

Socio-Economic Assessment of Murray-Darling Basin Submission Template

Submission Number 004

1. What organisation (if relevant) are you from?
[REDACTED]

2. Please enter your first name
[REDACTED]

3. Please enter your email
[REDACTED]

Bring communities back to the heart of conversations and action that decide their future

This section encompasses the following categories:

- Governments must rebuild community trust in water reform, and lead from the front
- Current funding is not enough to support community led transitions for Basin communities impacted by water reform
- Socioeconomic neutrality criteria should be accompanied by a process to provide flexibility for communities to move to less water dependent futures where communities request this

4. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the Panel's key findings and recommendations, and why? Please provide as much detail as possible.

If I was marking the committee for its ability to put together another "you beaut" set of recommendations !00/100. Anybody could and governments will just say thanks very much and do nothing.

5. Are there any significant gaps? What are we missing?

The points that most inquiries fail to understand is that too much water has been recovered for the environment. The models being used for recovery and management are severely flawed and giving false outputs. The data in the models prior to about 1970 is nothing more than crude mathematical assessment. Drought and flood modelling is unpredictable leaving the models giving us nothing more than an elaborate averaging prediction of future flows. To highlight this is the fact that the lower lakes are full and the eastern catchment dams are by and large empty and this will continue while the basin plan exists. This can be easily rectified by temporarily trading government water to smooth out the gaps created by being unable to model droughts and floods.

6. If implemented, do you think our recommendations would make a difference or have a benefit to you and/or your community?

Financial assistance is a nonsense as it generally only lasts the term of a government. The only assistance worthwhile is restoring the economic wealth destroyed by the plan. This economic wealth must include long term assistance in the form of start up capital to value adding industries which increase returns to communities and farmers. These industries need to be protected from cheap imports that have ruined nearly all of our manufacturing because of high input costs generated by government action or inaction.

Meet the pressing needs of First Nations

This section encompasses the following categories:

- More needs to be done to improve social, cultural and economic outcomes for First Nations communities
7. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the Panel's key findings and recommendations, and why? Please provide as much detail as possible.
All communities have been disadvantaged by the plan to single out one community for specific treatment doesn't help fix the plan. This will create further division in the community if one section is given precedence over the rest.
 8. Are there any significant gaps? What are we missing?
If there is no water available for productive use then where is water coming from for First Nation communities?
 9. If implemented, do you think our recommendations would make a difference or have a benefit to you and/or your community?
No

Implement water reform with greater care so potential harms are minimised

This section encompasses the following categories:

- From this point on, governments should match the pace of all further water recovery to the capacity of systems and communities to absorb and adjust change
 - Basin communities need greater clarity around river operations
 - The quality, timeliness and awareness of indicators related to wellbeing and the environment need to be better
 - Research and innovation need more focus on helping farm businesses transition to flexible farming systems
 - Moving towards more sustainable irrigation infrastructure
10. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the Panel's key findings and recommendations, and why? Please provide as much detail as possible.
Nearly everybody is aware of what is happening it is absurd to recommend that communities absorb and adjust to change when they are going broke. Sustainability includes financial well being. Australian farmers are the most flexible sustainable farmers in the world. We have some of the best research bodies around we don't need any more. The basin community is sick to death of all these motherhood statements
 11. Are there any significant gaps? What are we missing?
The basin plan has been a nonsense from the start because it had the sole aim of delivering political outcomes. An American professor of environmental studies reviewed the plan and recommended it be scrapped and started again, he was ignored. You should have investigated both the original reasons for the plan and the management of the plan. It is pretty obvious that the Menindee Lakes debacle was caused by using the model to manage that system
 12. If implemented, do you think our recommendations would make a difference or have a benefit to you and/or your community?
None whatsoever. Endless motherhood statements never achieve anything

Support the capacity of communities to adapt to change

This section encompasses the following categories:

- Basin communities need greater clarity around river operations
- The quality, timeliness and awareness of indicators related to wellbeing and the environment need to be better
- The Australia Government needs to further invest in regional connectivity in the Basin

13. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the Panel's key findings and recommendations, and why? Please provide as much detail as possible.

Communities don't need any governments telling them about there wellbeing surely they can work that out for themselves. We are sick to death of endless surveys. The government investment you are talking about suggests we need more public servants, for goodness sake surely we have enough bureaucrats. This is the problem not the solution

14. Are there any significant gaps? What are we missing?

The panel has completely missed the point. The community is well aware of the plan and its impacts. It wants the plan fixed or scrapped. We don't need reeducating' we don't need to be told what the plan is doing, we just want it fixed

15. If implemented, do you think our recommendations would make a difference or have a benefit to you and/or your community?

None at all just another waste of taxpayers money

Address critical and urgent gaps in wellbeing, infrastructure and services

This section encompasses the following categories:

- The Australian Government needs to further invest in regional connectivity in the Basin
- Basin regions and towns facing acute social and economic issues needs immediate support

16. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the Panel's key findings and recommendations, and why? Please provide as much detail as possible.

Fixing the plan is the only support we need. That will give a long term solution the problem. Stop gap measures are only temporary, the old cliché "throw a few dollars at them should fix it" has never worked before and won't work this time.

17. Are there any significant gaps? What are we missing?

The significant gap is the fundamental problem of fixing the plan. When something is broken patching it up never works

18. If implemented, do you think our recommendations would make a difference or have a benefit to you and/or your community?

None