

## Socio-Economic Assessment of Murray-Darling Basin Submission Template

### Submission Number 011

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

████████████████████

2. Please enter your first name

██████████

3. Please enter your email

████████████████████

### **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.

Recommendation 1 is long winded waffle. Obviously all stakeholders need to be considered, with Rural communities having a minimum of 50% input, Greens and ecological ideologue's should have maximum 10% input to decision making. Recommendation 2 Current environmental flows have achieved only 2 failed outcomes, flooding of areas not considered permanent wetlands and depriving rural communities & food/ fodder producers of vital water resources. Water licences need to be reattached to farming land and only primary producers should be able to trade water licences. This will drop the market price and reduce recovery costs. Recommendation 3 Using cost as a deterrent to recovery is just drawing out the process. We need an immediate change in policy. Communities need control of water assets now, waster traders have had a good run and now must feel the same restrictions and loss of profitability as they have inflicted on rural communities by exploiting profits in drought seasons Recommendation 4 the government should not be targeting buy backs from primary producers/ communities but rather compulsory clawing back allotment's to non primary producers at reduced market rate

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

Your process sounds like long winded gobbly gook. Immediately return control to rural communities, irrigation licences to be attached to primary production land and restrict water trading to primary produces within the same river system, with each parcel having a percentage of water entitlement permanently attached to the land that can not be traded. Ecological flows and downstream (eg SA) should not have a biased priority over catchments upstream

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

Yes, the current system puts rural communities at the bottom of the decision making and water entitlement priority list process. They in fact need to be the major decision makers in future management plans

### **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.
- We are one nation, ethnicity or first nation's has nothing to do with water access. If it is tied to land then it is able to be delivered equitably. Any new start up enterprise needs to be assessed on merit not cultural background alone. First nations input should be considered as community stakeholders [REDACTED]. If they are the majority of that particular community then kudos to them and they can have input relevant to their region. They should not be inflicting their requirements onto other communities and vice versa.
8. Are there any significant gaps? What are we missing?
- Water access is equally important for all, we are all come first in this nation. No special considerations are appropriate solely based on being from a selected cultural group. Only first nations people living in a particular region should be allowed consideration. City based activists come under the 10% ecological ideologues formerly addressed.
9. If implemented, do you think our recommendations would make a difference or have a benefit to you and/or your community?
- Yes all water access will be tied to community requirements, not what outside influencers may consider as appropriate

### **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.
- there should be no new water licences issued of current ones expanded. Communities must have priority in future decision making. Any environmental programs need community approval

and must have key parameters measured to demonstrate current and future beneficial effects.

Are there any significant gaps? What are we missing?

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

as previously outlined

### **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

12. 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 must have minimum 50% decision making in all management plans

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

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

as previously outlined

### **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

15. 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.

The need for the resources outlined in #19 are a direct result of lack of community input. If the community has controlling input into management plans, uncertainty and distress caused by external decision makers are removed and the need for government front line support is also lessened

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

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

as previously outlined