

Minimum Feed-in Tariff Review 2025-26

Submission received on our draft decision paper on minimum feed-in tariff review 2025-26

Submission prepared by:

Anonymous 10 (please do not publish my name)

Organisation:

-

I have read and agree to the above submissions and privacy collection statement.

Yes

Please confirm which one of the following applies to your submission:

I agree to my submission (other than the information I have identified as confidential or commercially sensitive (if relevant)) being published, but please do not publish my name.

Date submitted:

25 January 2025

Submission to pricing team inbox:

Dear ESC,

I write to ask you to reconsider such another drastic reduction in solar feed-in tariffs.

I installed a home solar system two years ago. It generates more power than I can use, and part of the rationale for committing to an installation was the awareness that some of my costs could be recouped by selling the excess energy generated. Indeed, some market advertising included this recouping as part of promoting home solar systems.

So I'm disappointed at the proposal to further reduce minimum feed-in tariffs.

The draft report does not make clear to me why the ESC is swayed primarily by the "market forces [that] are driving this change." I appreciate that the costs avoided for retailers is one element the ESC considers. But this suggests that commercial interests are given more weight than consumers' interests. Also lacking is adequate consideration for homeowners as power suppliers; we seem treated purely as consumers whose input savings are considered but not any export factors. This approach may be consistent with older ways of doing things, but it strikes me as asymmetrical and out-of-date – operating according to older supply-and-demand mindsets rather than the new normal of homeowners being also part of the supply equation.

Moreover, if I read the draft report correctly, homeowners are compensating retailers for negative costs incurred for wholesale electricity costs (-2.4c/kWh) and/or for other avoided costs (-0.08c/kWh). It is unclear to me why, when various levels of government have encouraged homeowners to invest in renewable energy, those progressive homeowners are now compensating oldschool retailers for outdated infrastructure.

I ask that (1) you reconsider the weighting given to wholesale pricing within this schema, perhaps even recognising that solar homeowners are not merely consumers, and (2) not include any negative avoided costs in the final calculation.

Thank you,