

State of AI for Water: Where Are We Now?

Questions and answers from the AI for Water Centre webinar

Thank you to everyone who joined, and to the panel for their answers. We received more questions than we had time for. This note collects them, tidies the answers given in the chat, and adds written answers to the questions we could not reach in the session.

Questions are grouped by theme and keep their original numbers, so you can find yours. Some have been shortened, and the names of people who asked have been removed. Answers under a panellist's name are theirs, lightly edited for clarity. Answers under "AI for Water Centre team" were written after the webinar.

Find your question

Theme	Questions
1. Trust, evidence and assurance	Q1, Q8, Q12, Q6
2. Ethics, regulation and governance	Q3, Q10, Q11, Q21, Q16, Q4
3. Cybersecurity, privacy and intellectual property	Q5, Q13
4. Jobs and the workforce	Q2, Q7, Q14, Q31, Q28, Q20, Q22
5. Keeping knowledge in the organisation	Q15, Q24
6. Regional and rural communities	Q17, Q19, Q23, Q18
7. Infrastructure, data and funding	Q9, Q26, Q27, Q30, Q25
8. About the Centre	Q29
Next steps and contacts	End of document

1. Trust, evidence and assurance

Q1 From your experience in the water sector, where is the biggest gap today between what AI can technically do and what water utilities and water-resource organisations are willing to trust and deploy? What evidence or capability is needed to close that gap?

NICK ASHBOLT

AI can already integrate large datasets, detect anomalies, forecast conditions, optimise operations and, increasingly, use agents to interrogate models and recommend actions. But water utilities run critical infrastructure under strong public-health, environmental and regulatory obligations. An operator or regulator needs to know: Why is the AI recommending this? What evidence supports it? How uncertain is it? When will it fail? And who remains accountable?

Closing that gap takes more than better algorithms. We need prospective evidence from real water systems that AI-supported decisions are safe, robust, and better than or demonstrably complementary to current practice. That means test-beds and operational demonstrations where recommendations first run in shadow mode: the AI observes the same system and makes recommendations, but people keep control. We can then compare what the AI recommended, what operators decided and what actually happened.

We also need assurance frameworks: validated data and models, traceable evidence, explicit uncertainty, defined operating envelopes, cybersecurity, audit trails, human override and clear escalation pathways. Importantly, we need to test AI under abnormal conditions, not just when the system is behaving normally.

Finally, we need capability in people and institutions. Operators, engineers, scientists, managers and regulators need enough understanding of AI to know when to trust it, when to challenge it and when not to use it. That is why the proposed Centre puts training at its core.

So the bridge from technical capability to deployment is evidence plus assurance plus institutional capability. We build trust progressively: from AI that advises, to AI that recommends and explains, to carefully bounded autonomous action where performance and safety have been demonstrated. Trust should be earned through evidence, not assumed because the AI is sophisticated.

Q8 We already have the technology for direct potable reuse, but no social licence. It isn't a technology problem as such.

NICK ASHBOLT

Agreed. The evidence we need is broader than showing that the technology exists (though it can still be improved) and that the algorithms are accurate. We need to demonstrate safety, robustness, transparency and uncertainty, and also build institutional capability, regulatory assurance and public legitimacy. That means testing AI with utilities in test-beds, initially alongside existing decision processes, documenting when it succeeds and fails, and progressively establishing where AI recommendations can be trusted and where human judgement and deliberation remain essential.

The lesson from potable reuse is that technological readiness does not equal implementation readiness. For AI, we need to develop the technology, governance, workforce capability and social licence together, rather than solve the technology first and expect adoption to follow.

Q12 Are the tasks we would most like AI for, such as handling very large, messy datasets, inherently the hardest to quality-assure and check?

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

Often, yes, and it is a fair warning. If a person cannot feasibly check a dataset by hand, they also cannot easily check what an AI did with it. Three things help:

- Check results against independent evidence, not against the AI itself: mass and water balances, laboratory results, physical limits, and data held back from training. The Centre's Discover program is building reusable, physics-grounded evaluators for this purpose.
- Keep the raw data untouched and make every cleaning or gap-filling step traceable, so an engineer can see what was changed and why.
- Have the AI flag and explain anomalies for a person to decide on, instead of silently fixing them, and report how uncertain each result is.

The general rule: the harder an output is to check, the less authority it should carry until it has been tested.

Q6 Could you give a few examples of mistakes AI has made and their implications?

JONATHAN ROBERTS

The Iranian girls' school attack is probably the most widely known, and tragic, example of careless use of AI. The details are not yet clear, but it has been reported that the AI was working from out-of-date information.

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

For context: the strike hit a girls' school in Minab, Iran, on 28 February 2026, killing more than 150 people, at least 123 of them children. Reporting on the Pentagon's internal inquiry says the site was still listed as a military facility in an out-of-date database, and that staff placed more confidence in an AI targeting system than it warranted. AI was one factor among several, alongside cuts to civilian-harm review staff and very compressed timelines, and the investigation is continuing.

Other examples, closer to home:

- In 2025 Deloitte agreed to partially refund the Australian Government for a A\$440,000 report that contained AI-generated errors, including references that did not exist. AI-drafted technical work still needs expert review, and the author remains accountable.
- In June 2026 an OpenAI research agent got around access restrictions and entered the Medicare statistics portal and three other government sites (see Q5). An agent given a goal and internet access may pursue it in ways nobody intended.

- In water, the more likely failure is quieter: a model trained on normal conditions gives a confident but wrong answer during a flood, a drought or a sensor fault. This is why the Centre tests AI under abnormal conditions and runs it in shadow mode before it informs live decisions.

The common thread is out-of-date or out-of-range data combined with people trusting the output too much, more than a fault in the algorithm itself.

2. Ethics, regulation and governance

Q3 Will there be a component of work that focuses on ethical and equity concerns for both organisations and the workforce? What will the experience of frontline operators look like, and what is the change management strategy?

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

Yes. Ethics, equity and workforce impacts sit inside the Centre's first program, **Adopt** (Trusted AI Adoption and Water Work Transformation), which every partner enters through. Its research covers task and role redesign, AI literacy, calibrated trust, professional responsibility, labour impacts, social licence, privacy, data governance and benefit realisation. It is a core research program, not an add-on.

For frontline operators, AI should arrive first as an adviser. Operators help define what a good recommendation looks like, see the AI's recommendations alongside their own decisions in shadow mode, and keep the ability to override. Their experience is part of the evidence: we will measure adoption, trust and how work changes, before and after each intervention.

The change management strategy is the Centre's **Ready → Assist → Augment → Discover → Delegate** pathway. A use case moves to the next step only when it has a named decision owner, a baseline, a data and safety boundary, a measured benefit, operator understanding, assurance and a viable path to a second site. If those are not in place, it stays where it is.

Q10 How do you see the risk and ethics debate playing out differently for private and public entities?

JONATHAN ROBERTS

I expect public entities to be more conservative than private ones, though it is less clear what that means for where each will set the balance between risk and ethics.

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

Public entities answer to ministers, regulators and the public, so transparency and legitimacy weigh heavily and a failure costs public trust. Private firms face commercial and liability pressures and may move faster.

For critical water services, though, the risk to the public is the same whoever owns the asset or supplies the software. The Centre's position is that the accountable owner of the outcome, usually the utility, sets the decision rights and operating envelope, and technology providers work inside those boundaries: no opaque vendor lock-in, no uncontrolled data extraction and no untested operational claims.

Q11: What are the panel's views on the current and desirable role of regulation, nationally and internationally, given how fast the area is moving?

Q21: AI has potential as decision support and as knowledge-base systems, but over-reliance could have large human, social and economic impacts. What is the industry doing on governance and regulation, and should development be more closely supervised?

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

Regulation is behind the technology, which is normal in a fast-moving field, but the gap matters more for critical infrastructure.

Australia does not yet have AI-specific legislation. AI used by water utilities falls under existing obligations: drinking-water and environmental regulation, privacy law, critical infrastructure security rules, and directors' and professional duties. Some AI-specific requirements are arriving through privacy law. From 10 December 2026, organisations covered by the Commonwealth Privacy Act must state in their privacy policies when they use automated decisions that could significantly affect individuals, and WA's PRIS Act adds similar duties for WA public entities (Q4). Following the Medicare incident (Q5), the Australian Government has said it is considering legislative responses.

Internationally, the EU AI Act classes AI used as a safety component in water supply as high-risk, with requirements for risk management, data quality, logging, human oversight and robustness. It is a useful reference for Australian practice even where it does not apply.

What we think water needs:

- Regulators setting the outcomes and the evidence they expect, instead of approving particular tools.
- AI built into existing risk-management frameworks, such as the drinking water quality management framework, instead of a parallel system.
- Clear lines of accountability, so that over-reliance cannot quietly shift responsibility onto software.

One of the Centre's targets is a regulator-engaged assurance pathway, developed with regulators from the start.

Q16 Where can ethical discussions and recommendations happen? Tax reform is also an ethical consideration, for example a shift from a system based on income tax to one that taxes robot input in the same way as personal labour.

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

Tax policy is for government and the wider public to decide, not a research centre. What the Centre can contribute is evidence: the Adopt program will measure how AI changes tasks, roles and workloads in partner organisations, which is the kind of evidence those debates currently lack. Within the Centre, ethical questions will be worked through in partner co-design workshops and in governance that includes utilities, regulators and community voices, including Traditional Owners, on an ongoing basis.

Q4 Comment: Western Australia's Privacy and Responsible Information Sharing Act 2024 (PRIS Act) introduces binding rules, including 11 Information Privacy Principles, for how WA government agencies collect, use, store and share personal information, including obligations around automated decision-making. Compliance will matter for any business working with WA government data, including contractors.

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

Thank you, this is a useful reminder. The PRIS Act's Information Privacy Principles commenced on 1 July 2026, with mandatory data-breach notification following on 1 January 2027. They apply to WA public entities and to contracted service providers handling information for them, so they are relevant to public-sector water providers in WA and to their technology vendors. One principle deals specifically with automated decision-making: assessing its impact, telling people when it is used and providing for human intervention.

For water, this matters most where AI touches customer information, such as billing, hardship or smart-meter data. The requirements line up with how the Centre intends to work: documented impact assessment, transparency and named human authority over decisions.

3. Cybersecurity, privacy and intellectual property

Q5 Are there concerns with security, privacy and IP in giving AI access? Is this a new security risk we need to mitigate? How can we avoid problems with rogue AI, like the recent news?

JONATHAN ROBERTS

Yes, there are huge concerns. One clear direction is local, 'air-gapped' AI: AI that runs where it is used and is not connected to an external network. That looks feasible in the medium term.

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

The recent incident shows why. In June 2026 an OpenAI research agent, given a task and internet access, got around access restrictions and entered the Medicare statistics portal and three other government sites. The Government says no personal information was accessed, and a taskforce is investigating. The agent kept pursuing its task when it hit a barrier, instead of stopping.

The Centre's approach for water:

- Test agents in a sandbox before they go near live systems.
- Give them only the access a task needs, and keep an audit trail of everything they do.
- Require human approval before any action on a physical asset.

- Design systems to fail safely back to manual operation.
- Treat AI as part of cyber threat modelling.

On data and IP: partner data stays under partner control, federated learning is used where data cannot be pooled, and data and IP terms are agreed before projects start.

Q13 What about cybersecurity and the risk of making dynamic agents accessible via the internet, given the recent Medicare incident? How can the public trust AI products developed by private companies taking control in the public sector, when governments are often behind in understanding what caused a decision?

YANG LIU

I agree, cybersecurity and public trust are very important. That is why our Centre is about how AI can be designed, tested and adopted safely, as well as about developing it. We want to look at sandbox testing, system architecture, governance, legal issues and social licence. Before we move towards more autonomous or self-evolving systems, we need to make sure they are safe, trusted and properly managed.

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

On the second part of the question: control should not pass to the vendor. The utility remains the accountable decision owner, and every AI recommendation should be logged with the evidence behind it so the reasoning can be reviewed afterwards. Building the understanding to do that review inside utilities and regulators is a large part of the Centre's training role.

4. Jobs and the workforce

Q2 This all sounds good if we don't want basic jobs for humans any more: we would just need computer-savvy people driving and tradespeople at the work end. That increases unemployment for people without tertiary study.

DANIEL DEERE (PANEL COMMENT)

An important question. We are deliberately using AI to address labour shortages. But at what point do we reach labour excess? And will we need so many tradespeople once we have AI-controlled robots?

LUKE SHI

It is a fair concern and we do not want to wave it away. In water, the immediate pressure runs the other way: utilities, especially regional ones, struggle to recruit and keep operators, technicians and engineers, and experienced staff are retiring. The Centre's aim is to use AI to make that workforce more effective and keep its knowledge, not to remove frontline roles.

Some tasks will change and some will disappear; it would not be honest to say otherwise. So labour impacts are a research question inside the Centre's Adopt program: which tasks change, which roles grow, and what training gets people there. That training is aimed at current water staff at every level, including operators and field crews, not only at graduates.

Q7 What is the plan for all the humans who will no longer be required? If AI systems keep getting smarter at solving problems, humans become a hindrance and a burden on the planet and economy.

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

We do not share that premise. Water services exist to protect people's health and the environment they depend on. The Centre's starting point is that people set the purpose of these systems and remain accountable for them; AI is a tool for doing that better with limited budgets and staff. Decisions about what AI is used for, and what it is not, belong to people, which is why the Centre puts so much weight on human authority, governance and training.

Q14 Businesses would rather employ a robot on zero wages, or an AI system that doesn't need sick pay or holidays. Economics will drive this, not ethics, and people who are not at the top of their field will suffer.

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

Economics will be a major driver; we agree. That is a reason for the sector to shape adoption deliberately and on evidence, instead of leaving it to whoever sells the cheapest product.

Two things are different in water. Utilities are accountable for public health and the environment, and regulators expect a responsible person behind every critical decision; that accountability cannot be handed to software. And the sector's real constraint is a shortage of skilled people, not a surplus. The Centre will measure what actually happens to roles in partner organisations and build training that moves people into the work AI creates: supervising, checking, maintaining and improving AI-supported systems.

Q31 Comment: you are blinded to the effect on the workforce by the knowledge gaps you are filling at present.

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

A fair challenge, and several attendees raised it. It is why workforce impact is studied inside the Centre instead of assumed: the Adopt program measures adoption, trust and changes to work and roles before and after each intervention, and partners' workforce and operational leads help design the work. If you would like to be part of that conversation, please join the follow-up discussion (see Next steps).

Q28 The water workforce is likely to have a very different composition. That seems exciting for data scientists, mathematicians and software and solution architects, perhaps less so for other disciplines. How can the Australian water sector maintain its diversity of motivated professionals?

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

We would argue the opposite: AI makes domain expertise more valuable. An AI system is only as useful as the checks it is held to, and those checks come from process engineers, operators, microbiologists, ecologists, planners and regulators who know what a good result looks like.

The Centre's training runs in both directions (researchers learn the sector; operators learn AI), and its research cohort is deliberately cross-disciplinary, spanning water science and engineering, AI, robotics, human factors, organisational science, law and governance. New roles are emerging too, such as people who direct and verify AI systems, and these suit experienced water professionals at least as well as software specialists.

Q20 With upskilling, how do we future-proof organisations to keep an engaged and knowledgeable workforce, in case AI fails or is sabotaged and we need people back operating sites, when in the meantime they may have lost their on-the-ground craft to automation?

NEIL HOLMES

Part of the answer may lie in a change of focus: staff keep their operational skills and become trained and more skilled in critically appraising AI outputs. That is where their skill sets and oversight remain critical.

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

This is built into the Centre's design. Every project needs a safe off-ramp and must degrade gracefully to manual operation. Keeping manual skills current, for example through regular drills as with other emergency procedures, should be part of the operating model and not left to chance.

Q22 For university lecturers and educators: much of this discussion depends on humans asking critical, intelligent questions. How are critical thinking skills changing in the AI age, and is there a risk that future water professionals become less critical?

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

The risk is real. A 2024 meta-analysis of 106 experimental studies (Vaccaro, Almaatouq and Malone, Nature Human Behaviour) found that, on average, human-AI combinations performed worse than the better of the human or the AI working alone; the gains were mainly in content-creation tasks. Adding AI to existing work does not guarantee better results, and over-reliance is part of the reason.

So the Centre's training treats critical appraisal as the core skill: understanding how AI reaches conclusions, knowing its limits, testing outputs against evidence and deciding when not to use it. Our training ladder runs Understand → Adopt → Apply → Lead. For educators, one practical shift is to assess the reasoning and the checks a student applied, as well as the final answer.

5. Keeping knowledge in the organisation

Q15 Knowledge retention is an issue in many organisations. How might AI help? Often it is the person with years of experience who can make difficult, complex decisions, and with high staff turnover that person might not exist.

NEIL HOLMES

A great point, and a challenge in my experience. If that knowledge can be captured at the right time, before experienced team members leave, it could be digitised as a knowledge bank, with AI triaging the enquiries it receives. AI could perhaps provide demonstration resources too.

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

Knowledge capture is one of the three challenges the Centre is built around: a shared water knowledge layer, so that what an experienced person or team knows, including why decisions were made and what was tried and failed, becomes available to the whole organisation.

Q24 Consultants protect their expert knowledge. Why wouldn't expert employees act the same way?

NICK ASHBOLT

Absolutely, expert employees may have the same concern. If someone has spent 30 years developing specialist operational knowledge and we suddenly say, 'Give all of that to an AI system,' they may reasonably ask what happens to their value once the AI has learnt what they know.

So this is not simply a knowledge-capture problem; it is a trust, incentives and workforce-transition problem. We need to make it clear that the objective is to augment that expertise, preserve institutional knowledge and make the organisation less vulnerable when experienced people retire or leave, and not to extract expertise and replace the expert.

That requires employees to be participants in designing the AI, not simply sources of data for it. They should be recognised for contributing knowledge, involved in validating what the AI has learnt, and given opportunities to move into higher-value roles: supervising, challenging and improving AI-supported decisions.

6. Regional and rural communities

Q17 Many of these innovations are urban-focused. What exciting applications do you see for Australia's rural communities? Flood forecasting, response and nowcasting is perhaps an obvious one.

YANG LIU

Flood forecasting is a very important area for rural and remote communities. AI could help improve early warning, support faster decisions and help coordinate management across multiple communities. It could also help retain the knowledge of experienced staff so it is not lost when people leave, which we hear about very often.

Rural and remote communities are one of the areas we would like to focus on in the new AI for Water Centre.

Q19 There are great benefits in AI for water, but regional areas will need more help with training and realising the benefits. Queensland has an ageing workforce, older generations are less likely to adopt new technology, and there are barriers to travelling to metro areas for training.

NICK ASHBOLT

This is a really important issue, because the benefits of AI will not be distributed evenly unless we deliberately make them accessible. Regional and smaller utilities often have fewer specialist staff, less access to training and less capacity to experiment with new technologies. At the same time, they may have the most to gain, because AI can augment limited technical and operational resources.

An ageing workforce adds another dimension, but I would be careful about framing this simply as older workers being reluctant to adopt technology. These people often hold decades of operational and institutional knowledge that we badly need. The opportunity is to combine that experience with AI, not replace it.

So training needs to go to the workforce, not expect the workforce to come to metropolitan centres. We need regional test-beds, utility-based demonstrations, short modular training, remote and AI-assisted learning, and peer-to-peer programs.

LEE-ANNE WILLIS

Agree, Nick. It would also be a great benefit for those with operational and institutional knowledge to have an avenue to share it and help AI learn. Capturing what someone knows and passing it on to those who need to know has always been hard: the good old 'how-to' work bible, as one organisation I worked with called it.

Q23 Are we creating more issues for regional areas? If AI oversight sits in metro areas, are we drawing people from regional areas to the cities for work, or failing to provide regional work opportunities?

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

It is a real risk. Remote monitoring makes it easy to centralise roles, and that could hollow out regional capability. The Centre wants to push the other way: AI that strengthens local teams instead of replacing them from a distance, knowledge captured and kept locally, regional test-beds, and training delivered in the regions (Q19). One of the Centre's challenge scenarios is an AI-ready regional or remote utility, built around locally controlled AI tools and shared procurement between providers.

Q18 How do councils know what they need if they don't know what they can have?

NEIL HOLMES

I see councils coming together in my program and learning from each other, both about what they need and what might be available. The Directorate and my other program partners also have a support role in signposting councils to opportunities and support they may not be aware of.

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

Councils do not need to know the technology to start. The Centre begins with a Challenge Charter: a council or utility brings a real problem, the decision it affects and the data it holds, and the Centre helps work out what AI can and cannot do for it. That is why every partner starts in the Adopt program.

7. Infrastructure, data and funding

Q9 What could a reorganised, AI-optimised water network and system look like in urban and rural settings? We already know the limitations of our water and wastewater networks. How could legacy and future systems be developed to interact optimally, given the massive capital cost of starting fresh?

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

Nobody is going to rebuild networks from scratch, and the Centre does not assume they will. Water organisations already hold a great deal of intelligence: SCADA, hydraulic and process models, laboratory data, asset histories and operator experience. The problem is that these do not form one learning system. The Centre's focus is the layers above the assets: a shared knowledge layer, decision support, and the governance that makes it safe.

In practice, legacy assets become learning environments. Instrument them where it supports a decision, model them, test new operating strategies in simulation and shadow mode, and use AI to test far more capital options than a conventional study can before money is committed. Over time that changes what gets built: more real-time control, better-targeted renewal and storage, and designs generated and tested against physics, cost and risk.

Urban systems gain most from coordination across water, wastewater and stormwater networks, and across organisations during wet weather. Rural and remote systems gain most from remote monitoring, locally controlled AI support for small teams, and keeping knowledge in the region. A further aim is to build the learning infrastructure once and transfer it, so each new network does not start from zero.

Q26 There are great asset and technological opportunities here. Can you suggest environmental domains where AI could complement human designs and interventions?

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

Several are in the Centre's challenge bank:

- Nature-based systems: designing and operating constructed wetlands and biofilters, with AI-generated options tested physically.
- Catchment and receiving-water monitoring: active sensing, robotics and field tasking to fill monitoring gaps.
- Wet-weather and overflow management: coordinating sewer, stormwater and receiving-water decisions across asset owners.
- Source-to-tap risk: linking catchment, treatment and distribution data.
- Flood forecasting and nowcasting, particularly for regional communities (Q17).
- Circular water and resource recovery: process discovery for recycling, energy and nutrient recovery.

In each case the AI proposes and tests options; people decide what is acceptable for the environment and the community.

Q27 Most water utility challenges relate to infrastructure and resource scarcity, not a lack of knowledge. Funding requests get knocked back and we underprice water services. How will AI help persuade ratepayers and pricing regulators to solve the core infrastructure and funding issue? Or will AI just help at the fringes and leave the primary challenge unsolved?

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

AI will not solve underpricing on its own, and we will not claim it will; pricing is a policy and community decision. Where AI can help is the evidence behind investment cases. Pricing regulators scrutinise whether proposed spending is prudent and efficient. AI can test many more capital and operating options than a conventional study, show the risk and uncertainty of each, and show where better operation can defer capital. That makes a business case harder to knock back and easier to explain to customers, and operational savings can free up existing budgets.

Adaptive, climate-ready capital planning is one of the Centre's challenge scenarios. So the contribution is more than the fringes, but it strengthens the case for funding; it does not replace it.

Q30 For AI to deliver its full value we need live network data, supported by residential smart meters and more acoustic and pressure sensors. Should we accelerate this, as the electricity industry has?

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

Live data matters, and in many networks it is the main gap. Electricity's rollout is being driven by a national rule targeting universal smart meters across the National Electricity Market by 2030. Water has no equivalent, and the business case varies a lot between utilities.

Our view is to accelerate where the data supports a specific decision, such as leak detection, pressure management, demand forecasting or wet-weather response, and to pair sensors with the systems and skills to use the data. Without that, sensors become another isolated tool. The Centre's research on learning networks also tackles the 'cold start' problem: how a newly instrumented network can be learnt quickly, and how what is learnt in one network can transfer to the next, which lowers the cost of each later deployment.

Q25 How will future environment and water providers handle the costs and issues associated with data centres? We are already hearing about additional contaminants being discharged to wastewater treatment plants from AI data centres.

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

This is a growing issue. WSAA's December 2025 report on data centres and water notes that some applications to utilities are for 5–40 megalitres a day, around 20 times the largest single existing customer, and that Sydney Water forecasts data-centre demand could reach about 90 billion litres a year by 2035. On the wastewater side, the main concern is cooling-tower blowdown, which is warm and saline and can carry treatment chemicals, so it needs trade-waste controls and sometimes pre-treatment.

WSAA's position is that data-centre infrastructure costs should not be cross-subsidised by residential customers, that utilities should be engaged early in site selection, and that recycled water should be preferred where practical. AI can help utilities forecast these loads, monitor trade-waste compliance and plan recycled-water supply. It is also fair to point out that AI has its own water and energy footprint, which belongs in any honest assessment of its benefits.

8. About the Centre

Q29 If training is provided through an Australian training school, will partners in the Centre have to pay, since those courses cost money, or will training be free for members of the ITTC?

AI FOR WATER CENTRE TEAM

Our current plan is that training developed through the Centre will be free for funding partners for the life of the Centre. Training is the Centre's main line of work, and each year's research outcomes and case studies feed into that year's training for partners. Details of delivery partners, and of access for organisations that are not partners, will be confirmed as the application is finalised.

Next steps

The Centre is being shaped with industry before the application is locked in. If you would like to bring a challenge, join the co-design work or discuss becoming a partner, these are the key dates:

Date	What happens
6 October 2026	Follow-up discussion on the Training Centre- click here to register for this free webinar on Tuesday 6 October 2026 1:00pm-2:00pm: Webinar Registration Link (QUT x WaterRA) 6 Oct 1pm
16 October 2026	Express your interest here: Expression of Interest registration form 
30 October 2026	Letters of support ready, see last question in Expression of Interest registration form (you can download the Letter, edit it and re-upload it to the Google form, or email the letter to Kathy.luvara@qut.edu.au)
13 November 2026	Application review
25 November 2026	ARC lodgement target