Explanatory Notes

Queensland's Urban Potable Water and Sewerage Benchmarking 2024/25

June 2026

Contents

1. Introduction

Each year the Queensland Water Directorate (***qldwater***) publishes the annual Urban Potable Water and Sewerage Benchmarking Report. This is the 15th edition of the report.

The data covered in this report is captured and reported to the Queensland Department of Local Government, Water and Volunteers (DLGWV), which is responsible for (amongst other things) licencing and registration of water service providers, administration of Drinking Water Quality Management Plans, and performance reporting.

Most water and sewerage Service Providers (SPs) report to DLGWV using the Statewide Water Information Management (SWIM™) software, which is available to all members of ***qldwater***.

The report has been published as a set of PowerPoint slides displaying charts for all water reporting entities for each respective category, with this document providing explanatory notes and additional insights that should be read in conjunction with the charts.

The slide deck and explanatory report contain a suite of indicators and benchmarking data for 72 of Queensland's urban water/sewerage SPs. The data is presented in figures that provide comparative information to enable each SP to compare performance against that of similar sized SPs. The charts show ranked values of indicators for each SP that reported in 2024/25 in five groups based on the number of (water) connected properties served: Small SP with less than 1,000 connections (light blue), Indigenous SP (dark blue), Medium SP with between 1,000 and 9,999 connections (light brown), Large SP with between 10,000 and 50,000 connections (dark brown) and Extra-large SP with more than 50,000 connections (red).

This year we note the following changes: Blackall-Tambo Regional Council moves into the Medium category, with 1,000 reported connections, while Mackay Regional Council has been included in the Large category, with 40,817 reported connections, a notable decrease from the 57,506 connections reported in the previous period.

Queensland (along with NSW) differs from other states and territories in Australia in that its drinking water and wastewater services are primarily the responsibility of local government. In Queensland, urban services are provided by 69 councils, one non-council entity (RTA Weipa), three bulk water suppliers (data not included here) and two council-owned Distribution Retail Entities (DREs), compared to other states and territories that typically have either a single authority or a number of regional statutory authorities.

During 2024/25 Queensland's council-owned SPs spent more than $2.9 billion operating the $31.9 billion worth of water and sewerage assets under their control.

Water services are provided to just over 2.1 million water connections and 1.9 million sewerage connections in Queensland. They are required for public health and essential services, and are expected to operate continuously without disruption.

qldwater strongly supports the use of performance reporting and benchmarking to assist SPs in the continuous improvement of the services they provide to their community. This data enables each SP to critically examine its performance by investigating trends in its indicators and by comparing its performance against those of similar SPs, and particularly against high-performing SPs that are in a similar position and implementing the best-practices that are appropriate for their community. The diversity of the Queensland sector means that there is a

broad variety of external factors influencing efficiency and effectiveness of SPs, so comparisons with those with similar cost drivers will be most useful.

1.1. External factors potentially influencing performance

There are a wide range of 'external' factors which can influence a SP's performance. These factors include things such as:

- Climate – rainfall patterns, evaporation, temperature
- Geography – geology i.e., soil reactivity (shrink-swell) andtopography (i.e. mountains, flood plain)
- Size – population, number of connections, geographical area served
- Location – e.g., SEQ vs. Western Queensland, dense urban vs. rural urban
- Services provided – water treatment vs. treated water imported from another supplier
- Water supply – river vs. dam vs. bore water will require different treatments, distance to supply
- Asset age – old assets may require more maintenance/repairs and be less efficient
- Regulatory requirements and guidelines including but not limited to sewage treatment discharge licences (Environmental Authorities)

It is important to take these factors into account when comparing performance with other SPs.

One way for SPs to limit the effects of these external factors is to examine trends in their own performance indicators over time. It must be remembered that there may also be changes in the external factors over time as well (e.g., wet vs. dry years).

1.2. Service provider size as a factor in assessing statewide 'benchmark' performance

It is important to note up front that the figures for smaller SPs may be skewed towards relatively higher values for indicators that standardise data by 'per connection' or 'per 100 km of mains'. Smaller SPs have low populations and relatively short lengths of mains so that figures can be magnified when compared with larger organisations. This means that these indicators can result in small organisations comparing poorly with larger ones despite having similar performance profiles. In such cases, benchmarking is only useful against SPs of a similar size.

2. Sewerage Services

2.1. Capacity and viability

The total reported capital expenditure on sewerage infrastructure in Queensland was $956 million for 2024/25. In addition, the total reported operating costs to collect and treat sewage from across the State was $933 million at an average cost of $529 per connection. Note that not all councils provide sewerage services to their communities.

Sewerage CAPEX per connection

Capital expenditure will vary markedly from year-to-year, particularly when expressed per connection for SPs with a small number of sewerage assets. The indicator provides a snapshot of investment across the industry. The statewide median capital expenditure was $188 per connection (n=68), this is an increase from the previous year, for which the statewide median capital expenditure was $167 per connection (n=68).

For the medium-sized and larger SPs, the median capital expenditure was $258 per connection (n=43), slightly higher compared to last year at $242 per connection (n=42). For smaller and indigenous SPs the median capital expenditure was $124 per connection (n=25). Last year, the smaller and indigenous SPs capital expenditure was $43 per connection (n=26).

The smaller and indigenous SPs contained the top four SPs in this category with Palm Island Aboriginal Shire Council reporting the greatest relative capital expenditure of $3,322 per connection. This elevated capital expenditure largely reflects significant grant-funded sewerage network rehabilitation and wastewater treatment plant upgrades undertaken during 2024/25. For the medium-sized and larger SPs, Cassowary Coast Regional Council reported the greatest relative capital expenditure of $1,080 per connection, which is likely influenced by post-disaster recovery following Cyclone Jasper in December 2023, with recovery activities continuing into the current reporting period.

This year, the SP with the second greatest relative capital expenditure was Pormpuraaw Aboriginal Shire Council at $1,933 per connection. Pormpuraaw has a small population, which magnifies the apparent investment on a per connection basis.

Sewerage OPEX per connection

The ‘sewerage operating cost per connection’ is sometimes used as an indicator of the operational efficiency of a SP. The components of operating cost (operation, maintenance and administration) are:

- Charges for bulk treatment/transfer of sewage
- Salaries and wages
- Overheads on salaries and wages
- Materials/chemicals/energy
- Contracts
- Accommodation
- All other operating costs that would normally be reported
- Items expensed from work in progress (capitalised expense items) and pensioner remission expenses

- Competitive neutrality adjustments, which may include land tax, debits tax, stamp duties and council rates

Topography will also affect operating costs through the amount of pumping needed to move the sewage to the treatment plant. With higher levels of sewage pumping comes an associated increase in asset maintenance and energy costs. Note that the definition for this indicator excludes depreciation. Source waters can also be associated with higher energy costs, for example, SPs with bulk water supplies (dams) or those pumping water from artesian sources.

The statewide median OPEX per connection value was $439 (n=68). For the medium-sized and larger SPs, the median OPEX was $508 (n=43), while smaller and indigenous SPs, the median OPEX per connection was $352 (n=25).

In the 2023/24 reporting period, the statewide median OPEX per connection was higher at $478 per connection (n=68). Medium-sized and larger SPs recorded a lower median OPEX of $483 per connection (n=42), and smaller and Indigenous SPs reported a higher median OPEX per connection of $478 (n=25).

Cost drivers for sewerage services

The type of treatment as well as the level of treatment (related to the discharge/ reuse requirements) of sewage will affect the operating costs. With higher levels of sewage treatment come associated increases in other costs, particularly energy and human resources.

Service providers with a number of separate sewerage systems, larger areas of low-density service (low numbers of properties serviced per km of main) and those with higher numbers of, and smaller, sewage treatment plants will generally need more employees to effectively manage their systems and thus have higher operational costs. Management of biosolids is another costly expense which is greater for large SPs, particularly if they are at a large distance from reuse or disposal sites.

The maintenance costs of sewerage infrastructure are related to several factors, such as the age and condition of the assets and the soil reactivity (shrink-swell of soils damaging pipes).

Typical residential bill: sewerage

The ‘typical annual residential bill: sewerage’ is the dollar amount of the typical residential sewerage bill for the financial year, including special levies. If the bill is cost-reflective and a SPs’ operations are run effectively and efficiently, the typical residential bill should be minimised and indicate the SP is providing value for the community. However, if bills are lower than costs then a SP may not be financially sustainable. The aim for a SP should be to provide agreed levels of service at the lowest, but importantly sustainable, residential bill considering the costs of operations, capital and appropriate financial returns.

This indicator is currently only legislatively required to be reported as separate water and sewerage components by SPs with greater than 10,000 connections. Smaller utilities report the value for combined water and sewerage operations.

The median typical annual residential bill for sewerage services by medium and larger SPs was $825 (n=43), compared to $707 for all reporting entities (n=68).

Typical residential bill: water + sewerage

The median value for the typical annual residential bill for water and sewerage combined is $1,610 (n=68) and is reported by all SPs with the exception of Barcoo Shire, Croydon Shire, Etheridge Shire and Mapoon Aboriginal Councils because they do not provide sewerage services.

For the medium and larger SPs, the median value for the typical annual residential bill for water and sewerage combined is $1,758 (n=43) and for the smaller and indigenous providers is somewhat lower at $524 (n=25) (see comment below relating to indigenous council charges).

The distribution of SPs for this indicator is complex due to the combined confounding factors, including:

- Many councils do not pass the full cost of supplying water and sewerage services on to customers
- Some councils source their water from the Great Artesian Basin (GAB), which are generally not treated, reducing cost to supply
- Some smaller councils do not provide sewerage services to all of their communities
- Many indigenous councils do not specifically charge community residents for water or sewerage services and often report $0 for this indicator

Economic Real Rate of Return: sewerage

In the case of council-owned SPs, the financial performance of many SPs is intricately linked with that of the owner council. This makes determining the financial performance of the sewerage operations as an individual business unit hard to assess particularly for small SPs.

In addition, an important distinction must be made between the category of (usually large) councils that are financially sustainable and can provide dividends to benefit their communities, and the small and often more remote councils. In the latter, smaller populations and small rates bases can mean that funding assistance and subsidies from other council income is necessary to maintain services and, in some cases, even operating costs may not be recovered.

One comparator of financial performance is the Economic Real Rate of Return (ERRR). The ERRR: sewerage is the revenue from sewerage business operations, less operating expenses for the sewerage business, divided by written down replacement cost of operational assets. An appropriate value for ERRR is difficult to determine for SPs but should be at least positive, with a margin to allow for return on capital (NWC and WSAA, 2010). OTTER (2011) suggested that an ERRR of around 7% was required for full cost recovery in the pre-amalgamation Tasmanian urban water industry. The Productivity Commission questioned whether the NWC and the NSW Office of Water definition of full cost recovery as an ERRR “greater than or equal to zero” was sufficient (see PC, 2011, p. 386).

ERRR data is now only specifically required under the Queensland KPI framework from SPs with greater than 10,000 water connections, however, it can be calculated from other indicators requested from all SPs. The data provided here are the calculated values for all SPs to allow for consistent comparison. The statewide median value for ERRR: sewerage for all SPs that provided data was 2% (n=68). This is the same value as the previous year.

For the medium-sized and larger SPs the median ERRR: sewerage value was 3.1% (n=43), with eight SPs in this cohort reporting an ERRR: sewerage less than zero: North Burnett Regional, Paroo Shire, Burdekin Shire, Cook Shire, Cloncurry Shire, Banana Shire, Mareeba Shire and Western Downs Regional Councils.

For the small and indigenous SPs, the median value of ERRR: sewerage was -2.1% (n=25). The very low or negative ERRR values for small and indigenous SPs reflect the difficulty in recovering costs from small councils with low rates base. The ERRR calculation also uses the total revenue values which may not include all revenue for indigenous councils.

2.2. Customer service

Sewerage service complaints per 1,000 connections

Water and sewerage complaints per connection are reported in the following categories:

QG4.10	CS9	Water quality complaints per 1,000 connections
QG4.11	CS13	Water and sewerage complaints (all) per 1,000 connections
QG4.12	CS10	Water service complaints per 1,000 connections
QG4.13	CS11	Sewerage service complaints per 1,000 connections
QG4.14	CS12	Water and sewerage account complaints per 1,000 connections

During 2024/25 a total of 14,061 water and sewerage related complaints were reported across the State.

The statewide median number of sewerage service complaints per 1,000 connections was 0 (n=68).

For the medium-sized and larger SPs the median of sewerage service complaints per 1,000 connections was 0.4 (n=43), and for the small and indigenous SPs the median number of complaints per 1,000 connections was 0 (n=25).

Percent CSS response target met: sewerage incidents

Reporting on specific response times for sewerage incidents has limited meaning. SPs often report that there is no 'ideal' response time as it varies depending on the type of incident (e.g., emergencies should be treated faster than minor issues) and the distance to the area of concern. Instead, it is more appropriate to report on the percentage of customer service standards achieved within target times. This means that the results reported are against the specific Customer Service Standards (CSS) to which SPs have agreed with their customers. As a result, CSS are not the same for every SP and this fact should be taken into account when comparing data for different SPs. The statewide median for the percent of CSS response time targets met for sewerage incidents was 100%.

2.3. Condition of assets

Sewerage main breaks/chokes per 100 km sewer main

The statewide median for the number of sewer main breaks and chokes reported per 100 km of sewer mains during 2024/25 was 4.4 (n=68). This indicator can provide a rough indication of the condition and age of sewerage infrastructure although data may include breaks caused by third parties (e.g., accidental damage from excavation) as well as other anomalies like earth quakes and mining activities (underground blasting) and the impacts of extended dry and wet periods in areas with reactive soils.

For the medium and larger SPs, the median value for number of sewer main breaks and chokes that were recorded per 100 km of main is 5.6 (n=43), and for the smaller and indigenous providers is similar at 1.2 (n=25).

It must be noted that the range of length of sewer main amongst SPs is very large, ranging from 5 km for Lockhart River Aboriginal Shire Council, to 9,818 km for Urban Utilities. This means that for the SPs with short sewer main lengths, a single main break can yield very large values for this indicator when reported as 'per 100 km of sewer main'.

Therefore, the data as presented for this category must be viewed with caution as those SPs with small populations and small networks may be skewed towards the higher end of the rankings and may not be a robust reflection of the age or condition of the sewerage network.

3. Potable Water Supply

3.1. Capacity and viability

A total of 634,542 ML of water was sourced across the State in 2024/25 from all sources, including marine (desalination), surface water, groundwater and recycled (sewerage/ stormwater) sources, some 32 GL less than the previous year. Of this, 580,589 ML of potable water was produced with 366,021 ML supplied to residential customers, 135,906 ML to non-residential customers and 75,889 ML as non-revenue water. An additional 4,066 ML of raw-partially treated water was also supplied to customers (759 ML to residential and 3,707 ML to non-residential). A total of 41,279 ML of recycled water was supplied to customers in 2024/25 and is generally used for irrigation purposes (e.g. golf courses, sporting fields and crops).

The reported total capital expenditure on water supply was $852 million for 2024/25. In addition, the reported total operating costs to supply water from across the State was $1.98 billion at an average cost of $780 per connection for the State.

Water CAPEX per connection

Capital expenditure varies markedly from year-to-year, particularly for SPs with a smaller number of water assets, but still provides a snapshot of investment across the industry. The statewide median for capital expenditure was $336 per connection (n=72), this is 21% decrease on the previous year ($460 per connection n=72). For the medium-sized and larger SPs the median value of capital expenditure was $363 per connection (n=43) and for the small and indigenous SPs the median capital expenditure was $295 per connection (n=29).

Water OPEX per connection

Service providers with cost reflective pricing and effective and efficient systems will have lower operating costs and thus provide better value for money to their customers. The components of operating cost (operation, maintenance, and administration) are:

- Water resource access charge or resource rent tax
- Purchases of raw, treated or recycled water
- Salaries and wages
- Overheads on salaries and wages
- Materials/chemicals/energy
- Contracts
- Accommodation
- All other operating costs that would normally be reported
- Items expensed from work in progress (capitalised expense items) and pensioner remission expenses
- Competitive neutrality adjustments, which may include land tax, debits tax, stamp duties and council rates

The statewide median value for water OPEX was $780 per connection (n=72). For the medium-sized and larger SPs, the median OPEX was $762 per connection (n=43). For the smaller and indigenous SPs, the median OPEX was higher at $886 per connection (n=29). This is reflective of the myriad of variable cost drivers that contribute to the operating costs for each SP that are not directly related to the number of connections. Note that the definition for this indicator excludes depreciation.

The SP with the highest water OPEX per property was Torres Strait Island Regional Council, at $6,042 per connection which is reflective of the vast area covered, water supply/source, multiple islands and remoteness of this Council. Cassowary Coast Regional Council was unable to provide data for this indicator.

Cost drivers for water supply

External factors beyond the control of individual organisations dramatically affect the cost of providing water services. For example, SPs that maintain major storage dams for their water supply may have larger capital expenditure and operating costs than other SPs.

The amount and type of treatment needed for the water sourced will also affect operating costs. However, larger water treatment plants may have lower costs than smaller plants, through economies of scale. Service providers with a number of separate water supply systems, larger areas of low-density service (i.e., low numbers of properties serviced per km of main) and those with higher numbers of smaller water treatment plants will generally need more employees and other resources to effectively manage their systems and thus have higher costs.

The topography and location of the water supply will also affect operating costs through the amount of pumping needed to move the water to the treatment plant and then on to the customer and will have a relatively greater impact on small providers. High numbers of connections within urban areas provide economies (through density) which will help to reduce this cost, relative to SPs with widely spaced connections.

Maintenance costs of water supply pipe infrastructure are related to several factors, such as the age, type and condition of the assets, the soil reactivity (shrink-swell impacts on buried pipes), any corrosive characteristics of the water or soils, water pressures and the density of connected properties.

Typical residential bill: water

The ‘typical residential bill: water’ is the dollar amount of the typical residential water bill for the financial year, including special levies. If the bill is cost-reflective and a SP’s operations are run as effectively and efficiently as possible, then the typical residential bill should be minimised and the SP would be providing value for the community. However, if bills are lower than costs then a SP may not be financially sustainable. The aim for a SP should be to provide agreed levels of service at the lowest sustainable bill considering all costs and return on capital. Comparison of such indicators and consideration of efficiency is important as there may be incentives to either charge too little (e.g., to impress customers) or to charge too much (e.g., to increase returns).

The median typical residential bill for water supply by medium and larger SPs was $997 (n=43), and $881 for all reporting entities (n=72).

Note that most indigenous councils in Queensland do not specifically charge community residents water or sewerage fees and often report $0 for this indicator. Additionally, smaller SPs commonly include water charges within the general rates notice rather than issuing a separate water bill.

Economic Real Rate of Return: water

As for sewerage services, in the case of council-owned SPs the financial performance of most SPs is intricately linked with their owner councils, making it difficult to assess the financial performance of the water supply operations specifically.

In addition, an important distinction must be made between the category of (usually larger) councils that can be categorised as financially sustainable and can generate dividends (return on capital) to support their communities, and the smaller and often more remote councils. In the latter, smaller populations (and thus rate bases) can mean that capital investment in water infrastructure is difficult and relies on funding assistance and subsidies from other sources of income. In some cases, even operating costs can be difficult to meet.

For the medium-sized and larger SPs the median of ERRR: water was 2.6% (n=43).

For the small and indigenous SPs, the median value of ERRR: water was -1.7% (n=29). In this group, seven SPs reported a value greater than zero.

3.2. Customer service

Water service complaints per 1,000 connections

As discussed in section 2.2, previously in this report, we have published the values for 'water and sewerage complaints (all) per 1,000 connections. However, this indicator includes 'any other complaints' not included in the other indicators. Unfortunately, the interpretation of what comprises a 'complaint' varies markedly among utilities and comparisons among SPs remain problematic. The choice of a service complaint indicator may be more reflective of the customer experience across all SPs.

The statewide median number of water service complaints per 1,000 connections was 0.4 (n=72).

For the medium-sized and larger SPs the median of water service complaints per 1,000 connections was 0.6 (n=43), and for the small and indigenous SPs the median number of complaints per 1,000 connections was 0.0 (n=29). It must be noted that the majority the small and indigenous SPs cohort reported zero complaints.

Percent CSS Response targets met: water incidents

Reporting on specific response times for water incidents has no real meaning as there is no 'ideal' response time as it varies depending on the type of incident (e.g., emergencies should be treated faster than minor issues) and the distance to the area of concern. Instead, it is more appropriate to report on the percentage of customer service standards achieved within target times. This means that the results reported are against the specific Customer Service Standards (CSS) that SPs have agreed to with their customers. The results reported are independent of the specific response time taken and the associated issues discussed above and allows the results to be compared among SPs. The statewide median for the proportion of CSS response time targets met for water incidents was 100%.

3.3. Condition of water assets

Proportion potable water that is non-revenue water

Non-revenue water is the amount of potable water produced for which revenue is not received. It is made up of unbilled authorised consumption (e.g., network flushing, firefighting), apparent losses (e.g., theft, meter errors), and real losses (e.g., leaks, bursts, and overflows). Some non-revenue water is necessary in potable water production and network management including maintaining public safety. For some SPs this represents an important additional cost to be managed. The statewide median value for the proportion of potable water produced that is non-revenue is 12.96% (n=72).

For the medium and larger SPs, the median value for the proportion of potable water that is non-revenue water is 16.5% (n=43), and for the smaller and indigenous providers is somewhat lower at 4% (n=29).

It is known that many small and indigenous councils do not measure water usage. For these councils it is very likely that the reported values for this indicator are estimates. The number of councils that report 2% or less for this value may be indicative as it seems highly unlikely that reporting is accurate. As a result, the median of the full dataset is likely to be incorrect. It is suspected that the median value for the medium and larger SPs is likely to be more representative of the industry as a whole.

Water main breaks

The statewide median for the number of water main breaks that were recorded per 100 km of main during 2024/25 was 17% (n=72). This indicator can provide a rough surrogate for the condition and age of water main infrastructure although data may include breaks caused by third parties (e.g., accidental damage during excavation) as well as other anomalies like earthquakes and mining activities (underground blasting).

For the medium and larger SPs, the median value for number of water main breaks that were recorded per 100 km of main is 13.5% (n=43), and for the smaller and indigenous providers is similar at 31.6% (n=29).

It must be noted that the range of length of water mains amongst SPs is very large, ranging from 5 km for Lockhart River Aboriginal Shire Council, to 9,818 km for Urban Utilities. This means that for the SPs with short mains lengths, a single main break can yield very large values for this indicator when reported as ‘per 100 km of main’.

Annual potable water supplied per connection

Per capita potable water consumption figures are commonly used by government and the media but are not required to be reported by any SPs. Residential potable water consumption may however be estimated from other reported indicators. In particular, the potable water supplied per connection per annum (reported by all but indigenous SPs), can be used as a proxy for per capita consumption.

The median of reported values for average potable supply per connection for the State was 574 kL in 2024/25 (n=72), which is slightly lower than the previous year (refer Table 1). For the medium and larger SPs, the median value is 446 (n=43), and for the smaller and indigenous providers it is 1054 kL (n=29). The small and indigenous providers reported over double compared to the medium and large SPs. This is related to the small and indigenous providers water generally being sourced from groundwater and the GAB.

Table 1: Annual potable water supplied per connection per year since 2012/13.

Year	Annual potable water supplied per connection per year
2024-2025	574 kL
2023-2024	581 kL
2022-2023	584 kL
2021-2022	622 kL
2020-2021	583 kL
2019-2020	622 kL
2018-2019	555 kL
2017-2018	585 kL
2016-2017	515 kL
2015-2016	502 kL
2014-2015	519 kL
2013-2014	474 kL
2012-2013	509 kL

The potable water supplied per connection per annum, in kL per annum when divided by 365, provides a value for potable water supplied per connection per day. When this number is divided by an average number of persons per household, it yields an estimate of per capita daily consumption. The average number of persons per household in Queensland is 2.5. The relationship for this average holds most closely for higher density urban areas, and there are several other factors which should be considered for other locations.

As an example, the median of all reported values for the potable water supplied per connection per annum was 574 kL per connection per annum, which can be converted as described above to 629 L per person per day. Note that this method considers only potable water supplied, and some locations may have alternative/ additional sources.

3.4. Water security

Proportion of connections with water restrictions

The water consumption by a community is interlinked with the revenue that a SP can collect for the supply of water. Drought conditions may place an additional financial burden on SPs in the form of costs for providing supply of water (e.g., water carting), reconfiguration of water treatment plants to treat alternative supply sources and increased chemical usage for poor quality source water. Additionally, SPs in areas with reduced supply will impose restrictions, which result in reduced revenues due to reduced supply to customers.

A set of water security indicators are included in the mandatory annual reporting requirements. To display this data in a comparative format, we have included a chart that plots the proportion of connections for each SP that was under some level of water restriction. The colour shade displayed shows ‘relatively’ what level of restriction was imposed during the that period.

The graphs are not intended to compare the performance of SPs as such, but generally show that the larger the bar the longer more people were under some form of water restriction.

These charts provide additional context for the financial and consumption data provided elsewhere in the report.

4. Appendix

This appendix lists total water connections for Queensland's urban water service providers in 2024-25, sourced from the Statewide Water Information Management (SWIM™) system. Providers are split across two tables reflecting the cohort groupings used in this report: Medium SPs (between 1,000 – 9,999 connections), Large SPs (between 10,000 – 50,000 connections) and Extra-large SPs (more than 50,000 connections) (Table 2.) and small SPs (less than 1,000 connections) and indigenous SPs (Table 3.). Connection figures are provided to help contextualise per-connection indicators, particularly for smaller providers where low connection numbers can magnify reported values.

Table 2. 2025 Water Connections – medium, large and extra large

Service Provider	Size	Connections
Urban Utilities	Extra Large	685364
UnityWater	Extra Large	363809
City of Gold Coast	Extra Large	282392
City of Logan	Extra Large	144414
Townsville CC	Extra Large	90242
Cairns RC	Extra Large	76760
Redland CC	Extra Large	67426
Toowoomba RC	Extra Large	66801
Fraser Coast RC	Large	43895
Mackay RC	Large	40817
Bundaberg RC	Large	35957
Rockhampton RC	Large	33293
Gladstone RC	Large	26401
Whitsunday RC	Large	14907
Gympie RC	Large	14710
Livingstone SC	Large	14309
Cassowary Coast RC	Large	13602
Central Highlands RC	Large	12414
Western Downs RC	Large	11762
Southern Downs RC	Large	11696
South Burnett RC	Medium	9932
Tablelands RC	Medium	9902
Isaac RC	Medium	8406
Douglas SC	Medium	7435
Mount Isa CC	Medium	6978
Burdekin SC	Medium	6365
Mareeba SC	Medium	5825
Hinchinbrook SC	Medium	5417
Maranoa RC	Medium	5131
Goondiwindi RC	Medium	4919
Banana SC	Medium	4776
Charters Towers RC	Medium	4480
North Burnett RC	Medium	3402
Murweh SC	Medium	2177
Longreach RC	Medium	1993
RTA Weipa Pty Ltd	Medium	1963
Cloncurry SC	Medium	1736
Balonne SC	Medium	1731
Barcaldine RC	Medium	1678
Paroo SC	Medium	1223
Cook SC	Medium	1217
Carpentaria SC	Medium	1025
Blackall-Tambo RC	Medium	1000

Table 3. 2025 Water Connections – small and indigenous

Service Provider	Size	Connections
Flinders SC	Small	808
Winton SC	Small	685
Quilpie SC	Small	522
McKinlay SC	Small	446
Richmond SC	Small	383
Etheridge SC	Small	319
Bulloo SC	Small	222
Barcoo SC	Small	211
Diamantina SC	Small	210
Burke SC	Small	191
Croydon SC	Small	158
Boulia SC	Small	150
Torres Strait Island RC	Indigenous	1432
Torres SC	Indigenous	1329
Northern Peninsula Area RC	Indigenous	920
Yarrabah Aboriginal SC	Indigenous	582
Palm Island Aboriginal SC	Indigenous	568
Doomadgee Aboriginal SC	Indigenous	394
Hope Vale Aboriginal SC	Indigenous	386
Cherbourg Aboriginal SC	Indigenous	379
Pormpuraaw Aboriginal SC	Indigenous	318
Mornington SC	Indigenous	307
Kowanyama Aboriginal SC	Indigenous	304
Aurukun SC	Indigenous	300
Woorabinda Aboriginal SC	Indigenous	300
Napranum Aboriginal SC	Indigenous	280
Lockhart River Aboriginal SC	Indigenous	213
Mapoon Aboriginal SC	Indigenous	157
Wujal Wujal Aboriginal SC	Indigenous	121

5. References

NWC and WSAA (National Water Commission and Water Services Association of Australia). 2010. National Performance Report 2009-10: Urban Water Utilities, NWC, Canberra.

OTTER (Office of the Tasmanian Economic Regulator). 2011. Tasmanian Water and Sewerage State of the Industry Report 2009-10. Tasmanian Government, Hobart.

PC (Productivity Commission). 2011. Australia's Urban Water Sector, Report No. 55, Final Inquiry Report, Volume 1, Canberra.

Data used here was extracted from qldwater's SWIM™ database on 17/04/2026 as provided by Water Service Providers and The Department of Local Government, Water and Volunteers (DLGWV) but qldwater, DLGWV and the WSP(s) involved offer no warranty as to its accuracy and are not liable for any loss or damage however caused, suffered or incurred by other parties in connection with the Data.