

# 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:**

**Peter Eros**

**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, and my name (other than confidential information such as contact details) being published.

**Date submitted:**

**31 January 2025**

**Submission to pricing team inbox:**

Good afternoon,

I wish to add the following, in reference to the draft decision titled "Minimum electricity feed-in tariffs from 1 July 2025" by the Essential Services Commission.

Our house has a modest solar setup that, during the 2024 calendar year exported five times as much electricity than it imported, sufficient to run a similar house for about 7 months.

This earned us \$145 for the whole year. The proposed \$0.0004 feed-in tariff would reduce that to under \$2, hardly distinguishable from zero. Buying the same amount of electricity would cost \$1,150.

What our house produces for \$0.033 is sold next door for \$0.489, 14 times more. Reducing the \$0.033 tariff to \$0.0004 (over 82 times) could be funny but this appears to be proposed seriously. If I did the same -using electricity without paying for it- it would be called theft.

This proposal attempts to keep electricity retailers' profit untouchable. Why are they exempt from normal market forces that lower the price of a product when its raw materials/labour become cheaper ?

Electricity retailers contribute nothing to the supply of electricity: they don't generate power, don't maintain the distribution network and don't measure consumption. Their only activities are billing and playing poker at the casino known as Australian Energy Market.

This arrangement is now in the way of progress and should be reconsidered. Using different language, its "social license" is in question.

Without even the slight credit a home owner can expect for the exported electricity, the solar roll-out will decline or stop and I hope, that is not the aim here. Recall your "avoided costs" - nobody had to design, build and operate new power plants, yet electricity flows in from homes and businesses without harmful emissions.

Who will install solar equipment on their home as a public service ?

The document expounds "self-consumption" (using the solar electricity one produces), however this is not available to you if you commute to work (I am certain, this is the majority). After sending power to the grid all day, you will have to still buy power when you get home in the evening and the current tariffs make this a losing bet. A work-around is getting a home battery but their price places them out of reach for many.

As for the argument "the grid wasn't created for houses exporting" - of course not. Nicola Tesla, whose concept of electricity supply we use, couldn't foresee the technology that allows consumers to power themselves. We have such technology now but our institutions seem in the way. It's never too late to reassess and change course.

Yours sincerely

Peter Eros