



To whom it may concern,

In response to the NRC's questions -

1. Is the document clear in regards to the Commission's role in water sharing plan reviews? If not, what should be clarified?

While the NRC's role in water sharing plans seems clear, there is some uncertainty about the detail, appropriateness and relevance of the limited information influencing the plans.

2. Is the framework clear in regards to the overall approach to undertaking water sharing plan reviews? If not, what should be clarified?

As the NRC is not responsible for plan development, implementation or replacement, operation of water systems, or individual licence monitoring or pricing. The apparent reliance is on the relevant NSW government agencies complying with the general water management principles in the Act, in particular (h) the principles of adaptive management should be applied, which should be responsive to monitoring and improvements in understanding of ecological water requirements.

3. Do you have priority issues you would like to see addressed by the reviews?

Given the reviews reflect the end of state wide processes said to include the likelihood and potential impacts of known risks. The issue of whether the 'mixed and inconclusive results across water quality indicators' reflects a desire to ignore the known risks and the implied principles of adaptive management required to address them.

While this may not be NRC's role, the long term question is whether a 'top down' approach has or could contribute to the achievement of the desired environmental outcomes.

From that perspective please find attached a 'bottom up' document about water issues in a catchment and the difficulty believing these issues are a result of adaptive management. While it's all very well to share water, its quality and who is responsible for it, seems to be a very different matter.

Kind regards

