

I request a response to the following questions as outlined via your Goulburn-Murray Water – Pricing Submission 2024-2028.

In your Price Submission for 2024, you make an acknowledgement to the First People's of Australia. What is your authority to now charge them for water?

In your executive summary, you quote uncertain future, environment issues and forces all to validate your submission of a price hike. Who are you serving? Are you serving the First People and those who came after? Or are you serving your overlords, demanding more from those who you are meant to be serving?

In your board attestation, you suggest that you made reasonable inquiries. Are your reasonable inquiries really about making water available for people?

In your Performance section, you say that your performance was really strong despite the challenges. What about the challenges that the farmers faced? Who are you performing for? Are you performing for the people of the land? Or are you performing for your overlords, the water barons?

In your section on Risk, you want to deliver a prudent and efficient price submission. Water is the most abundant substance on earth. What is prudent and efficient about causing people to pay for a substance that is abundantly available?

In your section on Engagement, you are tailoring a pricing structure using simulators. Who will receive the benefit, your overlords or the people?

In your section on Management, you have a peer review of the price submission. I think this is a step in the right direction.

It was good to see that Outcomes included the feedback of the customers.

I'm looking forward to working with you on these issues and I hope to hear your response.

Yours sincerely,

Samuel McIntosh