

Submission to the National Competition Council

From: gts53@tsn.cc [<mailto:gts53@tsn.cc>]
Sent: Sunday, 19 September 2004 3:10 PM
To: info@ncc.gov.au
Subject: [Fwd: Services Sydney for declaration of sewage transmission and interconnection services]

Executive Director NCC

Is there any chance of an extension of time for public comment?
Is it possible to produce an executive summary in basic terms for public consideration?
(particularly in view of the importance to the national economy and national significance) Is it possible to have the issue more widely distributed to the public?

The matter, arguably, needs to be summarised in simple terms (cf 81 pages)

It appears that

- * Services Sydney (not to be confused with "Sydney Water") is relying on public investment in the business of withdrawing some sewage (being paid for so doing) processing it and selling the end-product.
- * this business would be in direct competition to the one of storing & treating rainwater along with a lesser degree of treating sewage prior to disposal
- * there is no prospectus, at this stage, which suggests that the proposal would be in the public interest or which suggests that any competition to access to sewage will be economically beneficial

Will the NCC's recommendation (as an initial determination in the process) give an implied impression to the public that this will be a good business to invest in?

What is meant by a vertically integrated provider? is this a case of throwing a few words together to make an impression?

Is the public aware of sewer mining vs water harvesting? (once again, new words introduced into the industry..... good for marketing and public investment)

The retail sewage (sic sewerage) services bundle is also something that the public may need clarification of

What is the bottom line? The NCC says everything OK & in the public interest.... but would like to split the "service" and "use" into 12 parts to allay any public view that there is "rubber stamp", "wholesale sell-off", or tacit / limited support (ie support) for public payment for water supply & sewerage as a promoted investment for those most willing /capable to pay as opposed to routine application of water/sewerage rates?

At the end of the day, for high standards of living (all aspects), the public and industry require copious quantities of potable water, cheaply.

The NCC's recommendation appears to be an initial step within a process which does not support this tenet.

Thank you for providing the opportunity for public comment on this very important aspect of the operating framework which affects the way that Sydney's (and the Nation's..... by inference) aqueous resources are managed.

Gary Smith