Water price review 2020

Submission received through Engage Victoria on Goulburn-Murray Water's price submission

Date submitted: 27 Nov 2019

Water business: Goulburn-Murray Water

Submission written by: Anonymous

Postcode: ----

From 18 November 2019, we began accepting submissions on our 2020 water price review via Engage Victoria (www.engage.vic.gov.au). On this website, people were given the option to send us general feedback or respond to a set of questions we provided.

1. Which of Goulburn-Murray Water's proposals is most relevant to you?

   The Gravity irrigation area prices

2. Does the submission by Goulburn-Murray Water accurately reflect the themes and outcomes explored through its engagement?

   Hard to know - there is always an emphasis on the positive feedback rather than genuinely addressing the constructive or negative feedback. There were many questions on the price submission that were not answered with respect to line of sight for fees paid and service delivered. There is a very large corporate back side which seems to load up the fees that has no transparency or accountability to.

3. General comments on this price submission

   The storage fees show the difference between basin and system prices, need to show the difference in infrastructure access fees for each irrigation area - they have showed the one price but no alternative - what is the level of cross subsidisation between area's? With all the cross -subsidisation it is hard to see where the efficiency drivers come from. With respect to the basin and system pricing, good move towards the one price but I fear some of the larger water shareholders will simply move their entitlements under a different bulk entitlement e.g. Lower Murray Water and pay the cheaper basin price - this will in turn increase the system price over time - effectively resulting in the "non-water user" fee issue. Would also like to see greater flexibility or options in choice for service, as it stands there is very little choice in what you pay, for example, ability to suspend service points for multiple years at a time if they are not going to be used or greater flexibility/cheaper to terminate or at least reduce the delivery shares. The Constant assumption of delivery shares yet reduction in GMID deliveries suggests the system is going to be even further highly underutilised and a lot of fees will be charged for little to no service for many "customers". I understand the challenges of the requirement for a high portion of fixed cost recovery but what is the tipping point?? A lot of work has gone into engaging but how much of what was said has influenced true change?