

Author name: Name suppressed

Date of submission: Friday, 20 June 2025

Your submission for this review:

I don't think the report goes far enough and understand it is only draft with Sydney Water now likely preparing to challenge the draft report findings. In reviewing the available reports Sydney Water is increasingly operating in areas that are questionable based on their core scope of services. They continue to loosely point to customer outcomes or other fringe drivers like water conservation where they are making investment and adding additional operational expenses that are passed on to the customer. As a monopoly they are encroaching on markets where it makes it difficult, if not impossible to promote competition. For example they have the waterfix investment under the mask of water conservation but then the dams are full and they have made considerable investment in purified recycled water as an alternative source. You can see from the submission the double counting of benefits like digital meters where benefits include network performance, water conservation and customer education, that are the same benefits mentioned across several areas of the submission, where there simply cannot be that quantifiable return and the IPART review process continues to fail in auditing this. This poor performance on return for investment is highlighted in previous reports where IPART has historically been critical of Sydney Water getting their promised return on investment but again fails to properly audit their performance and hold them to account. On the topic of digital meters and double counting of benefits, there needs to be more scrutiny and suggest an investigation why a government organisation is including huge discretionary spend, during a cost of living crisis. It is ridiculous that due to their poor infrastructure planning, resulting in a sudden hike in customer prices, where there are no comparable changes in circumstance - to then think it is OK to invest so much in an area it is not needed. The IPART review has failed to raise questions of the authenticity of the people making these decisions, especially given the organisation has historically been reported as being poor in the area of associating realised benefits to investment. This is a particular failure of the review process and it does a disservice to the people of NSW where there is no accountability through the IPART determination. Simply put as a customer and tax payer, I can't trust Sydney Water where they have assets that have a lifecycle of 50+ years and they need to hike prices in such a short period and they think it is OK to invest so much in optional areas that are not in scope of their core services. The submission in the areas mentioned could be classed as arrogant, brazen with disregard for the people of NSW and in my opinion, amounts to defrauding the Australian people for an unknown entities gain and if IPART fails to hold the decision makers to account and raise questions of authenticity and potential conflicts of interest in areas mentioned, there should be a question of IPART's role in determining the prices we should pay for taxpayer paid products and services.