

Information Disclosure for Water Services

Submission Template

How to make a submission

Our draft decision package for information disclosure in the water sector can be found [here](#). Attachment C in the Draft Decision Summary sets out how to make a submission, including where to send your submission, how we handle confidential submissions and preferred file format.

Submissions are due by **5pm on 20 October 2025**.

Submitter details

To check the boxes below: double click on the box, then select 'checked' under default value.

Organisation or individual name:	Waitaki District Council	
Confidentiality status of submission (tick either option):	This is a public submission that does NOT contain confidential information, and I consent to it being published on the Commerce Commission website.	☒
	This is a confidential submission that contains confidential information highlighted yellow.	☐
Reasons for any confidential information:		

Section 1: Feedback on Draft Regulatory Framework Paper

This document can be found [here](#). Please insert more rows if necessary.

	Paragraph #(s)	Feedback	Suggested changes (if any)	Reason(s)
1	56, 57, 58	We are concerned about the impact of including an audit in this process.	The Commerce Commission can advise water service providers whether the information meets the required standard.	Adding audit to the process for ID will significantly increase the regulatory burden on water service providers.
2				
3				
4				
5				

Section 2: Feedback on proposed ID requirements

Draft Determination

The Draft Determination can be found [here](#).

As outlined in the ‘How to have your say’ section of the Draft Decision Summary, to make more targeted feedback easier, we have grouped our proposed ID requirements into two categories in the Draft Determination:

- > **Basic disclosures**—information that we think is essential to support a basic understanding of our initial focus areas (asset management, financial sustainability and ring-fencing), and to identify issues that may need further scrutiny.
- > **Additional disclosures** (shaded grey)—information that would provide deeper insight. We will consider not including these in our first set of ID requirements (and potentially introducing them later as sector capability improves), only applying them to certain regulated suppliers where needed, or giving all or some regulated suppliers more time to comply (eg, a delayed start). We are interested in your views on these options.

We are also particularly interested in your feedback on:

- > **High-cost requirements**—which specific ID requirements would be costly to comply with, and why? If possible, please provide an indicative scale of effort and cost. Is there similar information that would be less costly to disclose?
- > **Tailored requirements**—are there any specific ID requirements that should only apply to certain regulated suppliers? If so, which requirements, which regulated suppliers (based on scale, complexity or the risks they manage) and why?
- > **Delayed implementation**—are there any specific ID requirements that should have a delayed start date? Why?
- > **Value to stakeholders**—how would consumers, councils and other stakeholders use the disclosed information and are there any gaps that would be worth including new ID requirements on now or in the future?

- > **Reporting frequency**—are there any ID requirements that we should change the reporting frequency of (for example, reporting annually compared to only if there is a material change) and why?
- > **Efficiency**—are there any ID requirements that we could remove because the information is already readily available to stakeholders (eg, through another reporting requirement) or where we could better align with existing practices?

Please provide this feedback, and any other feedback on the Draft Determination, in the table below. Please insert more rows if necessary.

	Clause #(s)	Feedback (eg, costs, tailored or delayed implementation, value to stakeholders, reporting frequency, efficiency)	Suggested changes (if any)	Reason(s)
1.		Duplication of information and overlapping reporting obligations. ID requirements overlap across reporting obligations, albeit with a different focus and level of detail. Similar asset, finance and other information is reported to multiple government departments. In addition to multiple parties (including the Commerce Commission requesting similar information) the timing of reporting and forecasting requirements is different. As the information required is not the same, there are no economies of scale for the information provider, which leads to inefficiency.	Remove overlap and duplication of reporting across different government agency/department regarding water service delivery.	So that regulated suppliers of regulated water services (water service providers) can act in a coordinated way across all reporting requirements. This will help to remove duplication and help water service providers in planning for reporting requirements and improve efficiency.

	Clause #(s)	Feedback (eg, costs, tailored or delayed implementation, value to stakeholders, reporting frequency, efficiency)	Suggested changes (if any)	Reason(s)
2.		Waitaki District Council (WDC) is concerned about the disproportionate impact on smaller entities of having to provide ID, for example does it make sense for the same amount of information to be provided by small entities as for larger entities?	Banding This should be based on the organisation's asset maturity assessment. These assessments going forward could identify differing levels of asset management for different size systems. That assessment should be agreed or signed off by the Commerce Commission and the ID requirements should match that.	So that the approach is proportionate and the amount of information required for ID is appropriate to the size of the system.
	5.4	Excessive reporting obligations. It seems questionable what value or benefit is provided through many of the disclosure elements. For example, if the water services provider has already disclosed capital spending and borrowing, what benefit is generated by tracing this to the capitalisation of work in progress?	Remove all excessive disclosure obligations and consider simpler, targeted performance measures.	Relieving the water services provider from unnecessary disclosure obligations can help improve efficiency.

Answer on question in Draft Decision Summary on support for implementation

The Draft Decision Summary paper can be found [here](#).

As outlined in the 'How to have your say' section of the Draft Decision Summary Paper, we are particularly interested in your feedback on what we can do to support regulated suppliers as we implement ID for the water sector.

Draft Decision Summary - Support
What type of support would most help regulated suppliers comply with our ID requirements, and why?
WDC appreciates the Commerce Commission's plans to focus on information that isn't already available elsewhere to try and reduce regulatory burden on regulated suppliers.
Where there is an in-house service model, WDC would like clarification regarding annual reporting requirements that are currently required for the DIA, and the new requirements for ID. Will Council need to prepare two reports, one for the DIA and one for the Commerce Commission?

Further feedback on Draft Decision Summary

Clause #(s)	Feedback (eg, costs, tailored or delayed implementation, value to stakeholders, reporting frequency, efficiency)	Suggested changes (if any)	Reason(s)
2.16	WDC endorses Taituarā's submission with regards to its comments on the exclusion of stormwater in this draft decision package. What is the Commerce Commission's intended pathway for stormwater?	The Commerce Commission outlines it's intended pathway for Stormwater.	Because Stormwater is part of three waters and many providers may have a three waters AMP (which includes stormwater). Stormwater has commonly been the activity with less resource allocated to it, to the dissatisfaction of many communities. With rainfall events intensifying and becoming more frequent, communities need improved stormwater assets.

Clause #(s)	Feedback (eg, costs, tailored or delayed implementation, value to stakeholders, reporting frequency, efficiency)	Suggested changes (if any)	Reason(s)
2.23	Should in-house water service providers really keep water services out of their Long Term Plans and Annual Plans?	For in-house water service providers, water services still be included in the Long Term Plan and Annual Plan process. The water strategy, annual budget, and annual reports could still be separate.	Water services staying in-house will ultimately affect other areas of Council and considering them separately seems counterintuitive. Setting of rates rises hinges on budgets across Council etc. \$X to be spent on water, leaving \$X for everything else. It will be challenging to set budgets and rate rises for the rest of Council services, if water services are not included in the LTP and AP. Water services will have first priority on debt capacity leaving little for the rest of Council as the limits will be set at a Council rather than water service level. Inclusion of rates and waters charges in one place is the only way to really assess affordability if it delivered in house.
3.9	Why is ID being introduced before all of the requirements are known?	This should be done prior to commencement of ID.	To avoid duplication and provide water service providers time to establish processes after stand up.

Clause #(s)	Feedback (eg, costs, tailored or delayed implementation, value to stakeholders, reporting frequency, efficiency)	Suggested changes (if any)	Reason(s)
		The functions of each regulatory authority should be understood, and potential duplication avoided from the beginning. This may require delaying the commencement of ID which we also believe should happen for other reasons documented elsewhere in our submission.	
3.13	Why does ID need to commence in 2026 when water service providers need to be financially sustainable by 2028?	Publish the requirements in 2026 but commence ID from 2028	Water service providers must be financially sustainable by 2028 so wouldn't that be a better time to start? Waiting will give water service providers time to establish systems and for regulatory providers to remove duplication.
3.16	Further consideration given to avoid duplicating existing reporting requirements.	Duplication should be avoided. Refer to comments made throughout this submission regarding duplication.	This is essential. The function of each regulatory body needs to be clear and the information they require to effectively fulfil their function.
3.28	Why is the deadline for ID reporting before water service providers have been established?	Consideration should be given to extending the timeframe to 2028. As It will be challenging to complete ID requirements while water service providers are being established.	To allow water service providers time to get established. An objective of ID is to support financial sustainability of providers. Postponing the start of ID to when providers are required to be financially sustainable by, will better support that outcome.

Clause #(s)	Feedback (eg, costs, tailored or delayed implementation, value to stakeholders, reporting frequency, efficiency)	Suggested changes (if any)	Reason(s)
4.1	Summary of proposed asset management ID requirements	Will these no longer be audited as part of LTP cycles for in-house models?	
4.6	Regulated suppliers would be required to publish a number of asset management planning documents	Delay enforcement until after water service providers have been established	As per 3.28. For those establishing separate entities this is a significant additional piece of work. Once resource is on the ground, these should be the first documents to be produced.
6.2	Proposed assurance requirements These are not required under the NEPM. Are they really necessary?	Alignment with requirements of NEPM	Is it fair to require audit of this information at a water service providers expense?

Answers to the questions set out in the Explanatory Paper

The Explanatory Paper can be found [here](#).

Explanatory paper – Financial questions

Capital expenditure: Capital expenditure is to be reported in specified categories
1. Do you think the proposed categories are appropriately defined and sufficiently detailed to capture the key aspects of regulated suppliers' capex? If not, what changes to the definitions do you think we should make, and why?
The categories seem sensible, but allocating costs accurately between categories will be challenging given many projects would sit within multiple categories.

Paragraph 3.8 states that water service providers will be required to report by split, for example 70%/30%, but 3.9 states that the annual report will attribute all cost to the highest category - 70%. This will mean that water service providers will end up with different disaggregation in different reports.

What is the purpose of collecting this information to this level of detail? Any comparison across suppliers will be exceptionally difficult given the very different populations and environments the suppliers operate in. As a practical illustration Waitaki identified that it was more cost effective to supply several townships from the main treatment plant. However, to do this requires a lengthy pipeline and multiple pump stations due to the undulating terrain it had to cover. Any comparison with schemes in Canterbury, with very different geography, would make this look like we were over investing in both these aspects compared to the population being serviced. Therefore, the level of disaggregation currently proposed would seem to be of little value and is likely to lead to false comparisons. On this basis we see no need for this level of detail during the early stages of this reporting regime.

2. Do you think there are instances where multiple categories should be combined into one? If so, which categories, and why?

See response question 4

3. Do you think we should add any additional categories of capital expenditure? If so, what and why?

No

4. Do you think certain regulated suppliers should only need to report expenditure in the high-level categories—growth, levels of service, and renewals? If so, please explain.

The reporting of network assets looks like it could get very complicated very quickly, with 4x growth categories, 5x LOS and 13x renewals. Already a single project may cover more than 1 high level category, and attributing costs over all the sub-categories seems challenging. For example a wastewater project that enables growth through network expansion and capacity upgrades while improving LOS by reducing overflows and at the same time renewing retic and pumping stations. Even something as simple as a pipe replacement could involve all three categories of expenditure if the pipe was replaced with an item that had greater capacity and a longer life with higher reliability.

Capital expenditure: Capital expenditure on network assets must be apportioned between categories

5. Do you consider this approach (apportionment of expenditure) to be practical and implementable? If not, please explain the specific challenges regulated suppliers may face in complying with this requirement, including the likely cost of any required changes to regulated suppliers' existing practices, and any potential difficulties in auditing the information. We also welcome suggestions for alternative approaches that could provide adequate transparency of regulated suppliers' capital expenditure.

Currently WDC's data isn't quite in line with the proposed categories but is not too far off and could be retrofitted with new fields relatively easily.

If this treatment of capex is adopted it is essential that this is only done once agreement has been reached with the DIA in terms of the same treatment to be applied in Territorial Authority Annual Reports.

Capital expenditure: Capital expenditure components

6. Will there be regulated suppliers reporting under the for-profit accounting standards? If so, which ones?

No comment

Operating expenditure: Operating expenditure is to be reported within specified categories
7. Do you think the categories are appropriately defined and sufficiently detailed to capture the key aspects of regulated suppliers' opex? If not, what changes to the definitions do you think we should make, and why?
The "components" grouping makes no sense. It is very difficult to understand the purpose of these, how they add any value and how they will be understood by consumers and other stakeholders. Again this raises the issue of how difficult comparison will be given the level of variation in operating environments. Even something as simple as number of connections will vary significantly if the number of connections are in one urban area or seven or eight smaller townships and settlements. Rather than a more detailed breakdown of costs, some form of disclosure by scheme size would be more appropriate and useful.
8. Do you think we should add any additional categories of operating expenditure? If so, what and why?
A new category to cover the purchase of raw water supply from a third party or lease of land. WDC currently has expenses and the categories don't appear to be in ID. As noted above, disclosure by scheme type / size may be required to get better comparative data.
9. Do you think the proposed maintenance categories (planned, predictive, unplanned) are appropriate for the water sector and can they be reported on? If not, what changes should we make, and why? What, if any, additional costs would this reporting impose on regulated suppliers?
WDC doesn't currently have a robust method of dividing maintenance between these categories, it would require additional fields, and training to ensure consistency of classification. Two categories would seem adequate, planned and reactive.
10. Do you think there are categories of expenditure that regulated suppliers should be able to combine if the amounts are below a certain materiality threshold, particularly for expenditure forecasts? If so, what would be an appropriate materiality threshold, and why?
This has surface appeal but would be pointless. The information would need to be classified at the lowest level in the reporting system so it will be less efficient to then try and group them up rather than just have a consistent disclosure across years and reporting formats.

Expenditure on changes to entities: This expense component is intended to capture capex and opex relating to the transfer of water services to a new or different entity

11. Do you think the ‘expenditure on changes to entities’ category is adequately defined to capture the range of costs regulated suppliers will incur? If not, what changes do you think we should make, and why?

The definition is inadequate and will struggle to capture the complexity of the work involved in any transfer. For example, would you be expecting a CE to capture their time on such an exercise? Again, the question is, what is the purpose of collecting this information?

12. Do you see any practical challenges involved in preparing, or auditing the disclosure of ‘expenditure on changes to entities’? If so, please explain these and how we might change the proposed requirement to address these.

Highly impractical to collect and even more difficult to audit especially in smaller organisation when it will just be part of multiple roles and other expenses rather than a neatly “ring fenced” group or activity.

Asset values: Information about asset values and movements in asset values will be required in the financial statements in regulated suppliers’ water services annual reports, for specified network asset classes

13. To what extent do regulated suppliers currently maintain the necessary asset information at the proposed level of disaggregation?

WDC doesn’t currently hold the information to match the capex categories, but we are close and could be retrofitted relatively easily through the addition of a new field.

14. If regulated suppliers do not already maintain the necessary asset information, what would be involved in changing the way asset information is recorded in order to comply with the proposed ID requirements, and what is the likely cost of these changes?

No comment.

Actual revenue and other income: We are proposing regulated suppliers’ actual revenue and other income is reported within specified categories

15. Do you think the proposed revenue and other income categories are appropriately defined and sufficiently detailed to capture the range of regulated suppliers’ revenue sources associated with regulated services? If not, what changes to the definitions or level of detail do you think we should make, and why?

No comment.

Actual revenue and other income: Regulated suppliers would be required to disclose detailed information about revenue from usage charges and rates

16. Do regulated suppliers currently maintain the necessary information to support detailed disclosure of revenue from usage charges and rates? What, if any, additional costs would this reporting impose on regulated suppliers?

As not all providers will have the necessary information and will therefore need to develop this information, guidance on what is meant by residential and non-residential will be useful even if this is well before they become compulsory. An example of where this would be useful is rural mixed use supplies where there is both a residential and commercial use through a single connection point.

17. For regulated suppliers operating under a split decision-making model, is the proposed detailed disclosure of revenue from usage charges and rates workable, given collaboration with related organisations (eg, shareholding Councils) may be required to complete a consolidated disclosure, where water services are funded from rates? If not, what changes should we make, and why?

No comment.

Financing and funding arrangements

18. Do you think that the disclosure requirements relating to financing and funding arrangements could be reduced or streamlined while still providing sufficient information for stakeholders to understand the financial sustainability of the regulated supplier? If so, what changes to the disclosure requirements do you think we should make, and why?

Should this section only apply if finance is not provided by LGFA or a tiered approach to reflect this. The issue is who outside of the LGFA will this be meaningful to?

Pricing: Regulated suppliers would be required to disclose information about all charges, including non-standard charges and charges with small numbers of customers

19. Do you have concerns about the proposed requirement to disclose information about non-standard charges and charges applied to a small customer base, because of commercial sensitivity? If so, please describe the nature of your concerns.

No comment.

Financial sustainability indicators

20. Do you think it would be beneficial to also require any of the financial sustainability indicator forecasts to be reported in real terms. If so, which indicators and why?

No comment.

Revenue and funding indicators: Ratio of cost of water services as a proportion of household income

21. Is there also non-residential data (instead of just household income) that you think we should require to create a similar but non-residential indicator? If so, which data?

There is no non-residential equivalent so this should not be pursued further.

22. Do you think the measure expressing water service charges as a percentage of household income should also be reported using alternative income thresholds, such as the lowest decile (10th percentile) or the lowest quartile of household income, in addition to the median? If so, which thresholds?

Household income can vary significantly especially if it is looked at in subsets of the supply area. So known measure like married national super would be a more appropriate measure, especially as this is a part of the community that tends to be asset rich, cash poor.

Explanatory paper – Implementation settings questions**Director's certification**

23. Do you think there are specific disclosure areas where the proposed ID requirements for assurance may not be necessary or may not provide additional value relative to the cost and effort it would take to implement?

If so, please explain your reasons including specific challenges in complying with these requirements such as likely cost of any required changes to regulated suppliers' existing practices and how we might change the proposed requirement(s) to address these.

At present it is hard to judge the cumulative effect of all the disclosures required. There is a real danger that by trying to meet the needs of every possible stakeholder in a single disclosure document creates something that is too long and complex to meet the needs of most stakeholders. This will only become clear when it is all seen together. there should be a process to review the disclosures on a regular basis to check it is all still fit for purpose and a way to limit further matters being added with nothing being removed. The current Council Long Term Plan process is an example of where this has occurred and is an example of something that should not be followed.

24. We also invite comment on the appropriateness of the proposed certification criteria for the matters being certified, including whether the criteria are fit for purpose and aligned with the type of information being disclosed and certified.
No comment.
25. Do you think there are particular types of disclosures where Chief Executive level certification would be more appropriate than what we are currently proposing? If so, please outline which disclosures would benefit from this approach and why, and describe any challenges regulated suppliers might face in meeting our proposed requirement (such as likely cost of any required changes to regulated suppliers' existing practices) that could be better addressed through this level of certification.
The current proposal for two councillors to certify information as accurate is not appropriate. Councillor roles differ from Directors including in their liability. For in-house water delivery through a Territorial Authority more flexibility may be required to find the most appropriate parties to give the assurance trying to be achieved. Similar certification, for example for audits, is provided by the Mayor and the Chief Executive. If an independent person is selected to head a committee or other governance body in relation to water services, they will not be an elected member but may be the most appropriate person, with the CE to sign a disclosure statement. This should be allowed for. We suggest considering certification being required from the CE and the Mayor or the Chair of the Water Services Committee where there are appropriate delegations in place.
What can be kept confidential: Commission-only disclosures
26. Are there other types of information proposed for public disclosure that you think should be disclosed to the Commerce Commission on a Commission-only basis because they are confidential, commercially sensitive or only relevant for compliance monitoring? If there are, please say what those types of information should be and explain why these should be disclosed to the Commerce Commission only.
No Comment.

Geographic disaggregation
27. Do you prefer either Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 to the proposed ID requirement? If so, which alternative do you prefer, and why?
Support alternative 2

Other comments

In this section you can provide any general or specific comments you may have on our draft decision, that may not be covered by the previous sections above. We ask that you please reference the appropriate document, section and/or page number where possible.

Other comments

WDC thanks the Commerce Commission for the opportunity to respond to the Commerce Commission's draft determination setting out a proposed information disclosure regime.

WDC is broadly supportive of introducing Information Disclosure (ID) to the water services industry as a means to improve outcomes for our community. We also acknowledge the Commerce Commission's efforts to engage with the industry on this matter.

WDC supports the intent of the submission made by Taituarā.

Water services are an example of a natural monopoly in that each is a service where there are high barriers or start-up costs that prevent others from readily entering the sector. Water services require an infrastructure of treatment, distribution or disposal facilities that come with substantial initial capital costs and ongoing life cycle costs.

The purpose of economic regulation is "to protect consumers from the problems that can occur in markets with little or no competition."

What consideration has been given to allow for the fact that the water services industry is different to other industries already regulated by the Commerce Commission?

As stated in our previous submission on this matter Territorial Authorities are heavily regulated with regards to the provision of water services. The purpose has never been to extract profit. Territorial Authorities have a legal obligation under the Health Act 1956 to improve, promote, and protect public health across the district. Under the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA 2002), the continued operation of water supplies is required unless approval has been obtained by Council to cease some or all the activity. The Water Services Act 2021 ensures that drinking water suppliers provide safe drinking water to consumers.

Other comments

The water services sector is inherently heterogeneous, which leaves us questioning the purpose and value of many aspects of ID. Among the Councils and their CCOs there are very significant differences that have a material impact on the costs of service delivery and the ongoing investment needed to sustain a healthy network. For example, service delivery areas vary in size, customer types differ, organisational scale ranges considerably, and consumer density fluctuates substantially. Moreover, topography and geology—factors that materially affect both delivery costs and revenue potential—differ markedly across providers. Where one water service provider can process and distribute water with little investment, another may need much more investment as their environment presents natural barriers e.g. hilly terrain. This diversity makes meaningful comparisons between water service providers challenging and raises questions about the practicality of uniform price regulation.

Multiple central Government agencies are combining to regulate the water services sector. While distributing regulatory oversight across agencies appears logical in principle, the current approach creates significant inefficiencies as each agency requests similar—but not identical—information, forcing even singular entities such as CCOs to provide multiple reports with overlapping yet distinct data requirements. This burden is magnified for councils, which must also respond to additional regulators seeking the same underlying information in different formats. For the sake of consumers and sector efficiency, these regulatory requirements warrant consolidation and alignment. Has the Commerce Commission engaged with other agencies who share an interest in water services to simplify reporting requirements?

WDC strongly urges that consideration is given to the disproportionate impact on smaller providers of the introduction of ID. We suggest banding requirements based on asset maturity assessments to ensure proportionate reporting obligations.

As stated in our previous submission we request that the Commerce Commission uses consistent methodology and timeframes around deadlines for reporting requirements/reporting period where possible.

With the significant detail required for large quantities of data, and the frequency of reporting, it is questionable what benefit there is to consumers and the community. Has the Commerce Commission considered simplified performance management measures that have a continuous improvement focus, rather than what look to be purely comparative measures. As we've established within the previous paragraph, water service providers are often impossible to compare as each may have significantly different demands that affect the cost of their operations and investment requirements.

We're not suggesting the Commerce Commission shouldn't regulate the sector. However, we question whether a different approach might deliver better value to consumers and communities. Rather than the current framework, could measures that actively support Service Providers to improve their performance over time be paired with streamlined, simplified compliance measures? This would help shift the focus toward performance outcomes alongside compliance, ultimately driving continuous improvement and cost savings.

Other comments

WDC supports Taituarā's submission on the following point that: "The ID regime should therefore be designed around the needs of users and what would arm them with the right questions to ask and to serve as evidence of any need for further regulatory intervention."

Regarding the implementation date of ID, WDC is concerned that these new documents will need to be in place by the due date of the new arrangements in 2027. There doesn't appear to be any allowance for what needs to happen to establish these new organisations. We must be financially sustainable by 2028 so wouldn't that be a better time to start? Waiting will give water service providers time to ensure everyone's role is understood and reduces the risk of duplication.

About Waitaki

The Waitaki district has a population of 23,472 (2023) and covers a large land area (7,152 km²) making it one of the larger districts in New Zealand. The district reaches inland from the Waitaki River mouth, up the Waitaki River Valley, through Ōhau to the top of the Ahuriri River Valley, extending south to Ōamaru, and down the east coast beyond Palmerston to Flag Swamp.

The Waitaki district is the only Council in the South Island working with two regional Councils - Environment Canterbury and Otago Regional Council.

WDC currently supplies water to around 90% of the district's population through the operation of 15 individual water supplies (eight of which are rural supplies). Over the last few years, Council has progressively amalgamated water supplies, reducing the number of water supplies from 23 to the current 15. In rural areas, water is also used by stock and thus contributes to the rural economy.

WDC provides eight wastewater systems which collect liquid waste from more than 14,000 residents across the district, before treating and disposing of it to acceptable environmental standards.

Our stormwater systems are designed to provide a safe and effective collection of excess water and to protect properties from getting damaged. Approximately 60% of the district's population have access to a public reticulated stormwater system, with the remaining 40% being served by individual soak pits and associated disposal systems.

About Waitaki

Primary industries (agriculture, forestry and fishing, and mining) contributes significantly to Waitaki's economy. Primary industries accounts for the largest proportion of GDP (38.8%) in Waitaki District and 22.6% of total employment.