

**Submission  
No 2**

## **INQUIRY INTO STATUS OF WATER TRADING IN NEW SOUTH WALES**

**Name:** Mr Greg Adamson

**Date Received:** 4 June 2022

---

In the interest of brevity, I will provide a very condensed submission.

As a resident and land holder in the Murray Darling Basin region which is impacted by water trading, I have come to question why Delivery Entitlements are paid by the landholder, but not the water licence holder.

Would it not be more reasonable that water licence holders (particularly water traders) be required to pay an amount toward the delivery costs of water? Similar to rates on real estate?

It seems absurd that landholders, who in times of drought and are reliant on traded water which is not available, are required to pay a prescribed fee for water. Yet, concurrently, water traders profit significantly for the lack of availability of water. The current fee structure promotes non-irrigators to invest in water, taking profits from our region, at the same time exacerbates the financial burden on struggling farmers to pay for something not available (in times of drought).

It would make more sense that those who hold water licences, be they local or internationally based, fund the infrastructure required to deliver water as they effectively financial benefit the most from the water licence every year.

Such a reform would lead to a more equitable water delivery charge to water users than what currently exists.

I can provide further detailed research if requested.