in place to ensure the asset management plan and the asset management system described in it remain current	2	C	2
12.2. Independent reviews (e.g. internal audit) are performed of the asset management system	2	C	2

5. Detailed findings, recommendations and action plans

Recommendation references in Section 5 correspond to the formal current review recommendations listed in Section 2.4. Recommendation references are only included where the rating requires a formal auditor recommendation. Observations associated with A1, A2, B1 or B2 ratings are retained as findings where relevant but have not been assigned formal recommendation references.

Where a finding applies to more than one effectiveness criterion, the related criteria have been grouped, and the evidence is recorded in the relevant row. The recommendations are intended to be stand-alone so they can be incorporated into the Post-Review Implementation Plan.

5.1 Asset Planning

Key process: Planning processes reflect stakeholder needs and integrate asset management with business objectives.

Expected outcome: Assets are planned using structured lifecycle, risk, funding and service-level considerations.

Overall Adequacy / Performance rating: B – Requires some improvement / 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
1.1. Asset management plan covers the processes in this table	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Reviewed AMP 2023-24 and AMP 2024-25, Asset Management Policy, asset committee minutes, and previous Post-Review Implementation Plan (PRIP). Interviewed CFO, Contracts and Compliance Coordinator, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor. **Findings**: Harvey Water has an Asset Management Plan in place and has continued to update it during the review period. The latest AMP reviewed was B1. 20240826 AMP 2024-25-F.pdf, and earlier versions reviewed included B1. 20230118 AMP 2023-24-F.pdf and B1. 210225 AMP 2021-22_Final.pdf. The AMP addresses the key asset management processes relevant to Harvey Water's licensed services, including asset planning, operations, maintenance, risk management, financial planning, capital expenditure planning and review of the AMS. The Asset Management Policy also provides supporting governance context for the AMP. The current review found that the AMP is being used as a core asset management document and is available to management and operational personnel. Harvey Water advised that the AMP is accessible to the Operations Team and is considered through asset management meetings and management / Board forums. However, the AMP could be strengthened by more clearly defining ownership, accessibility, implementation responsibilities and the relationship between the AMP and supporting processes, records and systems. Some asset management practices are operating in practice, but the AMP does not always clearly show how those practices are implemented, monitored and updated across all asset classes. Overall, the AMP covers the relevant asset management processes, but improvements are required to strengthen the clarity, ownership and practical implementation linkage of the AMP.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
1.2. Planning process and objectives reflect the needs of all stakeholders and are integrated with business planning	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Reviewed AMP 2023-24 and AMP 2024-25, Asset Management Policy, HW Strategic Plan 2022-2026, Strategic Plan KPI files, HW Operating Budget documents, HW Capital Budget documents, and previous Post-Review Implementation Plan (PRIP). Interviewed CFO, Contracts and Compliance Coordinator, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor. **Findings**: Harvey Water's asset planning process reflects key stakeholder needs, including service delivery to irrigators and customers, regulatory obligations, operational requirements, safety, financial sustainability and renewal of the channel and pipe network. The AMP, Asset Management Policy, Strategic Plan, KPI documents and budget records demonstrate that asset planning is connected to business planning and annual financial planning. The review found that asset planning is integrated with business planning through the annual budget process, capital expenditure planning, management oversight and strategic planning activities. Harvey Water's ongoing channel and network renewal planning also demonstrates that asset planning is linked to business objectives and long-term service delivery needs. However, the link between stakeholder needs, business objectives and asset management objectives could be documented more clearly. The AMP and supporting planning records do not always explicitly show how stakeholder requirements, service levels, regulatory expectations, risk, funding constraints and operational priorities are translated into asset management objectives and actions. Overall, Harvey Water's planning process reflects stakeholder needs and is integrated with business planning, but the documentation of this linkage could be strengthened.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
1.3. Service levels are defined in the asset management plan	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: AMP files, Asset Management Policy, Customer Service Charter, Water Services Manual, Works Procedure Manual, Strategic Plan KPIs, and HW water sewerage and irrigation licence performance reporting datasheets. **Findings**: Harvey Water defines service levels through a combination of the AMP, Customer Service Charter, operational procedures, KPI documents and licence performance reporting. These documents provide a basis for understanding the service commitments relevant to the licensed services, including customer service expectations, operational response requirements and performance reporting obligations. The review found that Harvey Water monitors service performance through operational and management processes. Customer service targets, operational procedures and licence performance reporting provide evidence that service expectations are understood and that performance against service-related obligations is monitored. However, the review found that the AMP could more clearly define and consolidate service levels relevant to asset management. In particular, the relationship between licence service standards, customer service commitments, operational performance measures and asset performance measures is not always explicitly mapped in the AMP or supporting procedures. The AMP and supporting documents would be strengthened by clearly identifying the asset-related service levels that drive planning, maintenance, renewal and capital decisions. This would help demonstrate how service obligations are translated into asset management objectives, performance measures and improvement actions. Overall, service levels are defined and monitored through Harvey Water's AMP and supporting documents, but the linkage between service levels, licence obligations and asset performance measures could be more clearly documented.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
1.4. Non-asset options (e.g. demand management) are considered	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Reviewed AMP 2023-24 and AMP 2024-25, Asset Management Policy, HW Strategic Plan 2022-2026, Strategic Plan KPI files, HW Opex and Capex Budget documents, and Customer Service Charter documents. Interviewed CFO, Contracts and Compliance Coordinator, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor regarding planning decisions, demand, operational changes, customer requirements, renewal planning and capital works prioritisation. **Findings**: Harvey Water considers non-asset options in practice as part of operational and business planning. These options may include operational changes, demand management, customer engagement, scheduling of supply, changes to operating practices, maintenance intervention, or deferral / staging of capital works where appropriate. The review found that Harvey Water's planning is not limited to capital investment. Discussions with Harvey Water personnel indicated that management considers operational and financial constraints, customer requirements, service expectations, network performance and renewal needs before determining whether an asset solution is required. However, the process for documenting non-asset option assessment is not consistently formalised. The AMP and supporting planning documents do not always clearly show where non-asset options have been considered, what alternatives were assessed, why an asset-based or non-asset-based solution was selected, or how demand, operational or customer management options were evaluated. This is a moderate improvement opportunity rather than a material deficiency. Harvey Water considers non-asset options in practice, but the decision-making trail could be strengthened so that future reviews can clearly see how non-asset options were considered before capital or renewal works were approved. Overall, Harvey Water considers non-asset options through its operational and business planning processes, but the assessment and rationale should be more consistently documented.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
1.5. Lifecycle costs of owning and operating assets are assessed	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Reviewed AMP 2023-24 and AMP 2024-25, Asset List as on 30.11.2025, 20260105 Priority Maintenance to be completed next 90 days, Jobs completed for period 01.12.2022 to 30.11.2025, previous PRIP, and Opex and Capex documents. Interviewed CFO, Contracts and Compliance Coordinator, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor regarding operating costs, maintenance costs, renewal planning and capital planning. **Findings**: Harvey Water considers the costs of owning and operating assets through its AMP, annual budgeting, capital planning and maintenance planning processes. Operating budgets, capital budgets, priority maintenance records and completed job records demonstrate that asset-related costs are identified and monitored. The review found that lifecycle cost considerations are applied in practice, particularly in relation to the gravity-fed pipe and channel network, channel replacement planning, maintenance expenditure and renewal / capital planning. Harvey Water considers funding capacity, maintenance requirements, asset performance and renewal needs when planning expenditure. However, lifecycle cost assessment is not yet consistently documented as a formal whole-of-life cost analysis across all asset classes. The review did not identify a consistent framework showing how acquisition, operation, maintenance, renewal, disposal, risk and performance costs are assessed over the full life of assets and used to compare investment options. Cost information is available through budgets, maintenance records and capital planning documents, but it is not always clearly linked at asset level to lifecycle decisions such as whether to maintain, renew, replace, defer or upgrade assets. This limits Harvey Water's ability to demonstrate that lifecycle cost assessment is applied consistently and systematically across the asset base. Overall, Harvey Water assesses asset costs through practical budgeting and planning processes, but further improvement is required to formalise lifecycle cost assessment and link it more clearly to asset-level decision-making.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required
1.6. Funding options are evaluated	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Opex and Capex budget files, HW Strategic Plan, and discussions with the CFO regarding budgeting, operating expenditure, capital expenditure, funding capacity and approval of expenditure. **Findings**: Harvey Water evaluates funding options through its budgeting, financial planning and capital planning processes. The operating and capital budget documents reviewed demonstrate that funding requirements are identified and considered as part of annual planning and management review. The review found that operating expenditure, recurrent costs, maintenance requirements and capital expenditure are considered through established budget processes. Capital works and renewal requirements are considered in the context of available funding, operational priorities, asset condition and service delivery requirements. Discussions with the CFO confirmed that funding capacity and financial constraints are considered when preparing budgets, reviewing expenditure and prioritising capital works. This indicates that funding decisions are not made in isolation from asset management requirements. The review did not identify evidence that funding options were not being considered, or that lack of funding evaluation had adversely affected the delivery of licensed services during the review period. Overall, Harvey Water has adequate processes for evaluating funding options through its financial planning, budget and capital planning processes.	
	Adequacy Rating: A – Adequately defined	Performance Rating: 1 – Performing effectively

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
1.7. Costs are justified and cost drivers identified	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: AMP, Asset list as of 30.11.2025, Opex and Capex variance records, maintenance history, and maintenance forward planning. Interviewed CFO, Contracts and Compliance Coordinator, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor regarding maintenance costs, operating expenditure, renewal planning, capital expenditure and cost review processes. **Findings**: Harvey Water justifies costs through its budget, maintenance, renewal and capital planning processes. Operating and capital budgets provide evidence that asset-related expenditure is identified, reviewed and approved through established financial planning processes. The review found that cost drivers are considered in practice. These include asset condition, operational requirements, maintenance needs, service performance, renewal requirements, contractor costs, funding availability and the ongoing channel and network replacement program. Completed work order records and priority maintenance records also provide evidence of maintenance and repair activities that contribute to operating and renewal cost requirements. However, the review found that cost drivers are not always explicitly documented at asset level. Budget and capital planning records identify costs and planned expenditure, but the relationship between expenditure, asset criticality, condition, risk, lifecycle cost, maintenance history and service performance is not always clearly set out. Further improvement is available by linking costs more directly to the underlying asset-level drivers. This would assist Harvey Water to demonstrate why expenditure is required, what risk or performance issue is being addressed, and whether the selected action is the most appropriate lifecycle option. Overall, Harvey Water identifies and justifies costs through established budget and planning processes. Improvements are required to better document asset-level cost drivers and link them to lifecycle cost, criticality, condition and maintenance history.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
1.8. Likelihood and consequences of asset failure are predicted	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Reviewed AMP 2023-24 and AMP 2024-25, 20260105 Priority Maintenance to be completed next 90 days, Jobs completed for period 01.12.2022 to 30.11.2025, Risk Register, HW Risk Appetite, Risk Management presentation, Analysis and Evaluation Tables, Risk Assessment Meeting minutes, and Activity type and priority (02.Criticality Assessment_FAM.pdf and 02.Critical Assessment_AMS.docx files). Interviewed CFO, Contracts and Compliance Coordinator, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor regarding asset condition, failure risk, maintenance priorities and renewal planning. **Findings**: Harvey Water has developed risk and criticality assessment information that supports assessment of the likelihood and consequences of asset failure. The risk appetite, risk register, risk analysis tables and criticality assessment documents demonstrate that risk concepts are understood and are being applied to asset management activities. The review found that Harvey Water applies practical judgement when considering failure likelihood and consequence. This is evident in the way priority maintenance items, completed work orders and renewal planning are considered in relation to asset condition, service impact, operational constraints and customer / safety implications. However, the process for predicting likelihood and consequences of asset failure is not yet fully formalised or consistently documented across all asset classes. The review did not identify a complete and consistently maintained asset-level framework linking asset condition, failure history, likelihood, consequence, criticality, maintenance response and renewal timing. As a result, while asset failure risk is considered in practice, the basis for predicting failure likelihood and consequence is not always clearly documented or consistently linked to maintenance, operations, renewal and capital planning decisions. Overall, Harvey Water predicts likelihood and consequences of asset failure through risk, criticality and operational planning processes, but further improvement is required to make this process more systematic, asset-level and consistently documented.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
1.9. Asset management plan is regularly reviewed and updated	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Reviewed AMP 2023-24 and AMP 2024-25, asset committee minutes, and previous PRIP. Interviewed CFO, Contracts and Compliance Coordinator, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor regarding AMP updates, review responsibilities and asset management improvement actions. **Findings**: Harvey Water has reviewed and updated the AMP during the review period. The review considered AMP versions for 2021-22, 2023-24 and 2024-25, indicating that the AMP has been updated over time rather than remaining static. The latest AMP reviewed was B1. 20240826 AMP 2024-25-F.pdf. The existence of earlier AMP versions and the previous Post-Review Implementation Plan indicates that Harvey Water has taken actions to update and improve the AMP following the previous review. The AMP is also considered through management and Board / committee forums. Harvey Water advised that the AMP is accessible to the Operations Team and is included in asset management discussions. This supports the conclusion that the AMP is reviewed and communicated within the business. However, the review found that the AMP review process could be more clearly formalised. The process should define review frequency, review owner, required inputs, approval pathway, version control expectations, implementation responsibilities and how changes in asset condition, risk, maintenance performance, capital planning and improvement actions are incorporated into future AMP updates. Overall, Harvey Water regularly reviews and updates the AMP, but further improvement is required to formalise and document the review process.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

5.2 Asset Creation and Acquisition

Key process: New assets are evaluated, procured, commissioned and handed over effectively.

Expected outcome: Assets are fit for purpose and meet operational needs.

Overall Adequacy / Performance rating: B – Requires some improvement / 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
2.1. Full project evaluations are undertaken for new assets, including comparative assessment of non-asset options	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: AMP files, Asset Management Policy, Commissioning reports for Benger Pump 4 and Bore pump, and discussions with CFO, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor regarding project justification, operational need, non-asset options, funding and approval processes. **Findings**: Harvey Water undertakes project evaluation and decision-making for new assets through its asset management planning, budgeting, engineering and operational processes. The project examples reviewed, including Benger Pump 4 and the Bore commissioning evidence, indicate that new asset decisions are driven by operational need, service requirements and engineering considerations. The review found that for smaller or lower-risk works, the extent of project evaluation documentation is generally proportionate to the scale and risk of the project. Harvey Water personnel advised that project needs, practical alternatives, operating constraints and funding considerations are discussed before new asset works are progressed. However, the review found that comparative assessment of non-asset options is not consistently documented in a standard form. In particular, records reviewed did not always clearly demonstrate what non-asset options were considered, why they were discounted, and why the selected asset solution was preferred. This is an improvement opportunity rather than a material deficiency. Harvey Water considers operational and practical alternatives in decision-making, but the evidence trail should be strengthened, particularly for higher-value, higher-risk or critical asset projects. Overall, Harvey Water undertakes project evaluations for new assets, but the process for documenting comparative assessment of asset and non-asset options should be improved.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
2.2. Evaluations include all life-cycle costs	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: AMP files, Commissioning reports for Benger Pump 4 and Bore pump, Opex and Capex budget variances files, job schedules in AMS (forward log), maintenance history, and discussions with CFO, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor regarding project costs, future maintenance requirements, operating costs and capital planning. **Findings**: Harvey Water considers lifecycle cost factors in practice when evaluating new assets. The review found that project decisions consider capital cost, operating requirements, maintenance implications, available funding, asset performance and service delivery needs. Budget documents and capital planning records demonstrate that project expenditure is considered through Harvey Water's financial planning processes. Maintenance records and priority maintenance information also provide context for understanding future maintenance and operating implications of asset decisions. However, the review found that lifecycle cost assessment is not consistently documented in a standard project evaluation template. The records reviewed did not always clearly demonstrate the full lifecycle cost basis for new asset decisions, including acquisition cost, operating cost, maintenance cost, renewal cost, replacement timing, residual value or disposal considerations. For lower-risk works, the level of documentation appears proportionate. However, for higher-value or critical asset projects, Harvey Water should more clearly document the lifecycle cost assumptions used to support investment decisions. Overall, Harvey Water considers lifecycle costs when evaluating new assets, but the documentation of lifecycle cost assessment should be strengthened and standardised for material projects.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required
2.3. Projects reflect sound engineering and business decisions	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: AMP files, Asset Management Policy, Commissioning reports for Benger Pump 4 and Bore pump, and discussions with CFO, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor regarding project drivers, operational needs, engineering requirements, business justification and approval processes. **Findings**: The project examples reviewed indicate that Harvey Water's new asset decisions generally reflect sound engineering and business considerations. The Benger Pump 4 and Bore examples demonstrate that new assets are selected and commissioned to meet operational requirements and service delivery needs. The review found that Harvey Water considers engineering requirements, operational constraints, reliability, maintainability, funding availability and business need when progressing new asset works. Discussions with Harvey Water personnel supported that project decisions are subject to management and operational review before works are undertaken. However, the review found that the formal documentation of engineering and business decision-making could be improved. Project records do not always clearly show the decision rationale, options considered, risk assessment, approval pathway, lifecycle cost basis, expected benefits and link to asset management objectives. The absence of a consistent project evaluation record does not indicate that projects are unsound. Rather, it limits Harvey Water's ability to demonstrate consistently that engineering and business decisions were assessed, approved and retained in a structured form. Overall, projects reviewed appear to reflect sound engineering and business decisions, but Harvey Water should improve the consistency of documented project evaluation and approval records.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
2.4. Commissioning tests are documented and completed	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Commissioning reports for Benger Pump 4 and Bore pump, AMP files, and discussions with CFO, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor regarding commissioning expectations, commissioning documentation, asset criticality and handover requirements. **Findings**: Harvey Water retains commissioning documentation for new or changed assets. The Benger Pump 4 commissioning evidence provided confirmation that the asset had been commissioned and was operating satisfactorily. Harvey Water also provided a Bore commissioning report for a more critical asset, demonstrating that commissioning documentation is retained where required. The review found that commissioning is completed in practice and that evidence is retained for the project examples reviewed. This supports the conclusion that Harvey Water has a process in place for confirming that new assets are operational before being accepted into service. However, the level of commissioning documentation varies by asset type and criticality. The Benger Pump 4 documentation provided high-level confirmation of satisfactory operation, while the Bore commissioning report provided more detailed commissioning evidence for a more critical asset. The review did not identify a formal minimum commissioning documentation standard that specifies requirements for test procedures, acceptance criteria, test results, performance data, defects, sign-off, handover information and asset data updates. This creates a risk that commissioning evidence may vary between projects and may not consistently demonstrate that new assets meet operational, safety and performance requirements. Overall, commissioning tests are completed and documented, but minimum commissioning and handover documentation requirements should be formalised, particularly for critical assets.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required
2.5. Ongoing legal / environmental / safety obligations of the asset owner are assigned and understood	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Contractor Management Procedure, Contractor Guidelines Procedure, Contractor Induction, Operations Procedure, Emergency Management Plan, Compliance and Reporting Register, and discussions with Harvey Water personnel regarding operational, contractor, safety, environmental and compliance responsibilities. **Findings**: Harvey Water has established processes to assign and communicate ongoing legal, environmental and safety obligations relevant to the operation and maintenance of its assets. Contractor management procedures, contractor guidelines and induction material provide evidence that safety and site requirements are communicated to contractors and personnel involved in asset-related work. Operational procedures and emergency management documentation also support the assignment and understanding of responsibilities for operating assets safely and responding to incidents or abnormal operating conditions. The compliance and reporting register provides evidence that regulatory and reporting obligations are tracked. The review found that legal, environmental and safety obligations are generally understood through established operating, compliance, contractor management and emergency management processes. No evidence was identified that obligations were not assigned or that lack of understanding of these obligations had adversely affected the management of assets during the review period. Overall, Harvey Water has adequate processes for assigning and communicating ongoing legal, environmental and safety obligations associated with asset ownership and operation.	
	Adequacy Rating: A – Adequately defined	Performance Rating: 1 – Performing effectively

5.3 Asset Disposal

Key process: Assets that are under-utilised, obsolete, uneconomic or no longer required are identified and appropriately retained, renewed or disposed of.

Expected outcome: Asset disposal decisions are timely, justified, documented, and do not adversely affect service delivery or compliance obligations.

Overall Adequacy / Performance rating: B – Requires some improvement / 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
3.1. Under-utilised and under-performing assets are identified as part of a regular systematic review process	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: AMP files, Asset List, forward log, maintenance history, and discussions with CFO, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor regarding poor-performing assets, maintenance response, renewal decisions and asset replacement. **Findings**: Harvey Water identifies under-utilised and under-performing assets through its operational, maintenance and capital planning processes. Asset condition, operational performance, maintenance history and replacement requirements are considered when determining whether assets remain fit for purpose. The nature of Harvey Water's licensed asset base means that most assets are required to provide ongoing irrigation, water distribution and potable water services. As a result, disposal decisions are generally low complexity and tend to arise when assets are replaced, renewed, abandoned, made redundant or no longer required for operational use. The review found that operational personnel have direct knowledge of asset condition and performance, and this knowledge is reflected in maintenance records, priority maintenance planning and capital replacement planning. Under-performing assets are therefore identified through routine operational oversight rather than through a separate disposal-specific register. Overall, Harvey Water has adequate processes to identify under-utilised and under-performing assets as part of ongoing operational review, maintenance planning and capital planning.	
	Adequacy Rating: A – Adequately defined	Performance Rating: 1 – Performing effectively
3.2. The reasons for under-utilisation or poor performance are critically examined and corrective action or disposal undertaken	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: AMP files, Asset List, forward log, maintenance history, and discussions with CFO, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor regarding asset performance, utilisation, renewal planning and replacement decisions. **Findings**: Harvey Water examines asset performance issues through operational review, maintenance planning and capital replacement planning. Poor asset performance is considered in the context of asset condition, reliability, service impact, maintenance history, safety, cost and operational requirements. The review found that Harvey Water takes corrective action where under-performance is identified. Corrective actions may include maintenance, repair, renewal, replacement, operational adjustment or inclusion in future capital works. Completed job records and priority maintenance records provide evidence that defects and asset performance issues are reviewed and actioned. Where assets are no longer required or are replaced, disposal or removal is considered as part of the relevant renewal or replacement decision. Given the nature of Harvey Water's network assets, disposal decisions are generally straightforward and are typically linked to replacement, redundancy or change in operational requirement. Overall, Harvey Water critically examines the reasons for under-utilisation or poor performance through practical operational and maintenance processes and undertakes corrective action or disposal where required.	
	Adequacy Rating: A – Adequately defined	Performance Rating: 1 – Performing effectively

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
3.3. Disposal alternatives are evaluated	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: AMP files, Asset List, and discussions with CFO, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor regarding disposal, replacement and redundancy of assets. **Findings**: Harvey Water evaluates disposal alternatives as part of asset replacement, renewal and operational planning. The review found that disposal decisions are generally low complexity because most licensed assets are operational network assets required to provide ongoing services. Where assets are replaced or become redundant, disposal alternatives are considered in the context of operational need, residual value, safety, site requirements, ongoing maintenance requirements and whether the asset can be retained, reused, abandoned, removed or replaced. The review did not identify any material under-utilised or under-performing assets for which disposal alternatives had not been considered. No evidence was identified of inappropriate retention of obsolete assets causing service, safety, cost or compliance issues. Overall, Harvey Water's process for evaluating disposal alternatives is appropriate for the nature and complexity of its asset base.	
	Adequacy Rating: A – Adequately defined	Performance Rating: 1 – Performing effectively
3.4. There is a replacement strategy for assets	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: AMP, capital planning and budget records, Asset Committee minutes, pipe/channel performance information, shutdown and maintenance history records, and annual report asset renewal disclosures. **Findings**: Harvey Water has a replacement strategy for key network assets, particularly channels and priority pipe/pump assets, with replacement needs identified through the AMP, asset lifecycle considerations, maintenance history, condition observations and capital planning processes. However, replacement decision criteria are not consistently documented across all asset classes. The replacement strategy should more clearly show how condition, criticality, service risk, lifecycle cost, maintenance history, failure likelihood, consequence of failure and funding constraints are used to prioritise renewal and replacement works.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

5.4 Operating Environment

Key process: External obligations, service expectations, risks, opportunities and performance requirements are understood and reflected in asset management practices.

Expected outcome: The operating environment is actively monitored and asset management decisions respond to regulatory, customer, environmental and service needs.

Overall Adequacy / Performance rating: B – Requires some improvement / 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
4.1. Opportunities and threats in the asset management system environment are assessed	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: AMP files, Risk Register, Risk Appetite document, Risk Management presentation, Risk Analysis and Evaluation Tables, Emergency Management Plan documents, Customer Service Charters, Compliance and Reporting Register, and discussions with Harvey Water personnel regarding regulatory obligations, customer requirements, service risks, asset performance, emergency response, renewal planning and external operating conditions. **Findings**: Harvey Water assesses opportunities and threats in its asset management system environment through a combination of asset management planning, risk management, compliance monitoring, emergency management and operational review processes. The review found that the AMP and supporting management processes consider matters relevant to Harvey Water's operating environment, including service continuity, asset condition, renewal needs, customer requirements, funding constraints, compliance obligations and operational risks. Risk management documents, including the risk appetite, risk register and risk analysis tables, provide evidence that threats are identified, assessed and considered through a structured risk framework. Emergency management plans also demonstrate that Harvey Water considers threats that could affect service delivery, including emergency events, operational disruption and response requirements. Customer service documentation and licence compliance records provide evidence that customer expectations and regulatory obligations are considered as part of the operating environment. Harvey Water also considers opportunities through planning and improvement activities, including asset renewal planning, future information system improvements, performance reporting improvements and continued development of risk-based asset management practices. However, the review found that the linkage between opportunities and threats, risk ratings, asset criticality, treatment actions and asset management decisions could be more clearly documented. For example, the evidence does not always clearly show how external threats or opportunities are translated into specific changes to maintenance priorities, renewal timing, operating procedures, capital planning or performance monitoring. Further maturity would be achieved by documenting how identified opportunities and threats are assessed, assigned, monitored and linked to asset management actions. This would provide clearer evidence that changes in the operating environment are systematically considered and reflected in planning, risk treatment, maintenance, operations and capital decision-making. Overall, Harvey Water assesses opportunities and threats through established management, risk and planning processes. Improvements are required to make the link between the operating environment, risk assessment, asset criticality, treatment actions and asset management decisions more visible and consistently documented.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
4.2. Performance standards (availability of service, capacity, continuity, emergency response, etc.) are measured and achieved	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: AMP files, Operations Procedure, Emergency Management Plan, Compliance and Reporting Register, and HW water sewerage and irrigation licence performance reporting datasheets. **Findings**: Harvey Water monitors operational performance standards in a number of areas relevant to the delivery of licensed services. Evidence reviewed indicates that performance information is maintained for matters such as network availability, shutdowns, pipeline performance, water delivery efficiency, emergency response arrangements and annual licence performance reporting. The review found that Harvey Water has practical processes for monitoring service continuity and operational performance. Shutdown information and pipeline availability / pipe metrics provide evidence that service interruptions and asset performance matters are monitored. Water delivery efficiency reporting also supports management's understanding of operational performance and system losses. Emergency response arrangements are documented through Harvey Water's emergency management documentation and associated response procedures. This provides a basis for managing continuity of service and response to operational events. However, the review found that performance standards are not yet consistently defined and consolidated across the asset base. While Harvey Water monitors performance in several areas, the link between performance standards, asset condition, asset criticality, maintenance planning, renewal planning and capital decision-making could be more clearly documented. The performance information reviewed is useful, but a more formalised performance framework would improve consistency. This framework should define key operational performance standards, measurement methods, reporting frequency, responsibilities, thresholds for escalation and links to maintenance and renewal decisions. Overall, Harvey Water measures and monitors operational performance standards, and the evidence reviewed indicates that service availability, continuity and operational performance are being managed. Improvements are required to consolidate performance standards and more clearly link them to asset management decisions.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
4.3. Compliance with statutory and regulatory requirements	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Water Services Operating Licence WL31, Compliance and Reporting Register, HW water sewerage and irrigation licence performance reporting datasheets, annual licence reporting evidence, operational audit evidence, and discussions with the CFO, Contracts and Compliance Coordinator, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor. **Findings**: Harvey Water has established processes for identifying and monitoring statutory and regulatory requirements relevant to the licensed services. The compliance and reporting register provides evidence that obligations are tracked, while the licence performance reporting datasheets demonstrate that performance information is prepared for regulatory reporting purposes. The review found that Harvey Water maintains awareness of its licence obligations and has processes in place to support statutory and regulatory compliance. Compliance responsibilities are supported by management oversight, compliance tracking, annual reporting and operational processes. The review did not identify evidence of material non-compliance with statutory or regulatory requirements relevant to the asset management system. However, an improvement opportunity remains to more clearly link compliance obligations to service levels, asset performance measures and asset management reporting. This would assist Harvey Water to demonstrate how compliance requirements are translated into operational and asset management controls. Overall, statutory and regulatory compliance processes are established and operating. The improvement relates to clearer linkage between compliance obligations, service levels and asset performance monitoring, rather than a deficiency in compliance management.	
	Adequacy Rating: A – Adequately defined	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
4.4. Service standard (customer service levels etc) are measured and achieved	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Customer Service Charter, Strategic Plan KPIs, Compliance and Reporting Register, HW water sewerage and irrigation licence performance reporting datasheets. **Findings**: Harvey Water has defined customer service standards through its Customer Service Charter and related customer service documentation. The evidence reviewed indicates that customer service expectations, customer communication requirements and service-related obligations are documented. The review found that Harvey Water monitors customer service performance through customer service targets, annual licence performance reporting and compliance reporting processes. Shutdown notification records also provide evidence that customer impacts and service interruptions are managed and communicated. The annual licence performance reporting datasheets provide evidence that Harvey Water measures and reports service-related performance information relevant to its licensed activities. This supports the conclusion that customer service standards are measured and generally achieved. However, the review found that customer service measures could be more clearly linked to asset performance and asset management decision-making. Customer service levels are monitored, but the relationship between customer outcomes, asset performance, maintenance priorities, shutdown trends, response times and renewal planning is not yet consistently documented in a consolidated performance framework. The AMP and supporting procedures could more clearly map customer service standards to asset management objectives and performance measures. This would improve transparency and demonstrate how customer service outcomes influence operational, maintenance and capital planning decisions. Overall, Harvey Water measures and monitors customer service standards and has evidence that customer service levels are being managed. Improvements are required to better consolidate customer service performance reporting and link it to asset performance and asset management decisions.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

5.5 Asset Operations

Key process: Assets are operated safely, efficiently and consistently in accordance with documented procedures and service requirements.

Expected outcome: Operational activities are controlled, risks are managed, asset data is reliable, and services are delivered efficiently.

Overall Adequacy / Performance rating: C – Requires substantial improvement / 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
5.1. Operational policies and procedures are documented and linked to service levels	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Operations Procedure Manual, Customer Service Charter, Contractor Management Procedure, Contractor Guidelines Procedure, operational meeting notes and asset committee minutes, and discussions with Operations Manager and Contracts and Compliance Coordinator regarding operational procedures, service delivery, work requests, customer notifications and operational controls. **Findings**: Harvey Water has documented operational policies and procedures that support delivery of the licensed services. The procedures reviewed include important operational controls relating to water supply, asset failures, interruptions to supply, customer notification, contractor management and general operational activities. The Customer Service Charter and operational procedures provide a basis for understanding service expectations and the operating practices required to support those expectations. Operational meeting and asset committee evidence also indicates that operational matters are discussed and monitored through management processes. The review found that operational procedures are being used in practice and that personnel understand key operational requirements. However, the linkage between specific operational procedures and service levels is not yet consistently mapped. For example, procedures could more clearly identify which service level, customer commitment, licence obligation or asset performance requirement they support. The procedures would also be strengthened by clearer documentation of ownership, review frequency, approval status, operational responsibilities and links to work order processes. Areas requiring clearer formalisation include work request and work order initiation, prioritisation of operational tasks, escalation of service interruptions, customer notification requirements, and alternate arrangements when key personnel are absent. Overall, Harvey Water has documented operational policies and procedures and uses them to support service delivery. Improvements are required to more clearly map procedures to service levels, define ownership and review requirements, and strengthen links to work management processes.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
5.2. Risk management is applied to prioritise operations tasks	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Risk Register, Risk Appetite document, Risk Analysis and Evaluation Tables, criticality assessment documents, and discussions with the CFO, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor regarding operational task prioritisation, escalation of operational risks, asset criticality, service impact and use of the AMS / CMMS for operational work management. Harvey Water's response to the draft report was also considered, including advice that seven critical assets have been identified operationally and will be documented through the risk management process. **Findings**: Harvey Water has developed a risk management framework and applies operational judgement when prioritising operational tasks. The risk register, risk appetite document, risk analysis tables and criticality assessment documents provide a framework for identifying and assessing risks. The review found that experienced Harvey Water personnel understand the key operational risks associated with the licensed services and generally escalate urgent operational matters in practice. Operational priorities are informed by practical considerations such as service continuity, safety, customer impact, asset condition, environmental risk, operational constraints and availability of resources. Harvey Water advised that it operates a non-potable irrigation network supported by a defined group of critical assets, and that operational priorities are influenced by matters such as water delivery requirements, seasonal service needs, customer and member impacts, asset condition, safety and environmental risks, and continuity of supply. Harvey Water also advised that it has identified seven critical assets with a consequence rating of moderate or above. These assets are understood operationally, and their performance requirements are managed through day-to-day operational knowledge, maintenance response and service delivery practices. The customer and member requirement to retain 21 days of supply also reduces the immediate service consequence of some operational events. However, the review found that the application of risk management to operations task prioritisation is not yet consistently documented in a formal and auditable manner. In particular, the list of critical assets, the basis for their criticality, and the link between operational tasks, risk ratings, asset criticality, service impact and treatment actions are not yet clearly documented through the risk management process or operational work management records. As a result, while risk management is being applied in practice, the evidence trail does not yet consistently demonstrate how operational tasks are prioritised against defined risk criteria. This limits Harvey Water's ability to demonstrate that operations tasks are consistently prioritised in line with the risk appetite, critical asset status, likelihood and consequence of failure, customer impact and service obligations. The finding is therefore a documentation, consistency and traceability improvement rather than evidence that Harvey Water is not applying risk management to operational task prioritisation. Harvey Water has processes in place and applies operational risk judgement, but should strengthen the documentation of critical assets and the connection between the risk framework and operations task prioritisation. Overall, Harvey Water applies risk management principles when prioritising operations tasks, supported by experienced personnel and a developing risk framework. Improvements are required to make the process more clearly documented, repeatable and traceable to asset criticality and risk treatment actions.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires substantial improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
5.3. Assets are documented in an asset register including asset type, location, material, plans of components, and an assessment of assets' physical/structural condition	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Asset List as at 30.11.2025, CMMS Asset User Manual, Jobs User Manual, AMP file, criticality assessment documents, forward log, maintenance history in CMMS, files regarding Activity type and priority (02.Criticality Assessment_FAM.pdf and 02.Critical Assessment_AMS.docx), site observations undertaken during the review, and discussions with the CFO and Services Supervisor regarding asset register structure, asset hierarchy, asset data completeness, condition information and practical use of the AMS / CMMS. Harvey Water's response to the draft report was also considered, including advice that the cooperative operates with seven critical assets and that child assets are listed in the asset register but are not currently linked to parent assets. **Findings**: Harvey Water maintains an asset register and AMS / CMMS that capture key network assets and support day-to-day asset and maintenance activities. The asset register provides a record of asset information and is used alongside job schedules, priority maintenance records and completed work order records. The review found that the asset register contains useful information and is being used in practice. Asset records, maintenance records and operational knowledge support Harvey Water's ability to identify assets, plan work and record maintenance activities. However, the asset register does not consistently provide sufficient asset-level granularity for all key assets. For example, Benger Pump Station is recorded as a single whole asset rather than being broken down into individual pumps, motors, pond and other maintainable components. Similar gaps were identified or advised in other asset areas, where assets are captured at an aggregated level rather than at the individual equipment or maintainable-component level. Harvey Water advised that it operates with seven critical assets and that the relevant child assets are listed as assets in the register, but are not currently linked to the parent assets. This indicates that the gap is primarily structural and relates to asset hierarchy, parent-child relationships and data completeness, rather than an absence of asset records or evidence that the register is not used in practice. The current register structure limits Harvey Water's ability to use the asset register as a reliable foundation for maintenance planning, condition tracking, failure history, cost analysis and lifecycle decision-making. Where assets are recorded at an aggregated level, maintenance history and costs may not be readily attributable to the specific component that failed, required maintenance or drove expenditure. The review also identified opportunities to improve completeness and consistency of asset data fields. Critical equipment records should more consistently include asset type, location, condition, supplier details, component information, hierarchy relationship and other relevant information required for asset management decision-making. However, the review did not identify evidence that the current asset register structure or the lack of information in asset data fields have caused a material maintenance failure, cost blowout, asset condition deterioration or adverse service outcome during the review period. The absence of a consistent parent-child asset hierarchy and complete required data fields creates a material limitation in asset-level visibility. It affects Harvey Water's ability to analyse asset performance, assess condition and criticality, identify recurring failures, link costs to assets, and prioritise maintenance or renewal actions using reliable asset-level information. Overall, Harvey Water maintains an asset register and uses it in practice to support current operations, but the current asset register structure and data completeness require some improvement to define a consistent asset hierarchy, improve required asset data fields and strengthen periodic data quality checks so that the register can reliably support asset management, maintenance, cost analysis and renewal decisions.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
5.4. Accounting data is documented for assets	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Cost Review Meeting minutes, October cost meeting records, cost review emails, XXX_check R&M file, Asset List as at 30.11.2025, maintenance history in CMMS, AMS / CMMS information considered during fieldwork, and discussions with the CFO, Contracts and Compliance Coordinator and Services Supervisor regarding financial records, work order costs, reconciliation processes and asset-level cost analysis. **Findings**: Accounting data for assets is maintained within Harvey Water's financial systems and is used to support budgeting, expenditure monitoring and cost review processes. The review found that Harvey Water reviews cost information through financial reporting, budget monitoring, cost review meetings and related follow-up activities. Material and service costs can be investigated through financial records, work order information and manual reconciliation where required. This provides evidence that accounting data exists and is used in practice to support financial oversight of the licensed services. However, accounting data is not fully integrated with the AMS / CMMS at asset or equipment level. Material and service costs can be linked to work orders only through manual references or reconciliation, and labour cost capture at asset level is incomplete. As a result, routine asset-level cost analysis is not readily available and requires manual reconciliation between financial records, work orders and operational knowledge. This limits Harvey Water's ability to efficiently analyse cost drivers by asset, component, maintenance activity or lifecycle stage. It also reduces the ability to identify high-cost assets, recurring cost drivers, cost trends associated with repeated failures, or the whole-of-life financial implications of maintenance versus renewal decisions. The risk is not that Harvey Water lacks accounting data. Rather, the improvement relates to how accounting data is structured and linked to asset management information. Without stronger linkage between financial records, work orders and assets, Harvey Water may have less timely or less reliable information to support asset-level cost analysis and lifecycle decision-making. Overall, Harvey Water documents accounting data and uses it to support budgeting and expenditure monitoring. Improvements are required to strengthen the linkage between accounting data, work orders and asset records so that asset-level cost information can be analysed more efficiently and consistently.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
5.5. Operational costs are measured and monitored	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Opex budget files, cost review meeting evidence, Operations cost records, and discussions with CFO regarding cost monitoring, budget review, operating expenditure and management oversight. **Findings**: Harvey Water measures and monitors operational costs through its financial management, budget and cost review processes. Operating budgets provide evidence that recurrent expenditure is planned, while cost review records demonstrate that expenditure is monitored and discussed. The review found that operational expenditure is subject to management oversight. Cost review meeting records and related cost-checking evidence indicate that Harvey Water reviews expenditure, considers variances or cost issues, and follows up specific items where required. This provides evidence that operational costs are not unmanaged and that Harvey Water has processes in place to monitor expenditure associated with operating the licensed services. However, operational cost information is monitored more effectively at budget or cost category level than at detailed asset level. The linkage between operational costs, individual assets, work orders, asset condition, service performance and cost drivers could be strengthened. This would improve Harvey Water's ability to identify high-cost assets, recurring operational cost drivers and opportunities to adjust maintenance, renewal or operating strategies. Overall, Harvey Water measures and monitors operational costs through established financial and budget processes. Improvements are required to provide more reliable asset-level cost visibility and stronger links between costs, work orders, assets and operational cost drivers.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating
5.6. Staff resources are adequate and staff receive training commensurate with their responsibilities	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Staff KPIs, training/induction information, contractor induction material, organisation discussions and interviews with Harvey Water personnel. The review also considered Harvey Water's response to the draft report, including advice that qualified plumbers, poly welders and mechanical fitters are employed to maintain the irrigation systems, specialist contractors are engaged for civil, concrete, SCADA and automated-site works, and Water Controllers have a training calendar that includes annual and refresher training relevant to their duties. Interviews with Harvey Water personnel also confirmed that AMS / CMMS work order entry and close-out processes are primarily performed by one person, and that other personnel are not generally trained to enter work order findings, rectification details and equipment condition information directly into the AMS / CMMS. **Findings**: Harvey Water has experienced personnel with practical knowledge of the irrigation network, operational requirements and maintenance activities. Based on interviews and documentation reviewed, staff resources and training are generally adequate to operate and maintain the assets required to provide licensed services. Contractor induction processes are also in place to support safe and controlled work by external parties. Harvey Water advised that qualified plumbers, poly welders and mechanical fitters are employed to maintain the irrigation systems. Harvey Water also engages specialist contractors to support maintenance of civil and concrete works, SCADA and automated sites, and other specialist equipment where required. Contractor induction processes are also in place to support safe and controlled work by external parties. Water Controllers have a training calendar that includes annual and refresher training relevant to their duties. The review therefore did not identify a deficiency in trade capability or evidence that Harvey Water lacks the personnel or specialist contractor support required to operate and maintain the licensed assets. The improvement identified relates to the broader asset management responsibilities associated with the AMS / CMMS work management process. A complete work management process should enable personnel undertaking maintenance work to receive work orders through the AMS / CMMS, record what they found, document the work completed to rectify the issue, and record the condition of the equipment following the work performed. Those comments should then be available for supervisory review before the work order is closed. This supports accurate maintenance history, condition monitoring, failure analysis, asset-level reporting and future maintenance planning. During interviews, Harvey Water confirmed that this process does not currently operate in this way. AMS / CMMS work order entry and close-out information is primarily entered by one person, because other personnel are not generally trained to use the AMS / CMMS to enter accurate work order information. As a result, the quality and completeness of work order history is dependent on a single key user and on information being communicated back to that person, rather than being entered directly by the personnel performing the work. This creates a process resilience and asset information quality risk. If work findings, rectification details and post-work equipment condition are not consistently entered by the personnel performing the work and reviewed before closure, Harvey Water may have less complete maintenance history to support failure analysis, condition assessment, maintenance planning and lifecycle decision-making. It also increases reliance on one person for accurate system records. The finding does not indicate that Harvey Water's personnel are not competent to perform their trade or operational duties. Rather, it indicates that training is not yet fully commensurate with the broader AMS / CMMS responsibilities required to support a complete and reliable asset management work order process. Overall, Harvey Water has adequate staff resources, trade capability and contractor support for current operations. Improvements are required to train relevant personnel in AMS / CMMS work order processes, including recording work findings, rectification actions and equipment condition, and to define supervisory review expectations before work order closure.

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

5.6 Asset Maintenance

Key process: Assets are maintained through planned, preventive and corrective maintenance activities to sustain service performance and minimise failures.

Expected outcome: Maintenance is proactive, risk-based, efficient, measurable and supported by effective systems and planning.

Overall Adequacy / Performance rating: C – Requires substantial improvement / 3 – Corrective action required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
6.1. Maintenance policies and procedures are documented and linked to service levels required	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Reviewed Harvey Water's documented operations and maintenance-related procedures, including A13. Procedure_Manual 2. Operations 2025.pdf, which includes relevant operational procedures such as leaking or failure of assets, supply of water in the pipe system, meter testing, unauthorised interference with works, interruption to supply notification and related operational controls. Reviewed A12. Drinking Water Plant MAK5670E OIM.revA.docx, which provides operation and maintenance requirements for the Albemarle potable water treatment plant, including operating modes, safety precautions, process equipment, HMI controls, alarms, process settings and maintenance-related requirements. Reviewed A11. Potable plant checklists - Blank.xls as evidence of checklist-based inspection / operational control for the potable plant. Reviewed AMS / job management evidence including B5a. 20251130 Job Schedules_forward planning.xlsx, B5b. 20260105 PriorityMaint to be completed next 90 days.xlsx and B5c. 20251130 Jobs completed for period 01.12.2022 to 30.11.2025.xlsx to understand how documented maintenance requirements are translated into scheduled and completed work. Discussions were also held with Harvey Water personnel regarding maintenance planning, inspection practices, work order creation and the use of AMS for maintenance activities. **Findings**: Harvey Water has documented maintenance-related processes and maintenance work is performed in practice. Maintenance requirements are supported by the Asset Management Plan, job schedules, priority maintenance lists, operational knowledge and inspection practices. Maintenance personnel are familiar with the assets and use these processes to identify, prioritise and complete maintenance work. However, maintenance procedures could be improved by more clearly documenting how maintenance activities are linked to service levels, asset criticality, risk, inspection frequencies, preventive maintenance requirements and performance monitoring. The documentation does not yet provide a fully integrated maintenance management framework showing how preventive maintenance, inspections, corrective maintenance, work order generation, completion monitoring and reporting are intended to operate through the AMS.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

6.2. Regular inspections are undertaken of asset performance and condition	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: AMP files, Operations Procedure, forward log, maintenance history, site observations, and discussions with Harvey Water personnel regarding inspection practices, work order creation, preventive maintenance functionality, job scheduling and monitoring of completed inspections. During the site visit, the review team requested Harvey Water to demonstrate the next scheduled inspection work order for an asset in the AMS / CMMS. The key user responsible for recording and monitoring work orders was unable to identify the next inspection work order and, through further review of the system during the site visit, identified that the automated work order generation functionality was not triggering inspection / preventive maintenance work orders. Harvey Water advised that AMS / CMMS-generated preventive maintenance work orders had previously been active, but the functionality was not active at the time of the review. **Findings**: Harvey Water undertakes inspections and maintenance personnel use operational knowledge, job schedules, priority maintenance lists and AMS / CMMS work orders to identify and record inspection and maintenance activities. The review found that asset condition and performance are monitored through operational and maintenance activities. Harvey Water personnel have practical knowledge of the assets and use this knowledge, together with job records and priority maintenance planning, to identify inspection and maintenance needs.However, the review found that the inspection process is not sufficiently systematised or controlled. Inspections are not currently being automatically generated by the AMS / CMMS as work orders based on defined inspection frequencies. Harvey Water advised that the AMS previously generated preventive maintenance work orders, but this functionality was not active at the time of the review. During the site visit, the review team requested Harvey Water to demonstrate the next scheduled inspection work order for an asset. The key user responsible for recording and monitoring work orders was unable to identify the next inspection work order in the system. Further review of the AMS / CMMS during the site visit identified that the automated work order generation functionality was not triggering inspection / preventive maintenance work orders. Harvey Water advised that the AMS / CMMS had previously generated preventive maintenance work orders, but this functionality was not active at the time of the review. The key issue is that this was not identified by Harvey Water before the review team requested demonstration of the next inspection work order. This indicates that the control for generating and monitoring inspection work orders was not operating effectively, and that there was no routine management check to confirm that required inspection work orders were being generated. Harvey Water advised that the AMS / CMMS had previously generated preventive maintenance work orders, but this functionality was not active at the time of the review. The key issue is that this was not identified by Harvey Water before the review team requested demonstration of the next inspection work order. This indicates that the control for generating and monitoring inspection work orders was not operating effectively, and that there was no routine management check to confirm that required inspection work orders were being generated. As a result, regular inspection activity is dependent on operational knowledge, manual initiation and individual follow-up rather than a fully systematised inspection schedule. This creates a risk that required inspections may not be consistently triggered, scheduled, completed or monitored against defined frequencies. It also limits Harvey Water's ability to demonstrate through AMS / CMMS reporting that all required inspections were generated, completed on time, deferred, overdue or closed out in accordance with maintenance requirements. The review acknowledges that inspections are occurring in practice and that experienced personnel have knowledge of asset condition and inspection requirements. However, reliance on personnel knowledge and memory is not an adequate substitute for a controlled inspection scheduling process, particularly where the AMS / CMMS is intended to generate and track inspection work orders. The process should not depend on individuals remembering what inspections are required and when they should occur. The review did not identify evidence that a specific asset failure occurred because of a missed inspection. However, the absence of a functioning system-generated inspection schedule and the lack of awareness that the automated work order

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
	generation functionality was inactive represent a material weakness in the inspection control framework. Harvey Water cannot currently demonstrate that all required inspections are systematically triggered, completed and monitored across relevant assets. Overall, Harvey Water undertakes inspections of asset performance and condition in practice. However, the inspection process requires substantial improvement because inspection frequencies, automated work order generation, completion monitoring and reporting are not sufficiently controlled through the AMS / CMMS. Corrective action is required to reinstate and verify AMS / CMMS-generated inspection / preventive maintenance work orders, define inspection frequencies and responsibilities, and establish management reporting on inspection completion, overdue inspections, deferrals and critical asset inspection status. **Recommendation Reference**: **01/2026**: Enable and maintain preventive maintenance functionality in the CMMS for relevant asset classes, with documented schedules, responsibilities and completion monitoring. **02/2026**: Establish maintenance KPIs such as preventive maintenance compliance, corrective backlog, priority work completion, downtime and repeat failures, and report them periodically to management.	
	Adequacy Rating: C – Requires substantial improvement	Performance Rating: 3 – Corrective action required

6.3. Maintenance plans (emergency, corrective and preventative) are documented and completed on schedule	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Forward log, maintenance history in CMMS, WTP Kemerton related maintenance items included in the priority maintenance listing, Emergency Management Plan, Naegleria Response Scenario, Albemarle Mock Emergency Response file, and discussions with CFO, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor regarding the use of the AMS for job scheduling, work order management, preventive maintenance triggers and priority maintenance planning. **Findings:** Harvey Water has established a practical maintenance planning and recording framework through its AMS and supporting spreadsheets. The evidence reviewed shows that Harvey Water records forward maintenance schedules, priority maintenance items and completed jobs. The job schedule listing includes recurring maintenance activities, asset IDs, work instructions, operators, last run dates, next run dates and frequency information. The completed jobs listing demonstrates that corrective and service activities were recorded during the review period, including asset-related repairs, replacements, servicing, metering work and operational device maintenance. The priority maintenance listing also demonstrates that Harvey Water is actively identifying and planning asset maintenance work across the irrigation network and potable water assets. Examples include concrete repairs, channel lining works, replacement of rusted goosenecks, leak repairs, metering device works, access-related works, and WTP Kemerton potable and RO plant maintenance tasks. This indicates that maintenance issues are being identified and actioned through job records and priority maintenance lists. However, the review found that the maintenance planning framework is not sufficiently formalised or consistently controlled to demonstrate that emergency, corrective and preventive maintenance plans are fully documented and completed on schedule. The evidence provided consists mainly of system extracts and priority job lists rather than a formally approved maintenance plan or maintenance strategy that clearly defines maintenance regimes, frequencies, responsibilities, criticality basis, emergency maintenance requirements, preventive maintenance tasks, schedule compliance measures and escalation requirements for overdue work. The AMS contains functionality to support job schedules, work orders, work order history and preventive maintenance triggers. However, Harvey Water advised during the review that the preventive maintenance work order generation functionality was not active at the time of the review. As a result, preventive maintenance planning and scheduling is not currently being fully systematised through the AMS. This is consistent with the broader Asset Maintenance finding that maintenance planning and preventive maintenance processes are not fully systematised despite the system having CMMS-type functionality. The completed jobs register provides evidence that maintenance activities are being completed and recorded. However, the review did not identify sufficient evidence of regular management reporting on schedule compliance, overdue preventive maintenance, backlog trends, critical asset maintenance completion, or recurring maintenance deferrals. Although the completed jobs extract includes fields such as planned commencement, planned completion, date commenced, date completed and completed-on-time status, there was limited evidence that this information is routinely analysed and reported to confirm that maintenance plans are being completed on schedule across the asset base. The priority maintenance listing also included several items with planned completion dates extending beyond the nominal “next 90 days” period, and some WTP Kemerton items originated from earlier issue dates but were planned for later shutdown or operational windows. This may be reasonable in some cases due to access, shutdown, contractor or operational constraints; however, the evidence did not demonstrate a formal process for documenting deferrals, risk assessing overdue or deferred work, or linking maintenance priorities to asset criticality and service risk. Emergency response documentation was available, including emergency management and scenario-based response documents. These documents support Harvey Water’s ability to respond to emergency events and service disruptions. However, for the purpose of this criterion, they do not by themselves demonstrate that emergency maintenance plans are

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
	integrated with corrective and preventive maintenance planning, scheduled maintenance controls, and completion monitoring within the AMS. Overall, Harvey Water is undertaking maintenance and recording completed work, and there is evidence of forward planning and priority maintenance tracking. However, the absence of a fully implemented preventive maintenance scheduling process, limited evidence of formal maintenance plan approval, and limited evidence of systematic schedule compliance monitoring mean that the process is not yet adequately defined or consistently performed **Recommendation Reference**: **01/2026**: Enable and maintain preventive maintenance functionality in the CMMS for relevant asset classes, with documented schedules, responsibilities and completion monitoring. **02/2026**: Establish maintenance KPIs such as preventive maintenance compliance, corrective backlog, priority work completion, downtime and repeat failures, and report them periodically to management.	
	Adequacy Rating: C – Requires substantial improvement	Performance Rating: 3 – Corrective action required

6.4. Failures are analysed and operational/maintenance plans adjusted where necessary	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Maintenance history in CMMS, forward log, and discussions with Harvey Water personnel regarding how failures and defects are identified in the field, recorded in the AMS, reviewed by operations and maintenance personnel, prioritised for action, and escalated into priority maintenance, shutdown works or future planning. These discussions clarified that failure analysis is generally performed through operational review of reported defects, inspection findings, maintenance history and staff experience, rather than through a formal documented failure analysis process. Related evidence from Criteria 6.2, 6.3 and the Asset Management Information System process was also considered, as failure analysis depends on inspection records, maintenance history, work order data and asset information. Harvey Water's response to the draft report was also considered, including management's view that failures are assessed in practice but that formal documentation of decision criteria, cause and rationale at job level, and escalation thresholds should be strengthened. **Findings**: Harvey Water records asset failures and defects through AMS job records and supporting maintenance registers. The completed jobs register demonstrates that failures are captured against assets and corrective actions are assigned and completed. The current process for analysing failures is primarily operational and experience-based. Failures are identified through field inspections, operator observations, customer or landholder reports, operational issues and maintenance activities. Operations and maintenance personnel then assess the issue based on asset condition, service impact, safety, location, urgency, operational constraints and available resources. The issue may then be addressed immediately, added to priority maintenance, scheduled for a shutdown window, or considered for future renewal or capital works. The priority maintenance register provides evidence that identified failures and defects are used to adjust maintenance priorities. Examples include channel lining defects, concrete deterioration, leaks, rusted goosenecks, unsafe access issues and WTP Kemerton maintenance requirements. However, the review distinguishes between failure response and failure analysis. Harvey Water's current process demonstrates that failures are repaired and prioritised, but this is not the same as a documented failure analysis process designed to prevent recurrence, reduce operational risk, or adjust inspection and maintenance strategies. The review did not identify a formally documented process defining how failures should be analysed, what level of analysis is required for significant or recurring failures, who is responsible for the analysis, or how outcomes should be recorded and reviewed. In particular, there was limited evidence of defined responsibilities, thresholds or criteria for when a failure should trigger root-cause analysis, engineering review, risk review, management escalation, or changes to maintenance, inspection, renewal or operating plans. For example, the review did not identify evidence that failures routinely trigger a review of inspection frequencies, preventive maintenance tasks, operating practices or asset renewal timing. The review also did not identify consistent records of analysis for significant or recurring failures. Job records include work instructions, comments and completion information, but do not consistently document cause of failure, recurrence history, consequence assessment, decision rationale, lessons learned, or whether maintenance or operating practices were changed. As a result, Harvey Water cannot consistently demonstrate that failure information is being used to prevent similar failures or minimise future operational risk. Harvey Water advised that failures are assessed in practice and that the main gap is documentation. The review accepts that operational assessment occurs when failures are identified and repaired. However, because failure analysis is a key asset management process, the absence of a formal and documented process for significant or recurring failures represents more than a minor documentation issue. Without a structured process, there is a risk that recurring failure patterns, common causes, consequences and opportunities to improve inspection or maintenance strategies may not be identified or acted on consistently. This finding is also linked to the findings under Criteria 6.2 and 6.3. The review found that inspection scheduling and preventive maintenance planning are not fully systematised through the AMS. In that context, a documented failure analysis

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
	process is particularly important because it should provide one of the mechanisms for updating inspection frequencies, preventive maintenance tasks, maintenance priorities and renewal planning. Overall, Harvey Water can demonstrate that failures are recorded and corrective actions are completed, but it cannot yet consistently demonstrate that failures are formally analysed or that significant or recurring failures result in documented changes to operational, maintenance or renewal plans. Substantial improvement is required to establish a proportionate but formal failure analysis process that defines responsibilities, thresholds, required records, escalation requirements and links to changes in maintenance, inspection, renewal or operating plans. **Recommendation Reference**: **03/2026**: Define responsibilities and thresholds for failure analysis and ensure significant or recurring failures result in documented changes to inspection, maintenance, renewal or operating plans.	
	Adequacy Rating: C – Requires substantial improvement	Performance Rating: 3 – Corrective action required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
6.5 Risk management is applied to prioritise maintenance tasks	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: AMP, including the asset maintenance process, condition assessment approach and maintenance scheduling requirements; Risk register; Harvey Water Risk Appetite; Risk Analysis And Evaluation Tables; Future Asset Maintenance (FAM) Report form; Job Schedules forward planning; Priority Maintenance to be completed next 90 days report; Jobs completed for period 01.12.2022 to 30.11.2025. Interviewed CFO and Services Supervisor to understand how maintenance tasks are identified, prioritised, scheduled and escalated. Compared the documented risk framework and criticality assessment material with job schedules, priority maintenance lists, completed job records and management explanations. Discussions with Harvey Water personnel indicated that maintenance work is prioritised by operations and maintenance staff based on practical risk considerations, including safety, service impact, asset condition, urgency, operational constraints, customer impact and available resources. **Findings**: Harvey Water applies risk-based judgement in prioritising maintenance tasks. The priority maintenance listing demonstrates that identified defects and condition issues are assessed and converted into planned maintenance tasks. Items such as leaks, unsafe access, channel deterioration, concrete repairs, metering issues, rusted fittings and WTP Kemerton maintenance requirements indicate that maintenance priorities are influenced by asset condition, operational impact and service risk. The completed jobs register also shows that corrective maintenance activities are recorded and actioned across a range of asset types. This provides evidence that Harvey Water has processes in place for identifying and addressing maintenance issues, and that maintenance decisions are not made solely on an unstructured or unmanaged basis. However, the review found that the risk basis for prioritising maintenance is not consistently formalised or documented. The priority maintenance and completed jobs records identify the work to be undertaken, but do not consistently record the risk assessment, criticality rating, consequence assessment, priority rationale, or decision basis used to determine the order and timing of works. The review also did not identify a fully documented maintenance prioritisation framework that clearly links asset criticality, service risk, safety risk, likelihood of failure, consequence of failure and maintenance response timeframes. As a result, Harvey Water can demonstrate that risk-based judgement is being applied in practice, but cannot yet consistently demonstrate that maintenance priorities are determined through a documented and repeatable risk-based process. Overall, Harvey Water has processes in place and is applying practical risk considerations to maintenance prioritisation. Improvements are required to better document the risk basis for prioritisation and link maintenance decisions to asset criticality and risk ratings.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
6.6 Maintenance costs are measured and monitored	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Maintenance cost and monitoring records, and maintenance/job records used to support cost review. B5c. 20251130 Jobs completed for period 01.12.2022 to 30.11.2025.xlsx shows jobs including maintenance cost fields such as material cost, labour cost, contractor cost and total cost. B5b. 20260105 PriorityMaint to be completed next 90 days.xlsx shows priority maintenance tasks including material cost, labour cost, contractor cost and total cost, although these fields were not populated for all planned items. Interviewed CFO, Services Supervisor and Contracts and Compliance Coordinator to understand how maintenance expenditure is captured, reviewed and reconciled between financial records and asset management/work order information. **Findings**: Harvey Water measures and monitors maintenance costs. The completed jobs extract includes cost fields for material, labour, contractor and total cost, which demonstrates that maintenance cost information can be recorded against individual maintenance jobs. Budget and cost review information also indicates that maintenance and operating expenditure is monitored through Harvey Water's financial management processes. The review found that maintenance costs are considered as part of operational and financial oversight. This provides evidence that Harvey Water has processes in place to capture and monitor maintenance expenditure, and that maintenance costs are not unmanaged. However, the review identified opportunities to improve the consistency, completeness and usefulness of maintenance cost information for asset management decision-making. Cost fields in maintenance job records were not consistently populated across all records reviewed, and cost information was not always clearly linked to asset-level lifecycle analysis, recurring failure analysis, maintenance strategy review or renewal planning. The review also found that maintenance costs are monitored more effectively at budget or project level than at detailed asset level. This limits Harvey Water's ability to use maintenance cost trends to identify high-cost assets, recurring maintenance issues, whole-of-life cost drivers, or opportunities to adjust preventive maintenance, renewal or replacement strategies. Overall, Harvey Water has processes in place to measure and monitor maintenance costs, and these processes are being applied. Improvements are required to strengthen the completeness, consistency and asset-level analysis of maintenance cost information.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

5.7 Asset Management Information System

Key process: Information systems support asset planning, operations, maintenance, reporting and decision-making through reliable data, appropriate controls and useful management information.

Expected outcome: Asset information is accurate, secure, complete, accessible and capable of supporting effective asset management decisions.

Overall Adequacy / Performance rating: C – Requires substantial improvement / 3 – Corrective action required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
7.1. Adequate system documentation for users and IT operators	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Assets User Manual (user guidance for the asset module of Harvey Water's AMS, including how asset information is accessed and managed within the system), Jobs User Manual (user guidance for the jobs module of the AMS, including how job records and maintenance-related information are managed), Reports User Manual (user guidance for generating and using AMS reports), B2. 20251130 Asset List as at 30.11.2025.xlsx (to better understand the type of asset information maintained in the AMS and to consider whether the available user documentation aligns with the system information being used). Also, discussions were held with Harvey Water personnel to understand how users access system guidance, how the AMS is used in day-to-day asset and maintenance activities, and whether there are documented procedures available to support users. **Findings**: Harvey Water has documented user guidance for key AMS functions. The AssetsUserManual, JobsUserManual and ReportsUserManual files provide evidence that users have access to documentation for the main system functions used to support asset information, job management and reporting. The documentation reviewed indicates that Harvey Water has recognised the need to support consistent use of the AMS and has developed practical user guidance for core system modules. This supports the rating that processes are in place and being applied. However, the review identified opportunities to improve the completeness and currency of system documentation. The available documentation appears to focus mainly on user-level guidance for specific AMS modules. The review did not identify a complete suite of system documentation covering matters such as system administration, user access management, backup and recovery arrangements, change management, data ownership, data quality responsibilities, interface management, or IT operator procedures. The review also did not identify clear evidence of a formal document review cycle for the AMS user guides, or a process to confirm that user documentation remains current when system configuration, business processes or reporting requirements change. Overall, Harvey Water has documented guidance for key AMS users, particularly for assets, jobs and reports. However, improvements are required to strengthen system administration and IT operator documentation, define responsibilities for maintaining documentation, and ensure documentation remains current.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

7.2. Input controls include suitable verification and validation of data entered into the system	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Asset register extract, AMS / CMMS user manuals, job schedule and completed work order extracts, data fields used in the AMS, and discussions with CFO and Services Supervisor. The review considered the process for entering and maintaining asset management information in the AMS, including asset records, work order creation, maintenance planning, scheduling and work order close-out comments. Harvey Water advised that the Services Supervisor is the primary person responsible for entering and maintaining this information in the AMS. The review also considered whether there is an independent review, approval or periodic validation process over asset management data entered into the AMS, including whether asset information, work order data, maintenance schedules and close-out comments are subject to routine verification. Harvey Water's response to the draft report was also considered, including management's view that the data completeness issues identified relate mainly to reference data fields, such as supplier details and the Benger Pump Station hierarchy, rather than operational data fields that directly affect maintenance delivery. **Findings**: Harvey Water has an AMS in place and asset management data is being entered and used to support maintenance planning and work management. The AMS includes structured fields for asset information, job records, work instructions, planning dates, completion dates and work order comments. This indicates that basic data entry processes are operating. However, the review found that input controls over AMS data are not sufficiently formalised. Asset management data entry is largely dependent on one key user, the Services Supervisor, who enters asset information, creates work orders, plans and schedules work, and records work order close-out comments. This concentration of responsibility increases reliance on individual knowledge and judgement. The review did not identify a formal independent review or periodic validation process for AMS data entered or updated by the Services Supervisor. Other than review associated with forward work lists requiring approval to spend or request funds, there is no routine process to verify the completeness, accuracy or consistency of asset information, work order details, maintenance schedules or close-out comments entered into the AMS. The review also identified asset data completeness issues, including gaps in supplier details and issues with the Benger Pump Station hierarchy. Harvey Water advised that these examples relate mainly to reference data fields and that the Benger Pump Station hierarchy issue is also addressed under Criteria 5.3. The review accepts that these examples, by themselves, do not demonstrate that maintenance delivery has been adversely affected during the review period. However, these examples are not the sole basis for the rating. The key issue for this criteria is that Harvey Water does not yet have suitable verification and validation controls over AMS data input. The process does not consistently define mandatory data fields, validation rules, data ownership, review responsibilities, exception reporting, periodic data quality checks, or independent review before work order information is relied on for asset management purposes. This is particularly relevant because AMS data supports maintenance planning, work order history, failure analysis, asset condition information, schedule monitoring and asset-level reporting. If work order details, close-out comments, maintenance schedules or asset records are incomplete or inaccurate, Harvey Water may have reduced ability to analyse maintenance history, identify recurring issues, support failure analysis, monitor asset condition or make reliable maintenance and renewal decisions. While Harvey Water's current approach may be workable for day-to-day operations, it does not provide a sufficiently robust control framework for verifying and validating asset management data. The process relies heavily on user knowledge and manual judgement rather than defined mandatory fields, validation rules, data ownership, review responsibilities, exception reporting or scheduled data quality checks. Overall, Harvey Water has a functioning process for entering AMS data, and the data is being used for asset and maintenance activities. However, input controls require substantial improvement because data verification and validation are

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
	not formally defined, independent review is limited, and identified data quality checks are not yet sufficiently documented or routinely performed. **Recommendation Reference**: **05/2026**: Define required asset data fields and data quality checks for the CMMS and establish periodic management reporting to monitor data completeness, asset performance and licence-relevant obligations.	
	Adequacy Rating: C – Requires substantial improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

7.3. Security access controls appear adequate, such as passwords	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: The review considered the security access arrangements for Harvey Water's AMS / CMMS, including how users log on to the system, whether access is individually controlled, whether password controls are used, and whether access arrangements support accountability and traceability of system actions. Evidence was obtained through review of CMMS access arrangements and discussions with Harvey Water personnel regarding system governance and user access practices. These discussions confirmed that staff who access the AMS use a single shared logon rather than individual named user accounts. The review considered the implications of this arrangement for authentication, accountability, user access management and traceability of actions performed in the AMS, including creation or amendment of asset records, work orders, maintenance schedules, work order close-out comments and maintenance history. Harvey Water's response to the draft report was also considered, including advice that Harvey Water has developed an IT strategy that includes upgrading the AMS, that the AMS currently has limited IT support, that implementation will occur over a number of years due to project size and cost, that financial and geospatial information is held in other secure applications, and that AMS data is backed up remotely. **Findings**: Harvey Water advised that staff accessing the AMS use a single shared logon. This means that multiple users access the system using the same username and password, rather than individual named user accounts. While the AMS is password protected, the use of a single shared logon is not an adequate security access control arrangement for an asset management information system. It prevents individual accountability for actions performed in the system and limits Harvey Water's ability to trace changes, additions or deletions of asset management data to a specific user. This arrangement also weakens Harvey Water's ability to manage access appropriately. Because all users share the same credentials, access cannot be tailored to individual roles, user activity cannot be reliably audited, and access cannot be individually removed or amended when personnel responsibilities change or staff no longer require access. Harvey Water advised that it has developed an IT strategy that includes upgrading the AMS, and that implementation will occur over a number of years due to the size and cost of the project. The review accepts that this provides a pathway for future improvement. However, the IT strategy does not change the current access control weakness identified during the review period. Harvey Water also advised that financial and geospatial information is held in other secure applications, and that AMS data is backed up remotely. The review accepts that these arrangements reduce some broader information management risks. However, they do not address the specific access control weakness under this criterion. The AMS still contains asset management information, including asset records, work orders, maintenance schedules, work order close-out comments and maintenance history, and access to those records is not attributable to individual users. Remote backup is relevant to data recovery, but it is not a compensating control for shared user access. Similarly, storing financial and geospatial information in separate systems does not provide individual authentication, role-based access, user-level audit trails, or the ability to remove or amend access for individual AMS users. The review did not identify compensating controls sufficient to offset this weakness, such as individual named access, role-based permissions, periodic formal access reviews, or alternative user-level audit trails. Overall, although the AMS is password protected and Harvey Water has identified future system improvements through its IT strategy, the use of a single shared logon by all staff accessing the system represents a material weakness in security access control. Substantial improvement is required to establish individual named user accounts or equivalent controls that support authentication, accountability, traceability and appropriate access management. **Recommendation Reference**:

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
	04/2026: As part of the AMS upgrade or interim access control arrangements, replace shared AMS / CMMS user access with named accounts or equivalent controls that provide individual authentication, accountability and traceability of data changes and work order actions.	
	Adequacy Rating: C – Requires substantial improvement	Performance Rating: 3 – Corrective action required
7.4. Physical security access controls appear adequate	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Discussed physical access arrangements for Harvey Water offices, operational facilities and information systems with Harvey Water personnel during interviews and site visit activities. Considered whether any physical access control issues affecting the asset management information system were identified during the review. **Findings**: Physical security access controls appeared adequate for the scale and nature of Harvey Water's asset management information systems and operating environment. No specific physical access control deficiencies affecting the AMS or CMMS were identified during the review. The improvement opportunities identified for the Asset Management Information System relate to logical user access, data completeness, management reporting and system integration, rather than physical access controls.	
	Adequacy Rating: A – Adequately defined	Performance Rating: 1 – Performing effectively
7.5. Data backup procedures appear adequate and backups are tested	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Discussions with Harvey Water personnel regarding backup arrangements, IT controls and system support arrangements, consideration of the AMS / CMMS environment and the asset management information held in the system, including asset records, job records, work order history and maintenance information, and consideration of whether any backup or data recovery issues affecting the asset management system were identified during the review. **Findings**: Harvey Water has backup arrangements in place for asset management information systems. Discussions with Harvey Water personnel indicated that backup arrangements are understood at a high level and that asset management data is subject to IT backup controls. The review did not identify evidence of data loss, backup failure or inability to recover asset management data during the review period. No specific deficiencies were identified that would indicate backup procedures are inadequate for the current AMS environment. The review noted that, as Harvey Water progresses system improvements or future AMS / finance system integration, backup and recovery responsibilities should continue to be confirmed and documented. This includes confirming the scope of data backed up, backup frequency, recovery responsibilities, testing arrangements and evidence retained for backup testing. Overall, data backup procedures appear adequate for the current asset management information system environment, and no material backup control deficiency was identified during the review.	
	Adequacy Rating: A – Adequately defined	Performance Rating: 1 – Performing effectively

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
7.6. Computations for licensee performance reporting are accurate	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: HW water sewerage and irrigation licence performance reporting datasheets, Compliance and Reporting Register, and discussions with Harvey Water personnel regarding preparation and review of licence performance information. **Findings**: Harvey Water prepares licence performance reporting information using annual reporting datasheets and supporting compliance records. The evidence reviewed indicates that performance reporting computations are prepared using structured reporting templates and are supported by internal compliance and reporting processes. The review considered the performance reporting evidence provided and did not identify material errors in the computations reviewed. The computations appeared reasonable based on the records made available and the procedures performed. The review also found that licence performance reporting is supported by Harvey Water's compliance and reporting processes. This provides a basis for management to prepare, review and submit performance information relevant to the licensed services. Ongoing improvements to AMS data quality, performance reporting and consolidated management reporting will support continued reliability of licence performance reporting. However, the review did not identify evidence that existing computations for licence performance reporting are inaccurate or unreliable. Overall, computations for licence performance reporting appeared accurate based on the records reviewed.	
	Adequacy Rating: A – Adequately defined	Performance Rating: 1 – Performing effectively

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
7.7. Management reports appear adequate for the licensee to monitor licence obligations	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: AMS Reports User Manual, forward log files, maintenance work order history, Strategic Plan KPIs, HW Strategic Plan, Opex budget files, Capex budget files, Customer Service Charter files, Compliance and Reporting Register, HW water sewerage and irrigation licence performance reporting datasheets, and discussions with Harvey Water personnel regarding how reports are used to monitor operational performance, maintenance activity, customer service outcomes, costs and licence related obligations. **Findings**: Harvey Water has management reporting processes in place and uses a range of reports to monitor the operation of its licensed services. Reports reviewed included operational performance information, pipe metrics, shutdown registers, customer service target reporting, financial reports and CMMS / AMS reporting outputs. These reports provide management with information on key aspects of the business, including operational performance, service interruptions, maintenance activity, customer service outcomes and financial performance. This indicates that Harvey Water has processes in place to monitor licence-related obligations and that reporting is being applied in practice. However, the review identified opportunities to improve how reporting is consolidated and linked to asset management decision-making. The reports reviewed are useful, but they do not yet provide a fully integrated view of asset performance, maintenance effectiveness, asset-level costs and licence-related asset obligations. The specific reporting areas that would benefit from improvement are: - CMMS / AMS maintenance reporting – to improve reporting on overdue work, preventive maintenance completion, backlog, recurring failures and maintenance schedule compliance. - Asset performance reporting – to better link pipe metrics, shutdown information and operational performance to asset condition, risk and renewal planning. - Asset-level cost reporting – to strengthen the link between maintenance costs, financial reporting and individual assets or asset groups. - Licence obligation reporting – to provide clearer alignment between operational / asset reports and the specific licence obligations being monitored. - KPI reporting – to formalise asset management KPIs for maintenance effectiveness, asset reliability, service interruptions, response times, asset condition and cost trends. The main improvement required is not that Harvey Water lacks reporting, but that reporting could be better structured, integrated and aligned to asset management outcomes. In particular, CMMS / AMS data quality, clearer KPI definitions and improved integration between maintenance and financial information would strengthen the usefulness of management reports. Overall, Harvey Water has management reporting processes in place and uses them to monitor licence obligations and operational performance. Improvements are required to make reporting more consolidated, asset-focused and useful for long-term asset management decision-making.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

7.8. Adequate measures to protect asset management data from unauthorised access or theft by persons outside the organisation	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: The review considered whether Harvey Water has adequate measures to protect asset management data from unauthorised access, unauthorised changes or theft by persons outside the organisation. Evidence was obtained through review of CMMS access arrangements and discussions with Harvey Water personnel regarding system governance, user access practices and protection of asset management information. These discussions confirmed that staff who access the AMS use a single shared logon rather than individual named user accounts. The review considered the implications of this arrangement for protection of asset management data, including asset records, work orders, maintenance schedules, work order close-out comments, maintenance history and other data held in the AMS. Harvey Water's response to the draft report was also considered, including advice that the AMS holds the asset register and listing and functions primarily as an operational work order and maintenance scheduling tool. Harvey Water advised that detailed GIS, financial and personal data are held in other systems, including ArcGIS and MYOB, which operate with individual named user accounts and their own access controls. Harvey Water also advised that AMS data is backed up remotely and that Harvey Water is not bound by the Critical Infrastructure Act. **Findings**: The AMS is password protected, which provides a basic level of protection against open access. However, Harvey Water advised that all staff accessing the AMS use a single shared logon. This means the same credentials are used by multiple users. The use of a single shared logon weakens the protection of asset management data from unauthorised access or misuse. Shared credentials are more difficult to control than individual named accounts because the password may be known by multiple users, cannot be linked to a specific person, and may continue to provide access even when individual users change roles or no longer require access. This arrangement also limits Harvey Water's ability to detect or investigate unauthorised access or unauthorised changes. In the absence of named accounts or equivalent compensating controls, Harvey Water cannot clearly demonstrate who accessed, created or amended asset records, work orders, maintenance schedules or close-out comments. Harvey Water advised that the AMS does not hold all sensitive corporate information. Detailed GIS, financial and personal data are held in other systems, including ArcGIS and MYOB, which operate with individual named user accounts and their own access controls. Harvey Water also advised that AMS data is backed up remotely, and that the AMS functions primarily as an operational work order and maintenance scheduling tool. The review accepts that these arrangements reduce the consequence of unauthorised access to the AMS compared with a system containing detailed GIS, financial and personal information. The review also notes that this finding does not rely on Harvey Water being bound by the Critical Infrastructure Act. The assessment is made against the ERA effectiveness criterion, which requires adequate measures to protect asset management data from unauthorised access or theft by persons outside the organisation. However, the AMS still contains asset management data relevant to the licensed services, including asset records, work orders, maintenance schedules, work order close-out comments and maintenance history. These records support inspection planning, maintenance history, failure analysis, asset performance monitoring and asset management decision-making. As a result, the shared logon remains a material weakness in the protection of asset management data, even if the consequence is reduced by the use of separate systems for GIS, financial and personal information. The review did not identify compensating controls sufficient to demonstrate that asset management data is adequately protected from unauthorised access or theft, such as individual named accounts, role-based AMS access, periodic AMS user access reviews, user-level AMS audit logs, or other controls that would allow AMS access to be restricted, monitored and traced to individual users.

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
	Overall, while the AMS has password protection and Harvey Water holds detailed GIS, financial and personal data in other systems with stronger access controls, the use of a single shared AMS logon materially weakens protection of asset management data held in the AMS. Substantial improvement is required to strengthen AMS access control, traceability and monitoring so that Harvey Water can demonstrate that asset management data is protected from unauthorised access, misuse or theft. **Recommendation Reference**: **06/2026**: Prepare or update an implementation roadmap for AMS and finance system integration, including requirements for asset hierarchy, work order costing, reporting and access controls, named user access, user access review and traceability of changes to asset management data, and progress the roadmap through Harvey Water's IT strategy or equivalent improvement program.	
	Adequacy Rating: C – Requires substantial improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

5.8 Risk Management

Key process: Asset-related risks are identified, assessed, controlled and monitored to support service continuity and informed decision-making.

Expected outcome: Risk management is embedded into operational, maintenance and planning activities.

Overall Adequacy / Performance rating: B – Requires some improvement / 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
8.1. Risk management policies and procedures exist and are applied to minimise internal and external risks	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: HW Risk Appetite, Risk Register, Risk Management presentation, Risk Analysis and Evaluation Tables, risk assessment meeting attendees, and interviews and process discussions with Harvey Water personnel regarding risk management practices and application of the risk framework. **Findings**: Harvey Water has developed a risk management framework that includes documented risk appetite information, risk analysis and evaluation guidance, and a risk management presentation used to communicate risk concepts and processes. The evidence reviewed indicates that Harvey Water has defined risk management principles and is applying these concepts in its business and operational activities. The risk management framework considers internal and external risks relevant to Harvey Water's operations, including operational, financial, compliance, safety, service delivery and asset-related risks. Risk assessment meeting evidence also indicates that risk management activities have involved multiple personnel and are not limited to informal or undocumented discussions. However, the review found that the risk management framework is still being embedded into routine asset management activities. While risk policies and supporting materials exist, the link between the risk framework and day-to-day asset management decisions is not yet consistently evident. In particular, risk concepts could be more clearly and consistently linked to maintenance prioritisation, operational planning, asset renewal decisions and capital planning. Overall, Harvey Water has risk management policies, procedures and guidance in place, and these are being applied. Improvements are required to strengthen the consistency with which the risk framework is embedded into asset management processes and decision-making.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
8.2. Risks are documented in a risk register and treatment plans are implemented and monitored	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: HW Risk Appetite, Risk Register, Risk Analysis and Evaluation Tables, risk assessment meeting attendees, and interviews with Harvey Water personnel regarding risk register ownership, review, treatment planning and monitoring. **Findings**: Harvey Water maintains a risk register that documents organisational and asset-related risks. The register provides evidence that risks have been identified and recorded, and that the risk management process is being applied in practice. Supporting documents, including the risk appetite and risk evaluation tables, provide a basis for assessing and prioritising risks. The review found that Harvey Water has processes in place for documenting risks and considering risk treatment actions. Risk assessment meeting evidence also indicates that risks are reviewed and discussed through management processes. However, the review identified opportunities to strengthen the documentation and monitoring of treatment plans. While risks are documented, the link between risk ratings, treatment actions, responsible owners, target dates, review status and evidence of treatment implementation could be more consistently demonstrated. For asset-related risks, the connection between the risk register and specific maintenance, renewal, operating or capital planning actions could also be clearer. The review also found that risk treatment monitoring could be more formally linked to asset management reporting. This would assist Harvey Water to demonstrate that asset-related risks are not only recorded but are being actively treated, monitored and closed out where appropriate. Overall, Harvey Water has a risk register and uses it to document organisational and asset-related risks. The evidence indicates that risks are identified, assessed and discussed through management processes. However, further improvement is required to demonstrate that treatment plans for asset-related risks are consistently assigned, implemented, monitored and closed out. In particular, risk records should more clearly show treatment owners, target dates, review status, implementation evidence and links to related maintenance, renewal, operating or capital planning actions.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
8.3. Probability and consequences of asset failure are regularly assessed	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Risk Register, Risk Analysis and Evaluation Tables, 02.Critical Assessment_AMS.docx, 02.Criticality Assessment_FAM.pdf, and interviews and process discussions with Harvey Water personnel regarding asset criticality, asset condition, maintenance priorities and risk-based decision-making. **Findings**: Harvey Water has undertaken asset criticality and risk assessment activities. The criticality assessment documents and risk evaluation tables provide evidence that probability and consequence concepts are understood and are being applied to asset-related risks. The risk register also provides evidence that asset-related risks are documented and assessed. The review found that Harvey Water applies risk-based judgement in practice when considering asset failures, maintenance priorities and operational impacts. Priority maintenance and completed work records indicate that asset condition, service impact, safety and operational requirements are considered when maintenance activities are identified and prioritised. However, the review found that the assessment of probability and consequence of asset failure is not yet consistently embedded into routine maintenance, renewal and capital planning processes. While criticality and risk assessment documents exist, the review did not identify a consistently documented process showing how probability and consequence assessments are periodically updated and then used to adjust maintenance strategies, renewal priorities, operating plans or capital works. The review also identified opportunities to better link asset criticality, failure consequence, maintenance history and risk ratings. This would strengthen Harvey Water's ability to demonstrate that asset failure risks are regularly assessed and used to inform asset management decisions. Overall, Harvey Water has assessed asset criticality and applies probability and consequence concepts in practice. Improvements are required to make these assessments more routine, documented and consistently linked to maintenance, renewal, operating and capital planning decisions.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

5.9 Contingency Planning

Key process: Plans exist to respond effectively to asset failures, service interruptions and emergency events.

Expected outcome: The organisation can respond promptly and effectively to significant disruptions.

Overall Adequacy / Performance rating: A – Adequately defined / 1 – Performing effectively

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
9.1. Contingency plans are documented, understood and tested to confirm their operability and to cover higher risks	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Emergency Management Plans, Naegleria response scenario, Albemarle mock incident records, desktop exercises, pipe burst exercise, mock incident agendas and scenario-based workshop evidence, and discussions with Harvey Water personnel regarding emergency response, contingency planning, scenario exercises and operational response arrangements. **Findings**: Harvey Water has documented contingency and emergency management arrangements. The emergency management plans provide a framework for responding to incidents, service interruptions and emergency events relevant to the licensed services. The review found evidence that contingency arrangements are understood and tested through scenario-based exercises and emergency planning activities. Evidence reviewed included desktop exercises, pipe burst scenario testing, mock emergency exercises, Naegleria response scenario material, Albemarle / potable water-related incident exercises and inter-agency exercise planning. These activities demonstrate that Harvey Water does not rely solely on documented plans, but also tests contingency arrangements through practical scenario exercises. The exercises reviewed covered relevant higher-risk events, including water treatment-related incidents, pipe burst scenarios, emergency response coordination and service disruption events. The review also found that contingency planning is linked to operational response arrangements and emergency management responsibilities. This supports the conclusion that Harvey Water personnel understand contingency requirements and that plans are capable of being applied in practice. The review did not identify evidence that contingency plans were not documented, not understood or not tested during the review period. Overall, Harvey Water has documented contingency plans and has tested them through scenario-based exercises and emergency planning activities. The evidence supports that contingency plans are understood and operable for higher-risk events.	
	Adequacy Rating: A – Adequately defined	Performance Rating: 1 – Performing effectively

5.10 Financial Planning

Key process: Financial planning supports sustainable operation, maintenance, renewal and capital investment in licensed assets.

Expected outcome: Funding is identified and financial planning supports service continuity and asset lifecycle needs.

Overall Adequacy / Performance rating: B – Requires some improvement / 2 – Improvement required

<table>
<tr><th>Effectiveness criteria</th><th colspan="2">Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating</th></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">10.1. The financial plan states the financial objectives and identifies strategies and actions to achieve those</td><td colspan="2">Evidence reviewed and procedures performed: Opex and Capex budget files, HW Strategic Plan, AMP files, and discussions with CFO, Contracts and Compliance Coordinator, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor regarding financial objectives, budget preparation, operating expenditure, capital expenditure and financial oversight.

Findings: Harvey Water has established financial planning and budget processes that support the delivery of its licensed services. Financial objectives are reflected through the annual budget process, operating expenditure budgets, capital expenditure planning and broader strategic planning documents.
The evidence reviewed indicates that Harvey Water identifies strategies and actions to achieve its financial objectives through operating and capital budgets, management review of expenditure, and planning for maintenance, renewal and capital works. These processes support service delivery, financial sustainability and ongoing operation of the asset base.
The review did not identify any material deficiency in the way Harvey Water states financial objectives or identifies strategies and actions to achieve them.
Overall, Harvey Water’s financial planning process adequately defines financial objectives and supporting strategies and actions.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Adequacy Rating: A – Adequately defined</td><td>Performance Rating: 1 – Performing effectively</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">10.2. The financial plan identifies the source of funds for capital expenditure and recurrent costs</td><td colspan="2">Evidence reviewed and procedures performed: Opex and Capex budget files, and discussions with CFO regarding funding sources, revenue, recurrent costs and capital expenditure funding.

Findings: Harvey Water’s financial planning identifies and considers funding requirements for both capital expenditure and recurrent costs. Operating budgets identify recurrent expenditure requirements, while capital planning documents identify capital expenditure requirements and associated funding considerations.
The review found that sources of funds are considered through Harvey Water’s budget and financial management processes. Funding requirements are reviewed as part of the annual budget cycle and management oversight of operating and capital expenditure.
The evidence reviewed supports that Harvey Water has adequate processes to identify funding sources for capital and recurrent expenditure required to deliver its licensed services.
Overall, the financial planning process identifies sources of funds for capital expenditure and recurrent costs.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Adequacy Rating: A – Adequately defined</td><td>Performance Rating: 1 – Performing effectively</td></tr>
</table>

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
10.3. The financial plan provides projections of operating statements (profit and loss) and statement of financial position (balance sheets)	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Opex budget files, and discussions with CFO, Contracts and Compliance Coordinator and Operations Manager regarding financial projections, operating statements, financial position and management review. **Findings**: Harvey Water prepares financial planning and budget information that supports monitoring of operating income, expenditure and financial position. Operating budgets and financial planning records provide management with information to assess projected revenues, operating costs, expenditure requirements and financial capacity. The review found that financial projections are considered through Harvey Water's annual budget and management review processes. These processes support financial oversight of the licensed services and provide information for planning ongoing operations and investment. No material deficiency was identified in the provision of financial projections for operating performance and financial position. Overall, Harvey Water's financial planning provides adequate financial projections to support management oversight and decision-making.	
	Adequacy Rating: A – Adequately defined	Performance Rating: 1 – Performing effectively

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
10.4. The financial plan provides firm predictions on income for the next five years and reasonable predictions beyond this period	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Opex budget files, HW Strategic Plan, and discussions with CFO, Contracts and Compliance Coordinator, and Services Supervisor regarding income forecasting, budgeting assumptions, customer revenue, operating requirements, capital funding and longer-term financial planning. Harvey Water's response to the draft report was also considered, including advice that Harvey Water has a financial model that uses DWER's water forecast for the Southwest out to 2060 to identify the impact of water loss on Harvey Water's financials and the Wellington for Agriculture project, and that Harvey Water also uses a 10-year model to review alternative scenarios and develop mitigating strategies. The underlying financial model was not identified in the documents presented by HW as part of the review, and they were not mentioned when asking about this topic. **Findings**: Harvey Water prepares annual budget and financial planning information that includes income assumptions and supports short-term financial management of the licensed services. The evidence reviewed indicates that expected income is considered through the annual budget process and broader strategic and financial planning activities. The review found that Harvey Water considers revenue and funding expectations when planning operating expenditure, recurrent costs and capital expenditure. These processes support management's ability to plan for ongoing service delivery and financial sustainability. Harvey Water advised in response to the draft report that it has a financial model using DWER's water forecast for the Southwest out to 2060, and that this is used to identify the impact of water loss on Harvey Water's financials and the Wellington for Agriculture project. Harvey Water also advised that it uses a 10-year model to review alternative scenarios and develop mitigating strategies. This advice indicates that Harvey Water has additional long-term financial forecasting and scenario planning processes in place. However, the underlying financial model and 10-year scenario model were not identified in the documents reviewed or located in the SharePoint evidence searches performed by the review team. As a result, the review could not verify the model structure, forecast assumptions, income projections, forecast period, scenario outputs, governance, approval status, or linkage to the financial plan. The review therefore identified an opportunity to strengthen the evidence and documentation of medium and long-term income forecasts. While income is considered through annual budgeting, business planning and management's stated financial modelling processes, the documents reviewed did not clearly demonstrate firm income predictions for the next five years and reasonable income predictions beyond that period in a consolidated financial plan. This does not indicate that Harvey Water lacks financial planning or that income is not monitored. Rather, the improvement relates to retaining and presenting clear evidence of forecast income assumptions, forecast period, sensitivity to demand or water availability changes, scenario analysis, and the linkage between forecast income, recurrent costs, capital expenditure and long-term asset management requirements. Overall, Harvey Water has financial planning processes in place and applies them through annual budgeting, management review and long-term scenario planning advised by management. Improvements are required to ensure five-year and longer-term income forecasts, including supporting assumptions and scenario analysis, are clearly documented, retained and linked to the financial plan.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
10.5. The financial plan provides for the operations and maintenance, administration and capital expenditure requirements of the services	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Opex and Capex budget files, forward log, maintenance history, and discussions with CFO, Contracts and Compliance Coordinator, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor regarding operating costs, maintenance costs, administration costs, capital expenditure and budget review processes. **Findings**: Harvey Water's financial planning provides for the operating, maintenance, administration and capital expenditure requirements of the licensed services. Operating expenditure budgets address recurrent costs, while capital expenditure plans address renewal, replacement and capital works requirements. The review found that maintenance and operational expenditure are considered through the annual budget process, and capital expenditure is planned through capital budget documents and management review. Priority maintenance and completed job records also provide evidence that maintenance requirements are identified and inform expenditure planning. The evidence reviewed supports that Harvey Water has adequate financial planning processes to fund and manage the costs required to operate, maintain and renew the assets used to provide licensed services. Overall, the financial plan provides for operations, maintenance, administration and capital expenditure requirements.	
	Adequacy Rating: A – Adequately defined	Performance Rating: 1 – Performing effectively
10.6. Large variances in actual/budget income and expenses are identified and corrective action taken where necessary	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Cost Review Meeting minutes, October cost meeting records, cost related communication and follow-up, email communication regarding checking of repairs and maintenance cost information, Opex budget files, Capex budget files, and discussions with CFO, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor regarding the process for monitoring actual income and expenditure against budget, reviewing variances, and determining whether follow-up or corrective action is required. **Findings**: Harvey Water has processes in place to monitor actual income and expenditure against budget. Budget and cost review records indicate that financial performance is reviewed, cost information is discussed, and repairs and maintenance expenditure is checked as part of ongoing financial oversight. The evidence reviewed indicates that Harvey Water identifies and reviews budget and cost variances through its financial management and cost review processes. Where variances or cost issues are identified, they are discussed through internal review and follow-up processes, including cost review meetings and related email communications. The review did not identify evidence that large actual/budget variances were not being monitored or that required corrective action was not being considered. The available evidence supports the conclusion that budget variances are identified, discussed and followed up where necessary. The review noted an opportunity to further improve the linkage between financial variance analysis and asset-level cost drivers, maintenance planning and capital decision-making. However, this is an asset management maturity improvement rather than a deficiency in the process for identifying and responding to large budget variances under this criterion. Overall, Harvey Water has an adequate process for identifying large variances between actual and budget income and expenditure and taking corrective action where necessary.	
	Adequacy Rating: A – Adequately defined	Performance Rating: 1 – Performing effectively

5.11 Capital Expenditure Planning

Key process: Capital expenditure is planned, prioritised and delivered in alignment with asset condition, service needs and funding capacity.

Expected outcome: Capital works are justified, prioritised and implemented through structured planning processes.

Overall Adequacy / Performance rating: B – Requires some improvement / 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
11.1. There is a capital expenditure plan covering works to be undertaken, actions proposed, responsibilities and dates	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: AMP documents (2023-24-F, 2024-25-F, 2021-22_Final), capital planning records (A19. 202223_Capex Plan_HW.pdf), asset committee meeting minutes, budget documents (A19. 202324_Capex Bud_HW.pptx, A19. 202425_Capex Bud_HW.pptx), financial records (A18. 2026Bud_SWIAC_SWIMCO.pdf), and discussions with CFO and Services Supervisor regarding capital works, responsibilities, budget approval and project timing. **Findings**: Harvey Water has capital expenditure planning records in place. The AMP, capital budget and capital planning documents identify capital works and planned expenditure, and demonstrate that capital expenditure is considered through the annual planning and budget process. The review found that capital planning identifies works to be undertaken and proposed actions at a program or project level. Discussions with Harvey Water personnel confirmed that responsibilities for developing, approving and progressing capital works are understood through management, finance and operational processes. However, the capital expenditure plan could more clearly and consistently document all elements required by this criterion in one consolidated form. In particular, the review found that responsibilities, planned dates, proposed actions, status and decision rationale are not always presented consistently for each capital item. Some of this information is available through budget records, AMP content and management knowledge, but is not always clearly linked in a single capital expenditure plan. Overall, Harvey Water has a capital expenditure plan and capital planning processes in place. Improvements are required to better document works, actions, responsibilities and dates in a consistent and consolidated format.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
11.2. The capital expenditure plan provides reasons for capital expenditure and timing of expenditure	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: AMP documents (2023-24-F, 2024-25-F, 2021-22_Final), capital planning records (A19. 202223_Capex Plan_HW.pdf), budget documents (A19. 202324_Capex Bud_HW.pptx, A19. 202425_Capex Bud_HW.pptx), financial records (A18. 2026Bud_SWIAC_SWIMCO.pdf), pipe/channel performance and maintenance information considered during fieldwork, and discussions with CFO and Services Supervisor regarding the basis for capital timing and prioritisation. **Findings**: Harvey Water's capital planning process considers reasons for capital expenditure, including renewal needs, operational performance, asset condition, service continuity, funding availability and major channel / network renewal requirements. The reviewed capital planning and budget records indicate that capital expenditure is considered through annual and forward planning processes. Discussions with Harvey Water personnel confirmed that timing of expenditure is influenced by operational needs, funding constraints, asset condition and the practical timing of works. However, the review found that the reasons for the timing of individual capital projects are not always clearly documented. For example, the linkage between timing and the underlying driver, such as condition deterioration, risk exposure, service impact, failure history, cost escalation, customer impact or renewal priority, could be made clearer. Overall, Harvey Water is planning and timing capital expenditure through established processes. Improvements are required to better document why works are required when they are planned, particularly for major renewal decisions.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required
11.3. The capital expenditure plan is consistent with the asset life and condition identified in the asset management plan	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: AMP documents (2023-24-F, 2024-25-F, 2021-22_Final), assets list (B2. 20251130 Asset List as at 30.11.2025.xlsx), capital planning records (A19. 202223_Capex Plan_HW.pdf), budget documents (A19. 202324_Capex Bud_HW.pptx, A19. 202425_Capex Bud_HW.pptx), pipe/channel performance and condition information considered during fieldwork, and discussions with CFO and Services Supervisor regarding asset condition, remaining life and renewal planning. **Findings**: Harvey Water's capital planning considers asset condition, asset performance and renewal requirements. The AMP and capital budget records indicate that capital expenditure is directed toward sustaining the licensed asset base, including channel and network renewal planning. The review found that there is a practical link between asset condition information and capital planning. Discussions with Harvey Water personnel confirmed that condition, operational performance and renewal requirements are considered when identifying and prioritising capital works. However, the review found that the documented link between capital expenditure, asset life and asset condition could be improved. In particular, the capital planning records do not always clearly show how asset condition, remaining life, criticality, failure risk, performance trends and lifecycle cost information have been used to determine the timing and priority of capital projects. This is particularly relevant as Harvey Water continues major channel and network renewal planning. A clearer documented link between the AMP, asset condition, asset life and capital plans would improve transparency and support future investment decisions. Overall, Harvey Water's capital planning is broadly consistent with asset condition and renewal needs, but the supporting documentation should more clearly demonstrate this linkage.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
11.4. There is an adequate process to ensure the capital expenditure plan is regularly updated and implemented	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: AMP documents (2023-24-F, 2024-25-F, 2021-22_Final), capital planning records (A19. 202223_Capex Plan_HW.pdf), asset committee meeting minutes, budget documents (A19. 202324_Capex Bud_HW.pptx, A19. 202425_Capex Bud_HW.pptx), financial records (A18. 2026Bud_SWIAC_SWIMCO.pdf), and discussions with CFO and Services Supervisor regarding annual budget updates, capital works review, implementation tracking, reprioritisation and funding constraints. **Findings**: Harvey Water has a process for reviewing and updating capital expenditure planning through the AMP, annual budgeting process and management review of capital priorities. The evidence reviewed shows that capital planning has been updated across multiple years and that capital works are considered as part of budget and asset management planning. The review found that capital planning is implemented through annual budgets, management oversight and operational delivery processes. Discussions with Harvey Water personnel confirmed that planned capital works are reviewed against funding capacity, operational needs and renewal priorities. However, the process for updating and implementing the capital expenditure plan could be more clearly documented. In particular, the review found that records could better demonstrate project status, implementation progress, changes to timing, reasons for deferral or reprioritisation, responsibility for follow-up actions, and whether previously approved capital works have been completed or carried forward. Overall, Harvey Water has a process to update and implement capital expenditure planning. Improvements are required to make implementation tracking, updates, deferrals and reprioritisation decisions more transparent and consistently documented.	
	Adequacy Rating: B – Requires some improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

5.12 Review of Asset Management System

Key process: The Asset Management System is periodically reviewed to ensure continued relevance, effectiveness and continuous improvement.

Expected outcome: Formal review processes identify improvement opportunities and keep the AMS current.

Overall Adequacy / Performance rating: C – Requires substantial improvement / 2 – Improvement required

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
12.1. A review process is in place to ensure the asset management plan and the asset management system described in it remain current	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: AMP review evidence, asset committee minutes, previous PRIP and previous ERA review actions, and discussions with CFO, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor regarding AMP review, management oversight and asset management improvement actions. **Findings**: Harvey Water has reviewed and updated its Asset Management Plan during the review period. The latest AMP reviewed was B1. 20240826 AMP 2024-25-F.pdf, which indicates that the AMP was last updated or issued for the 2024-25 period on or around 26 August 2024. Earlier AMP versions reviewed included B1. 20230118 AMP 2023-24-F.pdf and B1. 210225 AMP 2021-22_Final.pdf. The review did not identify substantial changes to the overall nature of the licensed business or asset base since the previous review. Based on the documents reviewed and interviews with Harvey Water personnel, the AMP updates appear to reflect ongoing review and maintenance of the plan rather than a major redesign of the Asset Management System. Elements of the AMP are reviewed through management and Board / committee forums, and Harvey Water has continued to update asset management documentation and improvement actions. This demonstrates that the AMP is not static and that management has some review processes in place. However, the review found that a structured periodic review process for the broader Asset Management System is not yet fully established. The process should more clearly define review frequency, responsibilities, required inputs, approval requirements and outputs. The review should cover not only AMP currency, but also asset information, operations, maintenance, risk, financial planning, performance reporting and improvement actions. The risk of not addressing this gap is that the AMP may be updated periodically, but the broader AMS may not be systematically reviewed to confirm that it remains current, integrated and effective. Changes in asset condition, maintenance performance, risk profile, financial assumptions, regulatory obligations and improvement actions may not be consistently reflected in the AMP or related AMS processes. This could result in asset management decisions being based on outdated or incomplete information, and may weaken management and Board oversight of whether the AMS remains fit for purpose between ERA review cycles. Overall, Harvey Water updates the AMP and considers asset management matters through management processes. However, the broader AMS review process requires substantial improvement to ensure it is systematic, documented and repeatable. **Recommendation Reference**: **07/2026**: Implement a structured periodic AMS review process covering the AMP, asset information, operations, maintenance, risk, financial planning, performance reporting and improvement actions.	
	Adequacy Rating: C – Requires substantial improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

12.2. Independent reviews (e.g. internal audit) are performed of the asset management system	**Evidence reviewed and procedures performed**: Internal audit schedule, previous ERA review actions and PRIP evidence, and discussions with the CFO, Operations Manager and Services Supervisor regarding internal assurance and review activities. The review also considered Harvey Water's response to the draft report, including advice that Harvey Water engaged internal auditors, external to Harvey Water, to review implementation of the 2022 ERA recommendations. **Findings**: Harvey Water obtains independent external assurance over its Asset Management System through the periodic ERA Asset Management System Review process. The previous ERA review was completed in 2022, and the current review covers the period from 1 December 2022 to 30 November 2025. Harvey Water advised that it engaged internal auditors, external to Harvey Water, to review implementation of the 2022 ERA recommendations. This provides evidence that Harvey Water obtained independent assurance over the implementation status of selected previous ERA review actions. Harvey Water has monitored and progressed actions from the previous ERA review through post-review implementation planning and management oversight. This provides evidence that improvement actions are considered and followed up. However, the review of previous ERA recommendations is not equivalent to a periodic independent review of the broader Asset Management System. The review did not identify evidence that Harvey Water has embedded independent review or internal audit of broader AMS areas as part of an ongoing assurance and continuous improvement program. Areas that would be expected to form part of broader AMS assurance include asset planning, asset information, operations, maintenance, risk management, contingency planning, financial planning, capital planning, performance reporting and AMS governance. During interviews, Harvey Water personnel did not identify a periodic internal review or audit process that systematically assesses whether broader AMS processes remain effective between ERA review cycles. The evidence reviewed indicates that Harvey Water's internal assurance activity has focused mainly on tracking and reviewing previous ERA recommendations, rather than proactively identifying AMS deficiencies through its own internal continuous improvement process. Several findings and recommendations arising from the current ERA review relate to matters that could reasonably have been identified through periodic internal AMS assurance before the ERA review, including improvements to maintenance planning, inspection scheduling, failure analysis, AMS data controls, access controls, reporting and periodic AMS review. This indicates that Harvey Water's internal AMS review process is not yet sufficiently established to proactively identify and address AMS weaknesses. The risk of not addressing this gap is that weaknesses in the AMS may only be identified during periodic ERA reviews, rather than through Harvey Water's own assurance and continuous improvement processes. This could result in emerging issues in asset planning, maintenance, operations, risk management, asset information, financial planning or performance reporting remaining undetected or unresolved between ERA review cycles. Overall, Harvey Water has obtained independent assurance over implementation of previous ERA review recommendations. However, independent review of the broader AMS is not yet embedded as a periodic internal audit or assurance program. Substantial improvement is required to establish a periodic internal AMS assurance process that defines scope, frequency, reviewer independence, reporting requirements, findings, recommendations and action tracking for selected AMS components between ERA review cycles. **Recommendation Reference**: **08/2026**: Establish periodic independent review or internal audit of selected AMS components between ERA review cycles, including defined scope, frequency, reviewer independence, reporting of findings, recommendations and action tracking, to support proactive identification and resolution of AMS deficiencies.

Effectiveness criteria	Evidence reviewed and procedures performed / Findings / Recommendation Reference / Rating	
	Adequacy Rating: C – Requires substantial improvement	Performance Rating: 2 – Improvement required

6. Status of recommendations addressing asset system deficiencies from the previous review

The previous Asset Management System Review for Harvey Water was completed in 2022. A post-review implementation plan was prepared to address recommendations arising from that review. The current review considered the status of those recommendations through review of the post-review implementation plan, updated asset management documentation, emergency management and contingency planning evidence, operational documentation and discussions with Harvey Water personnel.

Recommen-dation reference	Process and policy deficiency / Performance deficiency	Auditor's recommendation	Date resolved	Further actions required
01/2022	**B2** **(1.1) Asset Planning** – Asset management plan covers the processes in this table. The 2022 review found that the AMP adequately covered the twelve key requirements of Harvey Water's ERA licence and associated obligations. However, the AMP required editing and update to correct the ERA Guidelines reference, remove duplicated Emergency Management Plan text, clarify appendices, ensure stand-alone documents were included or referenced, remove large text gaps, and present the AMP as a final rather than draft document.	The AMP should be carefully edited to address the following matters: - Correct issue date of the ERA Asset Management Guidelines. - Remove the duplication of AMP text in the initial thirty-three pages of "Appendix A - Emergency Management Plan", - Clarify appendices listed in the table of contents of Appendix A - Ensure that stand alone documents are included in or reference within the AMP Remove large gaps in text in the AMP and present as a final, rather than draft document.	October 2023	**No**. The current review considered subsequent AMP versions, including the 2023-24 and 2024-25 AMP documents. The specific editing and presentation matters raised in the previous review have been addressed. Broader current review findings relating to periodic review of the wider AMS are addressed separately under current recommendation **07/2026**.
02/2022	**Not Applicable** **(1) Asset Planning.** The 2022 review found that the AMP did not address the assets associated with the Albemarle Lithium water supply treatment plant at the Kemerton Strategic Industrial Area or the brine outfall from the RO plant to the ocean. Inclusion of these assets in the AMP or a separate AMP was pending a decision on ultimate ownership and operational responsibility.	That asset management documentation for the Albemarle Lithium water supply Treatment Plant and Saline Waste ocean outfall be prepared as a stand-alone document or included in the AMP as soon as possible.	November 2023	**No**. Harvey Water advised that the WTP was included in the AMS and that WTP jobs would be reported through the AMS. The current review considered the potable water supply infrastructure associated with the Albemarle supply, including WTP-related maintenance, operating documentation and emergency / scenario response information. No further action is required for the previous recommendation.

Recommen-dation reference	Process and policy deficiency / Performance deficiency	Auditor's recommendation	Date resolved	Further actions required
03/2022	**C2** **(9.1) Contingency Planning** - Contingency plans are documented, understood and tested to confirm their operability and to cover higher risks. The 2022 review found that contingency planning text in the AMP was brief and not sufficiently relevant, while Appendix A – Emergency Management Plan was a more fully developed contingency plan. The review also noted that previous recommendations regarding in-house workshops had not been fully implemented.	That text related to Contingency planning in the AMP should be replaced with a reference to Appendix A - "Emergency Management Plan." That recommendation No. R10 of the 2016 review and 12/2020 of the previous 2019 review regarding conduct of in-house workshops be implemented.	September 2023	**No**. Harvey Water reviewed and merged relevant documentation and updated contingency / emergency management arrangements. The current review considered emergency management planning evidence and scenario response documentation. The current review separately assessed contingency planning as performing effectively. No further action is required for the previous recommendation.
04/2022	**C2** **(9.1) Contingency Planning** - Contingency plans are documented, understood and tested to confirm their operability and to cover higher risks. The previous review found that field staff had strong operational knowledge, but Harvey Water should conduct in-house workshops where field staff discuss asset malfunction or failure scenarios and define implications, reporting and required actions.	That HW conducts in-house workshops at which field staff discuss and define the implications, reporting and actions required to manage and minimize the effects a proposed asset malfunction or failure scenarios. The scenarios should be prepared by the Works Manager who should facilitate, rather than lead the discussions. Participants should be encouraged to consider implications such as cost, damage, time intervals, access, delays etc. Minutes of proceedings should be prepared and distributed to participants. Existing procedures should be amended if considered necessary. Workshops should be conducted twice yearly, each considering a major and one minor scenario. That in-house workshops include selected scenarios of Recommendation R10 of the 2016 Review e.g. dam outage / shutdown, pipe burst etc.	November / December 2023	**No**. Harvey Water's post-review implementation plan recorded scenario planning and workshop actions, including Water Corporation scenario workshop activity, potable water incident scenario activity at the WTP, and operational scenarios such as pipe burst and channel collapse. The current review considered emergency management and scenario response documentation. Continued scenario exercises should remain part of normal business practice, but no further action is required for the previous recommendation.

Appendix A – Review Plan

The approved Audit and Review Plan is provided separately to the ERA.

Appendix B – References

Key references used in this audit:

Harvey Water personnel interviewed:

- Chief Financial Officer, Harvey Water
- Contracts and Compliance Coordinator, Harvey Water
- Operations Manager, Harvey Water
- Services Supervisor

Audit team:

- Daniel Rivera – Lead Auditor (Asset Management System Review)
- Joey Fu – Lead Auditor (Operational Audit)

Key documents reviewed:

- Water Services Operating Licence WL31 (Version 12, 13 June 2022)
- Map of Licence Operating Area
- 2022 Operational Audit and Asset Management System Review (final report)
- B1. 20230118 AMP 2023-24-F.pdf
- B1. 20240826 AMP 2024-25-F.pdf
- B1. 210225 AMP 2021-22_Final.pdf
- B1. AssetsUserManual.pps
- B1. JobsUserManual.pps
- B1. Policy_02.01_Asset Management.pdf
- B1. ReportsUserManual.pps
- B2. 20251130 Asset List as at 30.11.2025.xlsx
- B4a. 24102024_Risk register - 2025 v8.xlsx
- B5a. 20251130 Job Schedules_forward planning.xlsx
- B5b. 20260105 PriorityMaint to be completed next 90 days.xlsx
- B5c. 20251130 Jobs completed for period 01.12.2022 to 30.11.2025.xlsx
- 250624-Contractor-InductionHarveyWaterPowerPoint.pptx
- Procedure_6.02.09_ContractorManagement.pdf
- Procedure_6.02.10_Contractor Guidelines.pdf
- 06032025_Naegleria Response Scenario_Final.pdf
- 20210225 AMP 2021-22_Final.pdf
- 2023 post-review implementation plan audit - WL031 - Harvey Water 0.1.pdf
- 2023 post-review implementation plan audit - WL031 - Harvey Water.docx
- 20230715_SWIMCO_Emergency_Management_Plan_rev4a.pdf
- 20240207_ALB_Harvey Water Mock Emergency.docx
- 20240207_ALB_Harvey Water Mock Emergency.pdf
- 20240301_SWIMCO_Emergency_Management_Plan_rev3a.pdf
- 20240826 AMP 2024-25-F.pdf
- 20251211 SWIMCO_Emergency_Management_Plan.pdf
- 20260108 PriorityMaint - 90 days - WTP Kemerton.xlsx
- Agenda Inter-agency Exercise for Harvey Stirling Dams.docx
- Albemarle DoH Mock Incident Scenario Agenda.docx
- Desktop Exercise 20240124.docx
- Desktop Exercise 20240124.pdf

- Desktop Exercise 20240717_PipeBurst.docx
- Mock Incident Scenario Agenda 2025.docx
- RE Request for post-review implementation plan update - 2022 review - WL31.msg
- 01.Harvey Water Benger Pump 4 - Commission Report Feb 23 AP99194-1.pdf
- R89847 - Commissioning Report_Bore.pdf
- 01.HW_Risk Appetite.pdf
- 02.Critical Assessment_AMS.docx
- 02.Criticality Assessment_FAM.pdf
- 02.Harvey Water - Risk Management Nov 2024_pres.pptx
- 02.Risk Analysis And Evaluation Tables v0.2.pdf
- 02.Risk Assessment Meeting Attendees 2024.docx
- 03.Cost Review Meeting Invite.docx
- 03.Costs -SWIMCO R M.msg
- 03.October_cost meeting.xlsx
- 03.XXX_check R&M_email sent 061025.xlsx
- 04.IA_2025 to 2027 Audit Schedule original.pdf
- 04.z_2025_26 Internal Audit Requirements.pdf
- 05.HW Staff KPIS.pdf
- 06.AMP_250409_Asset_CommitteeMinutes.docx
- 06.CS Targets 2023_2026.xlsx
- 251006 -Ops mtg - fwd plan 2025.docx
- Harvey Water Customer Service Charter 2024 v1.1.pptx
- Shutdown Notifications_2022_2026.xlsx
- 2026_HW_Pipe Metrics.docx
- Asset Management System Review - Harvey Water - Findings AD.docx
- A13. Procedure_Manual 2. Operations 2025.pdf
- A14. 20251211 SWIMCO_Emergency_Management_Plan.pdf
- A14. 20230715_SWIMCO_Emergency_Management_Plan_rev4a.pdf
- A31. HW - Compliance and Reporting Register - 01122022 to 30112025.xlsx
- A17. Harvey Water - strategic plan 2022-2026.pdf
- A18. 2026Bud_SWIAC_SWIMCO.pdf
- A19. 202223 Opex Budget_HW.pdf
- A19. 202324 Opex Budget_HW.pdf
- A19. 202425_Opex Bud_HW.pptx
- A19. 202223_Capex Plan_HW.pdf
- A19. 202324_Capex Bud_HW.pptx
- A19. 202425_Capex Bud_HW.pptx
- Decision-to-renew-licence---WL031---Harvey-Water-with-hyperlink.pdf
- Decision---Approval-of-licence-amendment-potable-water---WL31---Harvey-Water.pdf
- Decision---Amendment-to-licence-extensi-to-northern-boundary-of-operating-area-plan-O.pdf
- harvey_water_doh_annual_report_2022_23_v1.pdf
- harvey_water_doh_annual_report_2023_24.pdf
- health_department_report_apr-june_2025.pdf
- A10. WTP Sample plan_25-26.xlsx
- A11. Potable plant checklists - Blank.xls
- A12. Drinking Water Plant MAK5670E OIM.revA.docx

- A12. MAK5670-MAKSTD-RO-OM.Rev0_VP Comments.pdf
- A9. MAK Service Reports / 2024
- A9. MAK Service Reports / 2025
- Assets_Harvey 2025 Report (12March2025).pdf
- SWIAC_FA Rec_0625.xlsx
- SWIMCO_Fixed Assets 2026.xlsx
- RE Approval of audit and review plan- 2025 audit and review - Harvey Water - WL31.eml
- 01.ALB_2023_24 Price Change.xlsx
- 01.ALB_2025_24 Price Change.xlsx
- 02.ALB_Inv_1222_0624.pdf
- 02.ALB_Inv_0724_1125.pdf
- Harvey Water WL31 2026 Asset Management System Review Report Draft v2_HW.docx – Harvey Water comments on draft findings and ratings.