

To the Essential Services Commission

Your draft report is all about economics and 'value'. "This has increased supply while demand is lower, resulting in the decreasing value of solar exports during the day . . .". Value to whom?

Solar exports are valuable to the environment and to those who have invested in roof-top solar. Brown coal fired generation has a huge environmental cost, and benefit only the generator owners. Why can't one or more of the Loy Yang or Yallourn generators be normally switched off, and only used in exceptional situations?

I am aware of the issues relating to networks and spilled power.

Roof-top Solar

Why are those of us who invested in solar as our contribution to reduce the impacts of global warming being punished further?

We have an apartment in Melbourne that has no access to solar. Our rates per kw/h are: peak - 31 c/kwh, off-peak 18.8 c/kwh, and controlled load 17.1 c/kwh, and the daily supply charge is \$1.05/day. Our retailer is Origin, supplier is Citipower.

We have a house in Connewarre that has solar. If we did not have solar, our rates would be: peak 35.7 c/kwh, off-peak 21.6 c/kwh, and controlled load 20 c/kwh, and the daily supply charge is \$1.15/day. Our retailer is Origin. Why are we paying about 10% more than in Melbourne?

With our solar, our rates are far higher - peak 40.5 c/kwh, off-peak 24.6 c/kwh, and controlled load 22.3 c/kwh, and the daily supply charge is \$1.32/day. So just having solar feed-in, we are penalised about 15% by the retailer.

A regulatory change that is sorely needed is to force retailers to charge the same rates for customers with and without solar!

Coal generators

Can we assume that the dirty electricity generators are going to be paid the 0.04c/kwh? If not, why not? Why would they need to be a protected species? They should, in fairness to those who have invested in clean energy, have to pay to supply electricity during the peak solar periods.

Options

NextEra Energy is a Fortune 200 company based in Florida US. It controls about 58 GW of generating capacity. It claims to be the largest provider of renewable energy in the United States. But it also owns, directly and through subsidiaries, a lot of fossil fuel plants and seven nuclear reactors. It announced (2022) its industry-leading goal to achieve Real Zero carbon emissions by no later than 2045, when it predicts renewables will be 83% of supply, nuclear dropping from 20% to 16% and 1% natural gas.

It has estimated that by late 2020's, New Near-Firm Onshore Wind will cost \$25-32/GWH, New Near-Firm Solar \$30-37, Existing Nuclear \$34-49, and New Small Modular Nuclear \$105-135.

Note 'near-firm' includes "4-hour battery back up to achieve a roughly equivalent reliability during peak hours for comparison with dispatchable generation sources".

Conclusions

1. Your recommendations are contrary to government policies encouraging renewables;
2. Retailers should not be allowed to charge higher rates for those who have solar inputs;
3. 'Dirty electricity' generators should have to pay to put electricity into the network during peak solar generation periods;
4. Wholesalers should be required to provide battery backup as per 'near-firm' discussed above so that reasonable solar feed-in tariffs (e.g. \$0.10 / kwh) are retained;
5. Retailers (passing on to wholesalers) should pay a minimum feed-in tariff (at least \$0.07 / kwh to make roof-top solar economically viable for existing investors);
6. We cannot continue to use fossil fuels when we have a green alternative.

I wish to be heard by the Commission regarding my submission.

Andrew O'Brien

