Minimum Feed-in Tariff Review 2025-26

Submission received on our draft decision paper

Table – Submissions received from Engage Victoria survey form (redacted)

Notes: Submissions that claimed confidentiality were considered in our decision-making process but cannot be displayed. We also provided redaction to offensive or defamatory content based on the 'Submission and privacy collection statement' on our Engage Victoria consultation webpage.

No.	Submitter full name	Q7. What parts of our proposed methodology for setting the flat and time-varying minimum feed-in tariffs do you support?	Q8. What parts of our proposed methodology should we change?	Q9. What alternative methodology should we consider for setting the wholesale price component?
1	Anonymous	None	All of it	Set as a minimum percentage of rate charged. I.e. if the charge is 20 cents and the percentage is 33% its 6.6 cents. Therefore at times of peak feed companies charge little and drive demand. This would also end all the admin and wasting of time setting rates ever year.
2	Anonymous	Nond	The obvious yet unexplained price differentials between retail, wholesale and rooftop generated power prices needs explanation	See above

3	Anonymous	None	All	Pay consumers a reasonable rate for helping to support lack of investment by government and business on energy generation
4	Anonymous	I support time varying tariffs	Nil	"There needs to be consideration for the minimum feed in tariff. 0.04 cents is effectively $0 and this will slow the uptake of future solar installations. The feed in tariff is a valuable tool to quantify the pay back period for a future consumer. As an experienced solar owner, I appreciate that most of my savings are from using power during the day and the associated costs that I am not paying, rather than the FIT. However, I did not realise this prior to purchasing solar panels. If there is no feed in tariff, or if it is virtually $0, then I think it will reduce the perceived incentive for future installations to be commissioned."
5	Anonymous	The wholesale cost associated with pricing.	Your methodology does not account for the hardware costs associated with home solar systems. The cost of feeding in to the grid should be taken into account. The state / wholesale infrastructure should be installing storage facilities to capture the excess power generated in a day from increasing solar installations, rather than discouraging solar feedin altogether. Retailers and wholesalers should be encouraged to provide battery storage to facilitate this shift, which would significantly help in peak period, lowering the costs there. It would also help balance the sunlight hours with the non sunlight hours, thereby	You should take into account the solar installation costs by factoring in this into the retail feed in minimum prices. Essentially every solar rooftop feeding into the grid is a mini wholesaler, imagine if you said to a wholesaler we want you to provide power to the grid for nothing. They would laugh and close down very fast. That's why we should be encouraging feed-in and capturing it rather than working out ways to close it down.

6	Anonymous	None.	Avoid a sudden drastic change in minimum pricing, as is currently proposed.	"If a significant reduction must be made, phase it down over a period of 5-10 years rather than a drastic drop to essentially zero in a single year. Customers who have made purchases expecting a certain level of feed in tariff (or are planning one) are likely to be significantly impacted or put off by this decision, which could slow Victoria's transition to renewable energy and leave consumers negatively impacted. Further, battery technology is not yet affordable enough to encourage consumers to purchase batteries to even out consumption over time. A phase-down is more likely to coincide with reducing battery prices, or provide consumers enough time to consider a transition, ensuring greater uptake of solutions which optimise energy use without compromising the transition to renewables."
7	Anonymous	None	Change back to higher feed in tariffs, up to 12c/kw	Minimum of a flat rate of 12c/kw on the feed in tariffs
8	Anonymous	None	FIT should not change unless those with solar get no charge during the day or get $0 supply charge with no increase in usage charges.	Do not reduce it in any way as the current low cost is bad enough considering the amount of energy now being given to suppliers for free. Who should be investing in storage capacity themselves.
9	Anonymous	Early evening Option 1	Early evening from 2pm Option 1	Tariff be set for off-peak everyday 10 am to 2pm
10	Anonymous	Time of use tariffs and usage	0.04c is a joke. In a cost of living crisis this makes no sense from 3.3 to 0.04? Why bother at all?! At least make it worthwhile and put it in the 1-2c per kilowatt band!	Cost of living and rewarding solar owners

11	Anonymous	None	"The feed in rate is a complete joke . The retailers are making massive profits. Where is the pay back for people with systems? Having low fees in rate will encourage more people to work from home and hence slow growth. If higher feed in is encouraged people less likely to stay home and use appliances during the day and feed into the grid. The current low 3.3 cents should be maintained."	There should be more investment into community battery's
12	Anonymous	I do not support the ridiculous reduction in feed in tarrif for rooftop solar- supply and usage costs continue to rise- yet feed in continues to fall- why not be completely mercenary and actualy chrge us for feeding in to the grid	the feed in tarrif is alrady low- keep it where it is	Think about the equity of the price controls you se arbitrarily and the impact this has but also what is says in a public policy sense
13	Anonymous	Time varying Tariffs are a great way to reflect the actual cost of electricity and shift supply.	Setting the FIT flat rate at effectively $0 penalises households and lowers supply, which benefits the large scale produces. Household should not be curtailed to protect traditional generators who also have larger carbon emissions. This is a pro thermal generator policy and is a failure of AEMO to manage the market fairly. This policy will slow down the transition to more renewables in the grid.	The FIT should reflect real market prices. Household should benefit from the market prices, just like large generators. Either set the FIT at a rate that encourages household investment into Renewable energy, or give household access to the same market prices as large generators.
14	Anonymous	None.	The inept decision making using a charities 'independent research' shows the commissioner is totally incompetent.	Real world independent research, not a pathetic biased charities views.

15	Anonymous	None	Having 0.00 tariff between 10am and 2pm is a disgrace as this is the period when my system is exporting to the network.	There should be a reasonable feed in tariff at all times of day, otherwise retailers are receiving electricity from residential customers for free which they on sell for profit
16	Anonymous	Absolutely none of it. It's a ridiculous setup that actually penalises people for having invested in rooftop solar.	There should be no situation where a consumer is forced to pay for electricity when they are producing greater than the amount that they are consuming.	There should be no payment made for any electricity being fed into the grid. What should happen is that if your usage is less than the amount generated by your house, then you pay nothing. It's that simple. Anything other than this is institutionalised theft at worst or discouraging a necessary source of clean energy at best. I implore the powers that be to understand that we stand at a crisis point where our power consumption, corporate profits, and our endangered and beleaguered environment meet, and if profits win out, we all lose. And this is not to even consider the fact that with the rising cost of living, this would be a very effective way to reduce the stress on peoples' wallets.
17	Anonymous	All of it. Overpaying FIT only raises retail prices for everyone else instead of encouraging self consumption.	Even lower feed in tariffs?	None. Time of Day is good.

18	Anonymous	None	Everything.	"The setting of ToU tariffs for feedin to such low rates will have a massive effect on solar adoption in Victoria. The stupidly low rate will deter any investment in new solar - as financially, solar doesn't make any sense with such low FIT. It will also run through to people who used their own money on top of grants to obtain larger systems with the express intent of feeding into the grid to help out and make it so that their system will never break even with respect to out of pocket expenses. A large system feeding into the grid every day will no longer be able to get enough from the FIT to even pay back the interest free loans offered by the government. That individuals will be feeding quality power into the grid for essentially free - only to have retailers still charge people the full off-peak rate for that same power does nothing but penalise the provider of electricity to increase margins for corporate entities. Given many new systems will still take 5-7 years to break even on costs - the decrease in FIT will balloon this out even further - being a retrospective penalty on those persons who decided to help the government reach the climate goals."
19	Anonymous	Setting the flat rate.	Half yearly to review the setting of the flat rate.	Value-Based Pricing, Market-Based Pricing, Penetration Pricing, Tiered Pricing, and Psychological Pricing.

20	Anonymous	Uncertain.	Your methodology assumes solar customers are going to willingly feed power into the grid every minute of the day irrespective of the financial return being provided. As soon as the value is removed, customers will aggressively find ways to retaliate, ie: scheduling their exports to reduce to 0 kWh during hours they are paid $0.00 per kWh. For many customers who have solar in less-than-ideal environments, you'll find they'll be encouraged to switch off exports altogether. I would imagine a state-wide result like this would be very undesirable for the distributor.	Uncertain. But the electricity being fed into the grid by solar customers shouldn't be taken for granted...it could disappear in a day.
21	Anonymous	None	All of it	Energy is not free and people with solar systems should not be forced to subsidise power companies with free energy. With the rates you propose there is no incentive to install solar, and in winter when production is less there will be insufficient available. Many people will set their systems to not export during periods where it is not paid.
22	Anonymous	None of them, we installed Solar panels to reduce our Electricity bills. You are clearly just doing what you are told by the Labor government. We all know the peak time for power usage is when the input into the grid is low for example on cloudy or rainy days. We know winter is when input is lowest and usage is highest.	Set a minimum benchmark of say 4c/kwhr for infeed from solar panels, .03c/kwhr is a joke. I will consider turning off our panels if continue with this. I feel I should be grateful that you won't charge me for excess solar input. Stop lying about future plans we don't trust you to manage our power.	Honesty for a start and acknowledgement of the capital investment home owners have made putting in solar panels. You are simply playing the Governments game and while you say you are independent you are merely a politicised part of the Energy Ministers department.
23	Anonymous	None of them as it's very low and doesn't give enough FIT as an incentive to install rooftop solar	Keep the way it is. Nothing wrong as it is at the moment	Slow down base production (coal power) during the day when solar production is at max capacity.

24	Anonymous	NONE!!!!!!!!		"Do not listen to the lobbyists of the off-shore mega rich power companies, who constantly bleat about how little they make. Buy back our own power generation and infrastructure for $1 and stop Australia sending profits overseas. Are you all being bribed so these companies can get richer? I hope you can live with these decisions to rip off the people who can least afford it. Who can feed back into the grid at the times you are proposing? It's when households need the power the most. What you need to 'propose' is simple. If power companies charge, for example, 0.35¢ per Kilowatt Hour, then that is what home solar should be paid to feed into the grid. That power should then be stored and used at times when the sun is not available. Let me help you understand this; if I buy some milk for $2 then I immediately take that milk back to the shop for a refund, I will get $2 dollars back! Your current and proposed pricing structure can only come from being bribed."	An entirely different approach that is not able to be conceived by your narrow minds. Citizens were encouraged to install solar on roofs to help with the power infrastructure. We have done that. Now the commision wants to make the buying of that generated power almost zero. Who does this benefit?

25	Anonymous	"I do not support either of the tariffs. I have just spent $10000 on a solar system which will never pay for itself with next to no feed in rebate. Like your advertising states, the solar producers power during the day when no one is at home using it. I then come home when the sun goes down and have to pay peak price for electricity. What an absolute scam by the government to entice people to spend thousands of dollars on a solar system and then give a 0.04ckwh feed in rebate!"	The methodology you are planning is going to stop people from going solar! For most people, there is absolutely no financial point going solar if the feed in rebate is 0.04ckwh. The methodology should be to encourage people to go green and get solar installed, not to financially penalise the people that have already spent thousands on their solar system.	"If the grid can't handle the solar already being supplied by residential roof top solar systems, why is the government spending millions on solar farms??? Stop building solar farms and pay a fair feed in rebate to solar owners. The government should be charged with fraud for luring people in with rebates on solar systems, saying how much money you will save and how good it will be for the environment! It is nothing but a con by the government which unfortunately I fell for and was scammed out of $10000!!! Shame GOVERNMENT Shame!!! I am more than happy to be contacted and explained how this is not a government scam, but I know this will never happen."
26	Anonymous	Time-varying (Time of Use) tariffs (import and export) are the right way to go, but the social understanding of how they work is limited. The media is having a field day. Changes to the tariffs only affect the affluent homeowners who have installed solar.. 30% to 40% of the electorate.	Leave the export tariff at 3 cents. Indeed, the Powercor trial of incentivising 100% of energy users to use more energy by zeroing out the tariff components of grid supply to homes is a more marketable methodology. (Disclosure: I'm a former PCA employee with no ties at all to this trial of theirs or the people running the trial there).	Rebrand Emergency Backstop as "Dynamic Export Limits". Sell hard that it's only needed for the one or two days of the year that we need desperately reduce export for grid stability reasons. Dynamically allow up to 10kW export. Get this solar power into the grid on days that it can be used, at 3.3 cents. But sell hard that everyone has to use it, that tariffs are lower in the middle of the day. The fine print? Old solar installations must be retrofitted with emergency backstop communications channels to access the same-as-today export tariff.
27	Anonymous	None	Feed in tariffs are already a [redacted]. Leave them how they are. You are bleeding us normal people dry.	Just leave it how it is. I will be moving out of Victoria given the poor state of this financially incompetent government.

28	Anonymous	None	Calculation of feed in tariffs	Honour the feed in tariff rates that Victorian consumers took up when they paid out for solar panels. Take into account the cost invested by consumers to install solar panels and adjust feed in tariffs accordingly. For example a sliding scale so that consumers can actually get their money back before the feed in tariffs are reduced. We are pensioners and paid out $7000 two years ago believing we could pay this back with the feed in tariffs over time!
29	Anonymous	The inclusion of time-varying tariffs acknowledges the variability in energy demand and supply throughout the day. This approach aligns with the broader principles of encouraging energy use and export at optimal times, promoting grid stability. Additionally, the transparency in the methodology and public consultation process is appreciated, as it allows stakeholders to provide feedback.	The proposed methodology does not adequately account for the social equity implications of reducing the feed-in tariffs to 0.04 c/kWh. Vulnerable groups, such as aged pensioners and low-income households, are disproportionately affected by such reductions, as they rely heavily on feed-in tariffs to offset rising energy costs. The methodology should also include a safeguard to ensure these groups receive a higher rate to mitigate financial stress.	Instead of relying solely on current wholesale market trends, consider adopting a weighted-average approach that incorporates historical wholesale prices and projects future market dynamics. This could smooth out extreme fluctuations and provide a fairer, more predictable tariff. Additionally, a separate, higher rate should be established for concession card holders, ensuring that their financial vulnerability is addressed in the methodology.

30	Anonymous	I do not support any part of your review	Excess solar power in the middle of the day is valuable to support industry, homes and especially the peaks from AC use	roof top solar providers should be fairly compensated for their capital investment, power companies sell the excess power at inflated rates, this just giving profit to retailers who will benefit from consumers capital investment. Why should small consumers be punished for taking some responsibility for their own energy requirements. If the the grid needs change let it be done using the supply charges we pay to the distributors, this just a cash grab from retailers. If the system has excess power during the day build batteries and store it. build a hydrogen plant, use pumped hydro, but this crazy idea just gives profits to retailers and disincentivises people from investing in systems that ultimately save the govt. a fortune by providing decentralised generation.

31	Anonymous	"I do not support the proposed methodology in any way as it is based on such a minimal feed in tariff to render the cost of installing solar panels for households to be totally uneconomical and a disabling disincentive for future action. Households investing in solar panels have reasonably relied upon feed in tariffs being maintained at levels that provide some scope for a payback period commensurate with other conservative investment products. Your proposal in essence will have households donating any exc power generation to private sector businesses with no benefit to either the householder or the community at large. Why would any household continue to provide effectively free power to the grid only to be charged at fully commercial rates when they need power. What possible incentive would there be for households to install solar panels in the future. Your proposal is piecemeal and totally inadequate as it does not take into account any action to incentivise the installation of household battery storage or the effective use of EVs as battery backup. This all the hallmarks of policy failure to achieve a distributed power network that allows households to properly participate and invest in the future power generation and distribution network"	"Abandon the proposed methodology and undertake meaningful analysis to design a system that incentivises households to be recognised partners in the solar power generation and distribution network. Your current proposal totally shifts the goal posts upon which households reasonably relied in making their investment in installing solar panels and will fully undermine any confidence in future renewable energy projects"	Set a feed in tariff price that provides household with a rate of return on their investment commensurate with conservative investment expectations. In the current investment environment this could fall within the 4% to 5% range

32	Anonymous	The pricing per period makes sense. However should be based on minimum retail offer not a zero cost. Or the retail prices should be dynamic per kilowatt and drop when solar feed in is high as currently the system means retail margins are huge on the spread between buy and sell.	Feed in rate should match default offer minimum rates per period. As the current methodology means that we are selling to retailers for near zero but for those larger consumers or without solar they are getting charged anywhere from 20 to 40 cents a kilowatt. So the retailers are ripping off the consumers.	Feed in should be based on time of use and match minimum rates per period. E.g if minimum buy price a consumer can get is 20 cents off peak then the feed in should match this as does not make sense for the solar generators to be subsiding the retailers profit margins.
33	Anonymous	Simply allow a feed it tariff that is fair for those who have spent a considerable outlay to have solar installed. The government has been encouraging Victorians to install solar and to not only save on electricity costs but to also take excess power for the consumer grid. If the feed in tariff is to be virtually nothing, will I have an option as to what happens to my excess, can I provide another address to receive the power? Or can I say do not put it back in the grid? Maybe my excess could be put toward the cost of a battery...that would be a great idea...maybe someone could suggest that?	Simply allow a feed it tariff that is fair for those who have spent a considerable outlay to have solar installed. The government has been encouraging Victorians to install solar and to not only save on electricity costs but to also take excess power for the consumer grid. If the feed in tariff is to be virtually nothing, will I have an option as to what happens to my excess, can I provide another address to receive the power? Or can I say do not put it back in the grid? Maybe my excess could be put toward the cost of a battery...that would be a great idea...maybe someone could suggest that?	Simply allow a feed it tariff that is fair for those who have spent a considerable outlay to have solar installed. The government has been encouraging Victorians to install solar and to not only save on electricity costs but to also take excess power for the consumer grid. If the feed in tariff is to be virtually nothing, will I have an option as to what happens to my excess, can I provide another address to receive the power? Or can I say do not put it back in the grid? Maybe my excess could be put toward the cost of a battery...that would be a great idea...maybe someone could suggest that?
34	Anonymous	"The minimum feed in should be 0.06 The afternoon rate for all options is ok, The zero rate for day time variable should be 0.04minimum. Why are you showing an option to feed in solar at night?"	A feed in rate for night time production, night time solar feed in is not currently possible so why has this been included as an option?	Ensure that the suppliers have the ability to feed the consumers and pay the consumer a higher rate for covering the shortfalls supplied by the grid

35	Anonymous	Feed in tariffs were initially implemented to provide an incentive to households to decrease power bills. We don’t agree with the 0.04c per kw. This has been a big con as we were receiving 0.66c per kw and now we are going to receive 0.04c per KW and our power prices are still dearer as of two and a half years ago. Rooftop solar is no longer an incentive when household receive almost nothing for their feed in tarriffs, especially living in Victoria as the winter months there is little sunshine.	The slashing of the feed in tarriffs to 0.04c per kw, and offering free batteries for storage once batteries are made safe from causing fires.	Either offer at least 50c per kw flat time feed in, instead of slashing the feed in price to almost zero, or either offer free batteries for storage to households once the batteries are made safe and not burn down houses. Before such time the batteries should not be made available until one hundred percent they are safe and as suggested a much higher feed in price.
36	Anonymous	None. The proposals are not sound and do not support the consumer reasonably.	During sunlight hours the feed in tariff needs to be the default wholesale rate. We have paid for the infrastructure. There is no costs for the supplier. If the default is 0.04 then the supplier is receiving free electricity to sell on to others. This is unreasonable	Feed in tariff needs to be the wholesale rate
37	Anonymous	Nonr	Rate should be based on wholesale rate	"Minimum 3c but increase based on wholesale rate with ability to turn off panels if required. If you set it at 0.04c, I'll be lobbying people to turn off exports on ""protest days"". It will no don't cause widespread outages. It will be pretty easy to create a solar union because everyone will be so upset"

38	Anonymous	The methodology is totally biased against the consumer trying to do the right thing.	Ensure fairness towards the people (voters) should be the ESCs main concern. Let businesses look after themselves.	Treat solar suppliers as well as you treat the big companies. Be very careful that you don't kill the "solar goose ". Can you imagine what would happen if ALL of your solar suppliers decided to stop supplying the grid. Maybe you would have to pay a fair price for our electricity.
39	Anonymous	None at this stage	The methodology used should take into account people took the initiative to install solar panels should be rewarded not punished for installing Solar panels.	The feed in tariff should be a percentage of the consumer buy in kilowatt rate. The feed in tariff should 50% of the buy in tariff. This allows for the various electricity providers to add 100% of their buy in tariff to manage and sell the electricity. Most business would be comfortable to have a markup of 100% on the products they sell.
40	Anonymous	None, there is no incentive to go Green when government decides to make these decisions and not provide and benefit to have solar panels.	Return to feed in tariffs as this is a failure and a cash grab. No power pricing will reduce despite the draft tariffs.	Implementation of the SEC as promised in the election and what you were voted in for.
41	Anonymous	None. The reasoning is flawed. This decision is completely illogical. Do the solar farm operators give their electricity to the retailers for free? What you are proposing is ridiculous. What a rort, first we are encouraged to spend thousands to install solar so that we can get ripped off afteraords.	Focus on the consumer rather than giving very large benefits to electricity retailers who are already making billions in profit.	See above. Encourage people to install solar rather than providing disincentives.
42	Anonymous	Support the flat rate system not the charges	0.04 cent is ridiculous, you will push people out of solar with the repercussions on electricity price etc. Including job loss for solar installers.	In my opinion you can drop the Fit. To 00.4 cent with no issues if then you drop the electricity price by the same percentage (or close too).

43	Anonymous	The whole methodology is totally wrong. There is lots of talk about moving to renewable energy. Home owners are doing their bit but this methodology totally contrary to this.	Home owners with renewable energy should be paid fairly for what they export onto the grid. This is about reducing our dependence on fossil fuels and reducing our carbon footprint. Basically the energy providers ar3 getting energy from us for free and reselling it back to consumers at market prices.	"A fair price. Comparable to what I pay the electricity companies for mains supply electricity."
44	Anonymous	You scope is too narrow. You should include the phasing out of gas and take up of renewables as being in scope	Include the phase out of gas as an input. Push retailers and generators to store energy. Recognise the sunk cost of customers who deployed solar.	Be open to consumer group input.
45	Anonymous	None	Where did you pluck these numbers from? Why can't you have a flat 3 cent rate. Why give people 7.5 cents for a time of day where the is virtually no power generation. Then nothing for the next Then 5.85 cents. Why Should power companies get power for nothing? They didn't pay to have solar installed. But hey, lets [redacted] the aussie battler again. Power prices are going to increase. You Can't do that fast enough. What's next, allowing companies to charge a service fee for feeding power back into the grid. It doesn't matter we are already over charged for current service fees. It's the new norm, Power up, solar down.	Give us something. A flat positive rate 3 cents, none of the proposed time of use rubbish when give power companies free power while we are at work trying to make ends meet. No everyone is on the gravy train
46	Anonymous	Literally none. This is disgusting	The rate is already too low. You are prioritising the companies over your voters and the environment	3.3 cents a KW is already too low.

47	Anonymous	None	An INCREASE in the FiT for VIC	Base it on regions with the highest amount of sunlight. Vic along with TAS have the lowest amount of clear skies of all Australian states meaning our solar systems have negligible benefit compared to the other states. This is a blatant cash grab and if this proposed change goes ahead I and many others will turn off our systems in protest permanently.
48	Anonymous	None	The price of tarrif is less than the rate of electricity. So basically we sell the we electricity to the grid at a very cheap price and then once the sun goes down we buy it nearly 10 times the price we sell it. Who's the genius that ever came up with that idea. I think you should find anither job that really help people. Because at the moment you're creating a system that rips people off, and getting all this big companies take advantage of us. If that is your aim then you are succeeding.	Give us an option not to sell to the grid. At least I know by principle that I'm not letting this big companies take advantage of me.
49	Anonymous	I don’t support varying times/ rebates at all. Both proposals see that consumers who are actually supplying the grid get 0 for major part of the day when sun is out.	The whole lot. Go back to a that feed in tariff paid to solar owners for excess generated & at a fair price like 10c to help recoup the costs we’ve spent, when it was wind to us at a much higher rate.	As above.

50	Anonymous	None	Don't lower the tariffs at all! They are already lower than when you got us all to invest! You sold us all solar panels by providing us with a state governed pay-off time estimator. For our family that meant a $20k investment and ten years to sweat it out. Now you are slashing the payback amount in order to make people who DID NOT LISTEN TO YOU have cheaper electricity, and we'll now be paying for these panels in our retirement. This is madness! This will tell the the people of Victoria exactly what they should do when the corrupt state government encourages anything in Victoria!!!	Consider the poor families out here who you sold into solar based on a pay back period!
51	Anonymous	None, the almost non-existent FIT is incredibly damaging	The current minimum of 3c FIT needs to be preserved	Solar owners should not be proposing methodology for complex statewide systems
52	Anonymous	Non	Customer pay for solar installations and electricity goes almost free to retailers	Coat of solar system should be paid back to customer if they want electricity.
53	Anonymous	None.	"If you are going to offer no real benefit for consumers for FiT, then perhaps look at offering this low ball offer with a credit for supply charge. If rooftop solar are providing the network with basically free power then consumers should at least have their daily supply charge covered. Perhaps if the export at least 10kwh per day the supply charge is credited. I see many consumers choosing to not export any excess which will decrease supply on high demand days."	Offer daily supply charge credit if a consumer exports 10kwh or more per day.

54	Anonymous	Based on cost and incentives at time of system purchase, cost-benefit analysis should be upheld, if you don't want more systems added to the grid, reduce incentives, however, the extreme reduction in feed-in tarrifs is NOT in line with the cost to us to purchase same kWH!	"Increase feed-in tariffs, or grade it by age of install.	
55	Anonymous	None	Higher feed in or battery rebates	Offer increased battery rebates
56	Anonymous	None of it.	You should be encouraging solar installation not detracting from it. Why should consumers buy costly lithium batteries? Let the retailers and wholesalers store battery power. There are too many of them anyway. Let them consolidate and compete. Why should the consumer shoulder the storage burden. Government for the people, not deep pockets!	Whatever will reach targets the hypocritical governments has already agreed to and not some quasi government board of corporate insiders.
57	Anonymous	I support keeping the existing tariffs 2023-24: 4.9c	2025-26 (proposed): 0.04c - I do not agree with this	higher rebates, or subsidising home batteries
58	Anonymous	None of it	Daily feed in charge	Consider that consumers were encouraged to buy solar systems and the Vic Govt web site - Victoria Energy Compare provides calculations for people considering switching to solar showing the savings. If you introduce these changes you are making a mockery of the Compare Website and people that did follow it should be compensated for the financial difference.

59	Anonymous	Not much of it I agree with to be honest. The ESC year after year lowers feed-in tariffs the big retailers pay households so that there is even less incentive for people to make a big financial outlay to go solar and increase energy generation from greener/environmentally friendly sources vs. these energy retailers that often have huge profit margins and the big players barely care whether they derive their energy from fossil fuels or not, contributing to carbon dioxide emissions and thus contributing to the climate crisis.	Rather than year on year reducing the Feed-in tariff (FiT) retailers pay homeowners, how about in a cost of living crises with increasing energy bills not go to from a minimum of 3.3c to 0.04c/kWh FiT when retailers charge households between 25-35c/kWh. I don't even have solar panels as yet but this another deterrent for sure. Yes people can shift their use to during the day where possible but unless you have a battery, households will be forced to give the already rich retailers energy at 0c/kWh and have to buy it back in the evenings at 30 times the price they produced it which is utterly ridiculous. Even the proposed tariffs at on-peak night time are way too low - this requires households to have a solar system plus battery installed (typically costs approx. $20,000+) to store that solar energy and then export it at night at 1.4-7.52c/kWh which again is pitiful compared to what households have to pay retailers at these times (30+c /kWh).	Give households better prices for both flat rate and time of use feed-in tariffs so that the ESC properly incentives people to install solar systems, decrease Victoria's reliance on fossil fuels and stop fueling both climate and financial cost of living crises by giving big booming energy retailers next to free energy to then on-sell to other poor consumers at 30x what they paid for it. If you lower the minimum, most big energy retailers that do not give a [redacted] about the environment will lower the FiT they pay to whatever the ESC sets as their minimum. The ESC is responsible for this and must act and not continue to lower these minimum FiT rates as you are directly playing a part in fueling both economic and environmental crises if you do.
60	Anonymous	Annual review process in general.	Feel like the fact that the retail cost of electricity isn't weighted sufficiently. No retailer (servicing my postcode) is providing a time of use that caters for the ~$0/kWh cost in peak solar periods. So I'm still being charged 'full price' for power that is now going to be freely provided by domestic rooftop solar.	As mentioned previously, the fact that energy retailers aren't providing flexible pricing during peak solar production periods feels key. ESC are saying that daytime power is worth essentially nothing; I'm being charged >25c/kWh for it, on top of network charges. Frustrating.
61	Anonymous	I agree with having times, but not 0.04c.	We work, there are no incentives now for solar, feed in rate during day should be higher	0.04c is not a good idea, will not get anyone to reinvest in systems

62	Anonymous	Neither	All concerning the benefit to the consumer who has gone to the expense of installing solar on his roof.	"ALL levels of goverments should be pushing for as many roof solar systems as possible and using every incentive to achieve that goal. Solar is NOT going to power this entire country, however, on an individual consumer level, the benefits to the consumer, the goverment and to the country overall is enormous. The proposed plans are to benefit the energy providers because , simply, solar take up has been underestimated and now primarily, they can not handle the extra loads and second, they are losing money by paying people for their extra solar power instead of selling power the provider produces to them."
63	Anonymous	I don't support it, you guys are just ripping us poor home owners more and more.	Retailers won't give us a hight rate, they always just give the Barr minimum.	Do t slash it from 3.3 to 0.04. It seems to be a money grabbing. We spend a lot of money getting solar put on and then it keeps getting cut more and more. These companies are making millions in profit and of course we lose out.
64	Anonymous	None	Feed in Tarrifs should remain in place and as minimum not below current rates but preferably higher. Cost of living is a huge issue and installing solar panels isnt cheap. Government rebates are being recued and now tarrifss will be non-existent.	Why should there be an alternative? We are being told that power brown-outs are going to be more of the norm both in summer & winter. With more people installing Solar & exporting to the grid this can only be a good thing. Why should the consumer be further disadvantaged.

65	Anonymous	I do not support them. They are a disincentive to solar users, favoring fossil fuel generators.	Feed in tariffs should remain to at or above existing levels to stop manipulation of market by regulators. The approach is seeking to shift the cost of infrastructure investment (in batteries) to consumers. If retailers / the wholesale market created network storage, this could be fed back into the network during period of high demand.	refer previous comment
66	Anonymous	None. Seems like energy companies are being greedy.	Going from 3.3c to 0.004c. Feed in tariff	Instead of being so dramatic how about a gradual approach. 3c in 25/26, 2.5c in 26/27 etc. One of the reasons for individuals choosing to go solar is getting some sort of feed back by helping to support the energy companies. Maybe the energy companies should use some of their profits to be able to store the electricity customers send back to the grid.
67	Anonymous	I don't support the proposed flat minimum feed-in tariffs. The rates are close to $0 and consumers won't get anything. There is no point in government pushing us to go for renewable energy sources while providing nil support with the FiT rates. Current FiT rates itself is very low.	Flat minimum feed-in tariffs needs to be reconsidered and maintain the same rates as of current date atleast.	Not sure about the methodologies used but consider the consumer who spent thousands of dollars to go for renewable energy sources to achieve government net-zero targets.
68	Anonymous	Time varying minimum rates seem ok	The 0.04c is effectively nothing.. a typical home system would export max 30kwh = approx. 1$/Day in summer and $0 in winter. How can this be appropriate? do you want to encourage people to put in solar systems or not? How can we get any real payback on outlays of $20K under such rules. We all know that retailers will avoid offering the Time varying rates so they can make more $.	Retailers should be forced into offering the time varying minimum rates if you have a smart meter. Benefits of having a smart meter have not materialized for the consumer.. Perhaps this can be a positive for all the extra money we have forced to pay for smart meters.

69	Anonymous	The fact that a minimum exists I think is a good way to get people to transition to self generated power.	"I dont think the minimum should ONLY take in to consideration the wholesale value. The cost of purchasing electricity from providers is getting ever higher, yet the value of selling it back during the day is ever lower. I believe that the decision to reduce the feed in value to effectively 0 is going to stop the uptake of solar panels by new people and ultimately halt the transition to renewable power. To cover the cost of 3kWh (very low consumption) after the sun goes down (at say 50c as a conservative cost in peak time) you would have to sell 3750kWh on the new 0.04c rate, which would take something like 93 days of full sun on an ~8kWh system (larger than average I believe). This makes solar not worthwhile when peak times are so expensive anyway and the sun is not generating during these times and solar batteries are so expensive."	Considering the price to consumers, the effect on the industry and the effect on the overall environmental impact. Currently the feed in incentive is a huge factor for most solar owners, the incentive will be gone and without incentives to store and use that power yourself, its pretty much not worth new buyers from transitioning anymore.
70	Anonymous	It is a joke, offering 7.52c/kwh at night when the sun is not shinning. Do you really think people are that dumb? Again from 3pm to 9pm very little export happening in those hours.	The entire methodology!!! The entire thing is not taking into account the fact that solar owners have spent their money in order to ensure their energy supplies are either always there and or at a price that is reasonable. Governments around this country are obviously working to help energy retailers make money. What is the issue? Is there too much energy being fed in during the best daylight hours, if so how will reducing a feed in tariff possibly help?	This is the thin end of the wedge for consumers and governments know that! Governments should be helping consumers by offering free or heavily discounted batteries so that their systems can store this energy and they can use it later. Oh hang on I forgot, then the energy companies might not make any money!!! It is a joke that will one day back fire on governments.

71	Anonymous	None.	All of it.	Link the changes in FIT to changes in retail electricity costs. That is, relate FIT to off-peak retail rates and daily charges. Consumers do not see wholesale prices. Consumers pay "retail", so the FIT should reflect that metric. Over the last 5 years, our retail off-peak rate (all quoted from September invoice values) has risen from 15.95 cents/kWh to 21.45 cents. A 34% increase. Our daily charges have risen from $0.9900 to $1.210, and increase of 22%. At the same time, your proposed flat rate FIT has dropped from 10 cents to 2.8 cents. A 72% fall. This has not been reflected in what consumers pay. The generators do no work to secure thi solar PV power. The distributors do very little (last year your figures indicated they spent 1% of their budget on PV adaptation). The retailers also do little to no work to bill for solar exports to the grid. So, I argue that the wholesale price is irrelevant. The FIT should be the retail price minus a small profit margin for the retailer - say 5%. On that basis, the FIT should be closer to 20 cents than 0 cents.
72	Anonymous	None	All of them. After going solar, your offering is an insult and really not worth anything meaningful. I would prefer to just have my exports stopped completely going back to the grid since the only benefit is that it alleviates the load on the grid.	It went for 5c per kWh, to 3.3c per kWh and now you are offering less then half a cent? Since I made back a big 180$ for the entire year from fit, its hardly going to be missed. Why can't you actually look at upgrading the grid as this solar push is no t new. What's next, double the kWh charge to offset the loss of income.

73	Anonymous	None	If our household is providing energy to the grid, why is that not reimbursed? A fit of 0 cents does not seem fair and does not seem likely to promote ongoing investment in solar power needed by Victoria to meet climate commitments.	I don't know, I'm not an expert on this.
74	Anonymous	Nil	Change nothing	Happy the way it is
75	Anonymous	None	All of it	You are abusing the fact that most people work during the day when they should be using their higher power using machines eg washing machine. The higher payment for solar feed in is during the evening which of course during summer may be ok but winter it won't produce any. Most people will just stop installing solar. We are aiming for a coal free state. Stop raising the power workers wages and start assisting people to save on their power. The economy is bad enough and families are struggling so naturally power goes up and we have to tighten the belt more. The elderly suffer as they can't afford cooling or heating when needed. What you propose makes it not worth installing solar. We have already dropped to unreasonable rates. Why not just raise the cost for consumers who haven't got solar and help people with incentives to instal.
76	Anonymous	None at all. They buy it for 0.04c and resell at a bigger rate.	Keep up with the other states in Australia as you want us to go green then we buy the panels and get a pittance for the power we generate	Comparative with other Australian states. Why should we get punished due to mismanagement by the Victorian Govt.
77	Anonymous	None.	The minimum feed in tariff	The minimum feed in tariff should never go below 10c/Kw

78	Anonymous	None	Grandfather solar feed in tariff's for current customers until the system is paid off which can be monitored via the Vic gov free interest loans	New price for new installations only
79	Anonymous	none	none	leave it as is for 3 years.
80	Anonymous	If the feed in tariff is set too low to at least cover the daily connection fee then I would prefer to just disconnect when the power company is looking for nominal cost power. The VIC gov encouraged private solar but if only for the benefit of the power companies, then you have lost my vote.	Recognise the investment and contribution to the community and Victoria of this very cost power. Buy power at 4 cents and sell next door at 34 cents, this seams to be a very one sided deal.	Buy and sell in the same market. Fixed price all day for both or flexible price for both all day. Not high fixed price in and and nothing out (feed in). It is disgusting that the VIC Gov have got us in this commercial mess.
81	Anonymous	Don't support such a low flat rate. My 2 kW system feeds in to grid about 10 kWh/day , which is 3650 kWh/year. At 0.04 cents per kWh, I would only receive $1.46 , and yet the power companies can sell that energy to my neighbours at more than $1000, and greatly profit.	Should be a higher flat rate only, so power companies don't con their customers.	None, stay at 3.3 c/kWh flat rate. Electricity is an essential service, and power companies have a social responsibility
82	Anonymous	None	The minimum should never be so [redacted] low, why should we have to buy from the grid at above 20 cents per kwh but you want to only buy from us for basically nothing.	How bout keeping track of what we feed in, then store that in like a bank, where by we don't get charged to buy from the grid until say we use more than the amount we fed into the grid.
83	Anonymous	None	All of it. Your recommendation to drop from 3.3c to 0.04c is beyond insulting.	Consider doing the right thing for the Victorian people who have been scammed by the government into getting solar and then having the rate slashed to effectively zero. Your claim that we just need to shift our usage to during the day is absurd. People work for a living and aren't at home during the day!

84	Anonymous	A flat export rate for any time... makes it easier to calculate, and more likely you will get something	Offering nothing for exported energy, when you will then charge other users to use it... need to find a fairer way to calculate wholesale costs or solar export rates. TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE THAT WE HAVE GOT TO THIS SITUATION WHERE YOU ARE REBATATING NOTHING.	"I recognise that in summer you will get a lot of solar exported, but in winter the amount is much less... consider a different feed-in rate for summer/winter. Maybe also offer less incentives for more people to get solar, which is what is causing the problem in the first place, or more incentives for people to get batteries."
85	Anonymous	Option 2 Time-varying minimum rates.	Not bother with the option 1 time-varying minimum rates, and the all time flat rate. They are just ridiculously low to nothing. Make it mandatory for energy retailers to offer the time varying rates. Vast majority don't because it benefits them and not the consumer/customer.	I have no opinion.
86	Anonymous	That it should not go below zero	"Simply applying the spot rates as a guide to the feed in tariff seems naive. Remove the suggestion that consumers can reduce their costs by using their energy during peak solar times. It is not practical. Who can come home at midday to cook the evening meal, do the vacuuming, the washing or whatever? Consumers could use batteries to overcome the peak usage at peak periods but batteries are expensive so only the well off could take advantage of them. It would be more efficient and more egalitarian if the energy companies took on this responsibility."	"The effect of energy storage should be considered. If the excess energy generated during solar peaks, low spot rates, is stored rather than wasted and then sold to consumers at the peak rate, it would be giving energy companies an incredibly high margin on their product. An alternative approach would be to make the feed in tariff a percentage of the consumption tariff. That percentage should provide for a fair margin after taking into account; line loss, energy storage efficiency loss and a return on investment for the energy storage system. This would encourage energy companies to be more proactive about utilising energy storage and reducing wasted energy."

87	Anonymous	Whilst the connection between the wholesale cost to retailers and the feed-in tariff rate is explained, the overall paradigm is problematic.	Based on the significant uptake of consumer solar production, there must come a time when the uptake of consumer production reduces or negates the need for retailers to need to buy wholesale price electricity. Should this not be a goal. It will require storage facilities for peak production times to allow consumer access when no solar is being produced.	As your proposed plan is already produced in 'draft' form it does some pre-empt this consultation. To suggest in option 1 , that the highest FIT rate for consumers be paid 'when the sun does not shine' is quite frankly an insult. The whole paradigm for how and by whom electricity is produced, through to the end consumer needs to be rethought. This needs to look at the profit margins of wholesalers and retailers. In short, this essential service needs to be in public hands to allow a fairer and more equitable system.
88	Anonymous	I don't support lowering the minimum feed-in tarriffs.	I think that minimum feed-in tarriffs should be increased significantly to incentise energy retailers to invest in localised batteries to store 'excess power' from rooftop solar.	I would like an alternative methodology that would increase the setting to the wholesale price. This would stimulate the energy retailers to invest in using the 'excess power' from household rooftop solar by, for example, setting up localised battery storage units (a bit like the state government's concept of 'neighbourhood batteries') - which they could then use when solar energy is not being produced.

89	Anonymous	I do not support it.	Given we are in need of more solar energy in the future, I see no point in discouraging consumers from installing solar power which is exactly what you are proposing to do with these changes.	"Leave it as be. his will force more investment in storage, which be needed. It will also continue to encourage consumers to install solar - which will be needed in the near future. It seems insane that you're proposing to curtail solar energy when we know we need more as coal plants shut down. If you make these changes, then everyone starts complaining there's not enough renewables in the system - I will attribute this directly to policies like this. Enough with the short term thinking - do we need the solar in the future? Yes. Do we currently have enough? No."
90	Anonymous	Ensuring a minimum tariff. Rather the allowing people to get paid nothing.	Old tariff rules still in play. Such as the original 60c rate should be supperceeded by this reform. Or a 5 year close out period enforced. Those on old rates have made their return and creates inequality.	Ensuring that consumers see these minimum tariffs. Stop retailers imposing fees and charges to offset the minimum charge.
91	Anonymous	A higher feed in tariff outside of peak production times	Weekends should not be excluded from option 1.	As FIT are reduced, greater support should be given to solar panel owners to assist in buying batteries and storage

92	Anonymous	The general concepts are fair but flat rate of 0.4c/kWh will generally be poorly received by the public (and media) and retailers should be discouraged from offering. Option 2 should be promoted by Govt and retailers for solar only residents or those with small batteries with export capability and would promote west facing panels which is desireable. Option 1 should be promoted for residents with larger batteries able to be configured to export excess to the grid	As retailers appear reluctant to promote existing ToU tariffs, time based feed-in tariffs should be simple to explain and should be fixed for an extended period as battery system configuration to align with multi tiered tariffs will often be complicated (beyond teh capability of most consuemrs)	"it should not necessarily be expected that daytime wholesale prices continue to decrease in the medium to long term as negative prices from coal generators will ease as these generators retire. Also industry will start evolving to take advantage of low daytime prices and hence the demand and market price during these periods will rise to a low but positive price. Likewise the massive growth of network energy storage will absorb much of the daytime excess to participate in the arbitrage energy market. ESC needs to ensure FiT ammendments benefit the resident (asset investor), retailers, DNSPs and AEMO. FiT ammendments also need to consider V2x implications as well as fixed home batteries. Should FiT incentivize resident V2x participation?"
93	Anonymous	None	Feed in tarrif	Keep the current feed in tariff or increase

94	Anonymous	I support Option 2 as this provides some compensation for rooftop solar investors who participated in good faith with a view to long term benefits.	I suggest providing higher feed-in tariffs to encourage further participation in the rooftop solar program. Without such a measure participation will drop off.	"The methodology should consider that it is the responsibility of the grid to develop further power storage facilities to make full use of the power generated during the day to drive down the need for generation using fossil fuels and maintain a reasonable price for power regardless of the time of the day. It should also be considered that system needs to be fair to rooftop solar investors who participated assuming there would be reasonable benefits from FiT payments to help recoup the cost of their rooftop solar installation over the years. To continue the greening of the grid the government (the new SEC) should build a distributed grid system with community battery storage in each local government area to store the excess power generated during the day. This would help stabilise the grid and provide power in times of outages due to weather conditions. Maintaining higher FiT is essential to maintain the momentum of the solar revolution and this is in the long term interest of the state."
95	Anonymous	Ther should be a minum price that reflects the savings to retailerd	More weight to the consuner	Consider the real value provided by solar
96	Anonymous	None, encourage battery installations.	All of it we need to completely rethink how and who supplies our electricity.	Small community batteries to supply electricity supplied by home solar panels.

97	Anonymous	"I support reducing the feed in tariff to bring it in line with what the market actually values the electricity at. I like the peak/off peak/shoulder pricings because they are easy to understand and make sense based on when I know energy is most valuable. People with solar panels get a personal benefit from using them, anything else should be a nice bonus (not something they are entitled to). Feeding renewable energy into the grid is a great thing to do to help people who can't have solar reduce their non-renewable energy use."	None	None
98	Anonymous	Don't know enough about it	The prioritising of electricity companies over consumers.	I don't believe my electricity should be given to these electricity companies effectively for free only to be resold at an inflated rate. The new feed in tariff is a disgrace. Whoever thinks this is fair is seriously mistaken. I am considering pumping up the solar on my house and getting rid of the grid altogether
99	Anonymous	None, Solar is supposed to be the way forward and those who have participated are not benefiting at all. A power company can charge me upwards of 30c/kwh and want to credit the equivalent at 0.04c/kwh. If so those who are yet to transition to renewable energy will have zero incentive to, and those that already have based on the promised savings have been lied to.	The minimum feed-in tariffs should be lifted in line with pass figure. At a minimum the feed-in tariff should be 50% of the equivalent cost when drawing from the grid	At a minimum the feed-in tariff should be 50% of the equivalent cost when drawing from the grid. This will allow variation for peak and off peak and ensure there is still an incentive for people to support renewable energy options now and into the future.

100	Anonymous	I do not agree with the methodology since it overlooks the bigger long term picture. This current approach is a knee-jerk reaction, which will solve very little except downgrade the attractiveness of renewables.	Keep the existing (already low) feed-in tariffs for now. We have a wave of big batteries around the corner, which will start absorbing the excess electricity. The economies of scale are best with big batteries, and they will need plenty of excess energy to carry the grid through the night on renewables. There is no point asking everyone to install household batteries because of additional complexities and inefficiencies compared to industrial size batteries.	Wholesalers should collect rooftop solar energy for later release using their batteries. The wholesale price needs to be averaged over the daily 24-hour cycle. If a rooftop solar owner uses less energy in a day than what they supplied to the system, they should not be charged for electricity use. If or how much individual generators should be paid for the excess power generated, can be left to the market forces.
101	Anonymous	The difference between the old and new tariff is quite large and appears to be designed to favour the corpirate sector with little consideration for those who have invested in sustainability.	It needs to bw balanced and such a large drop in what the homeowner receives is not balanced	The main priority shold be to keep the momentum in people adopting home solar and what they receive for excess energy is a major factor in consideting solar. Climate change mitigation should be a priority when implementing changes.
102	Anonymous	None	Scrap the entire thing	Nothing. The old saying of "if it's not broke don't fix it" applies here!
103	Anonymous	none of it	feed in tariffs during daytime hours should match those of energy suppliers	match those of major energy suppliers
104	Anonymous	Providing clarity on timeframes	Peak times only apply for certain parts of the year in Victoria and have only a partial utility.	The calculations need simplification relative to day light hours that produce solar energy, I have not methodology to recommend otherwise.

105	Anonymous	None	Reducing feed-in tariffs is the completely wrong approach. In the midst of the climate emergency anything that discourages the take-up of renewable energy is profoundly wrong. What is needed is subsidies for batteries and an acceleration in the transition to renewable energy in the grid more broadly. It is happening too slowly.	Increase the feed-in tariffs, accelerate renewable energy take-up, and subsidies batteries.
106	Anonymous	None	The feedin tarrif	Average Flat rate for electricity use and feedin tarrif
107	Anonymous	NONE!	Continue with feed in tariff of 3.3c/kwh	Set the feed in tariff at a reasonable value to reward consumers who have installed solar
108	Anonymous	None! It's all a scam. Previously people were encouraged to get solar panels, and feed in tarrifs were decent. The reason being, it saved on building new power sources. However, now, because power companies want to make money,the rate is almost nothing. This is basically a corrupt practice at the expense of those who got solar. The government needs to focus on a decent rebste rate,and stop focusing on what's best for power companies...	The rebate MUST be way higher, itsbecoming close to nonothing. This needs to be based on community need, not power company greed.	Focus on what is fair and equitable for the community.
109	Anonymous	None.	Do not reduce feed-in tariffs any further.	What are the alternatives?
110	Anonymous	None	Scrap the proposal	Scrap the proposal and leave as is, households invested in Solar require some payback to cover costs of installation.

111	Anonymous	I don't support any part of it feed in should be 50% not 0.04% and should be a flat rate regardless of time of day	See previous question	Feed in too grid should be 50% of Feed in rate
112	Anonymous	"N/A, while the justification is made that the ESC's ""protect the interests of solar and non- solar customers"" the draft proposed actions does not display this, leaning heavily to benefit retailers."	"The Feed-In Tariff at the minimum should not be further lowered in current market conditions. The FiT being lowered in the last 2 reviews based on predictions that did not match reality, should be taken into account and be reassessed and reversed leading to a FiT floating between 6.7 to 5.2 cents per kWh."	Predictions that take into account current market factors. eg. developing situation in the USA.
113	Anonymous	None. Why should consumers not get paid for their generation thus relying less on coal power.	Fees in tarriff should remain the same or made higher as solar is better for the environment.	Pay a higher minimum fees in tarriff.
114	Anonymous	Option 2 for varying rates is the least unacceptable.	A single flat rate of 0.04 is not acceptable when compared to the peak power rates that retailers charge from 3 pm.	No comment - don't know enough about whole price setting methods.
115	Anonymous	See my attached submission. The ESC needs to take a broader view and look at the bigger picture. The ESC needs to take into account state and federal government policies on emissions reduction, the need to reduce our fossil fuel usage to limit further climate change and to consider what effect their decision on feed-in tariffs will have on these issues.	See my attached submission.	See my attached submission.
116	Anonymous	None	The proposed methodology is setting the same complexity as retailers are. We are supporting a carbon zero approach that we are all responsible for but feel disappointed that regulatory bodies are not supporting residential solar providers.	Maintain the same.

117	Anonymous	None		The reduced feed in tariff has a significant negative financial impact on our household as we installed a solar power system in 2020 based on a 15 cent FIT	Do not reduce FIT

118	Anonymous	Non		The minimum price should be higher, and consideration for pensioners.	My cost to install my solar system was over $14000 with a little government assistance. I produce double my usage energy in summer. Now my feed in tariff is 4.5c/kw and I get charged 47.164 cents/kWh. I also get charged $1.34 a day for service to property, yet I have a smart metre. I'm sure I'm being charged to send my own electricity back to the grid also. This is considerably unfair. The price I get for my electricity production is just 10 percent when compared to the 90 percent that Red energy is making from me and other consumers from my solar production, yet I paid an extravagant amount to have the system installed. In fact, even though I produced double my load to January, I still had to pay a bill because I am careful as I am a pensioner. I believe that the cost of the feed in tariff that providers are making from our solar production is approximately 90 percent above what they are charging me and other customers and this is hugely flawed. Moreover, I believe I was guaranteed 0.66c for 15 years. Red energy failed to fill out paper work for six months to get me signed up and moving then still haven't given yet another year of this "contract." I now regret having paid so much for solar as, I feel we solar owners are being taken advantage of. We should be receiving more reprieve from paying such high prices and costs for having produced, supplied and provided the electricity to companies from which to profit so gallantly. We are paying out prices and costs that are considerably higher than we are being paid for our production that benefits the companies. Yet we have done our bit through our own costs, to help the environment and companies.

				In fact, they are charging new customers far less than we are being charged yet we have helped them out by producing the feed in and exporting it to them. We the people who have helped in every way, including with emissions should be given a higher and consistent rate for feed-in that should be compulsory rate to all companies with no deviation at all.
119	Anonymous	I support having some different minimum options for retailers in terms of flat daily minimums or time of day options	The minimums are too low so do not compensate homeowners for their investment in their solar systems. It is treating home owners with contempt to keep reducing the feed-in tariffs. The Victorian government has abandoned homeowners in favour of foreign multi-nationals and private equity investors such as Industry Super funds who donate to Unions who in turn donate to the Labor party. On 27th Jan 2025 39% of generation came from home solar and only 18% from the commercial subsidised solar farms. Home solar requires no extra transmission line subsidies which are then added to electricity bills.	Stop adding subsidies for commercial renewable projects and transmission lines to our electricity bills and get AEMO to better manage the use of home solar so a higher feed-in tariff can be paid. Ensure commercial renewable projects are responsible for the end of life remediation of their projects not electricity users given all existing projects will reach their end of life before 2050.
120	Anonymous	Only that the minimum feed-in tariff cannot be negative.	Most of it, see attachment.	Something much fairer to those who have followed government encouragement to install solar PV, see attachment.

121	Anonymous	Keeping a flat minimum feed-in rate across the entire day.	"The minimum feed-in rate should not be reduced from the current 3.3 c/kWh for the following reasons: 1. The government should be providing consumers with maximum incentives to have solar panels installed; and 2. Consumers that have recently had solar panels installed rely on a sizeable feed-in tariff to provide a payback on their recent significant investment."	None - I strongly advise to keep it simple; ie a flat all day rate.
122	Anonymous	None.	All of it , don't change current methodology	Leave as is.

123	Anonymous	Agree with the concept of having both flat rate and time variable option for feed-in tarrifs.	"The report from Frontier Economics excludes from its modelling a real world event (14 Feb 2024) where the market spot pricing achieved the maximum $16,600 per MW fee for 24 x 30 minute segments. I understand why this occurred and why it is excluded from the methodology for general calculation of rates. However it is entirely possible thanks to the presence of smart meters at the household to calculate and pay household for solar energy generated and supplied during a future market event like that which occurred on 16 February 2024. Under the proposed model the profits from such an event would go to energy producers and/or retailers and not householders whose feed-in rate was determined by a methodology which excluded this event type. Including a payment rate for exceptional market event that your modelling has not covered does not provide the opportunity for those households with batteries and electric vehicles and battery storage opting for the fixed rates the rare capacity and financial incentive to discharge into the grid to help mitigate these events. I don't personally own these devices but the release of additional stored power into the grid would be helpful at the state, business and consumer level. $16,600 per MW translates to $16.60 per KW which means a household with a 5KW system generating 5kw per hour would miss out on (($16,600/1000)x5)/2 = $41.50 in revenue for a 30 minute period. I do understand 100% would not pass through to the household but the final amount will certainly many	"Please address the high price events such as that detailed in Section 5.1 of the Frontier Economic Report for the 13 February 2024. As a market event that is entirely foreseeable it is very much possible to create a secondary model that specifically that caters to these outlier events should it occur. This is entirely feasible as you are not dealing with an unknown business scenario (just an event occurrence frequency). I really do think your current model would include a maximum expected price along with a minimum price. These exceptional market events should not just be ignored. Its an issue which requires it own consideration."

magnitudes more than the the proposal and not insignificant. Multiply this by 24 market events as occurred on 13 February 2024 and it is a significant quantum of money for an individual household and very large amount when you consider there are 700,000+ Victorian homes with roof-top solar.

Furthermore paying for exception events could enable is the addition of a feature in the Vic Emergency Ap that would notify owners of EVs and battery storage that additional grid energy is required to address market pricing and they could potentially respond to the benefit of the market and community generally. Smart batteries and inverters could the be activated to address (it would be helpful if the distributor could activate).

There is much discussion about grid reliability and energy sourcing I have no idea if the event of 14 Feb 2024 will be more or less frequent but grid reliability and resilience is certainly a valuable commodity (market pricing $16,600 per MW for 30 minutes for 24 times certainly demonstrates this).

Please and include a model for these types of events or events that are outside 3 standard deviations of the mean expected pricing (or an identifiable criterion that defines an outlier energy market generation event)."

124	Anonymous	I don't support either option. This is appalling! I installed panels when I was getting 12 cents per kWh regardless of the time of day at a time when i was purchasing electricity from the retailer at roughly 20 cents per kWh. This gave me an 8 year payback period for my solar panels. Since then my feed in tarriff has lowered to 5 cents per kWh and the price of electricity has risen to 29 cents per kWh, causing my payback period to more than triple. My solar panels will become stop working before i am ever paid back. You've essentially made solar not worth a cent.	Offer a decent feed-in tarriff of at least half the cost, ie. if the retailers are charging 29 cents per kWh, I should be getting 14.5 cents per kWh - why should their coal fueled power cost 29 times the rate of my clean, green power.	Refer above.
125	Anonymous	The ‘avoided cost’ methodology is feasible but the weighting given to various factors doesn’t seem accurate or effective in terms of benefitting consumers in the long term.	More value should be given to the benefits of solar exports in reducing carbon and improving health and above all – the methodology should not take the position that ‘electricity used in the home from the household’s solar electricity is ‘free’ as customers avoid paying retail electricity prices’. It is not ‘free’: the supply infrastructure cost has simply shifted and is still borne ultimately by the solar exporter/customer, who has had to invest heavily in equipment to capture and store solar energy.	As above, the weighting in the ‘avoided cost’ approach needs to be corrected so as to give higher value to the carbon and human health costs avoided by retailers. It also needs to take into account the heavy costs borne by exporter/consumers who invest in household solar generation, the ‘uptake incentive’ effect of the FIT and the overall community and electricity supply system benefits brought by increased customer self sufficient electricity generation and storage capacity. Please refer attached submission.
126	Anonymous	The methodology is flawed as it does not consider distribution and retailer impacts which are highly significant. It fails to consider options and methods to improve the overall system	"The timetable is unacceptable. To put up such a dramatic report in January during the height of the holiday season and where all organisations and individuals are unconnected. It smells of being done deliberately to avoid any considered analysis The study criteria needs to be changed and made much broader"	Change the ERC criteria. Broaden the study to consider the long term impacts and the possible solutions to achieving a cheaper and better system

127	Matt Way	I do not support the flat minimum feed-in tariffs	Increase the minimum tariffs so that it still useful. 0.04c is so small.	I'd rather avoid the daily connection fee and export solar without any tariff.
128	Rainer Busch	I don't support any of the proposed change	All of it. It's a rip off of all those who have invested in a solar roof set up. Our system will require an upgrade in the next 5 years. Those costs and the ongoing maintenance like cleaning of solar panels and safety checks are far in excess of the lousy 4.5 cents per kWh I'm getting now. If you lower the feed on tariff further I will stop feeding any of my surplus into the net.	This whole retail and wholesale set up is wrong. It should not exist as it it only serves one purpose: To create profits at the expense of the consumers. Electricity is an essential service and should be treated like this. The current system is not fit for purpose. Scrap it and start again, putting people first.
129	Matt Goodluck	None	All of them, specifically the low feed in tariff!	Requirements for energy providers to use batteries to capture overflow of generation during the day.
130	Daniel Thirkell	None of it, you guys are only going to contribute to increasing electricity prices after we have paid to install solar. Get real.	You should either increase the payment rates or drastically reduce the cost of a battery. You can't [redacted] us over on both ends. Do not do this.	Consider the fact that millions of households rely on the contribution of solar and payment from the retailer to help with their bills. People would benefit from a n amount that means their bill is 0 or a very small amount at most.

131	Keith Graham	"I do not support your proposal. You need our Solar to get to net free you need to up grade the net work to take all our solar in to batteries all day so support night time demand . You are setting up a system that people with out batteries will be paying for a higher rate on dirty energy over night."	"The day time feed in tariff change 9.00 -3.00pm. From 8.00 most people with batteries are recharging there system to around 10.00am on a good day with a small amount still going to the grid.i believe the 9.00am should be moved to 10.00am if you want to encourage new solar installations. I think you could be propping up the retail winds,Solar and gas supply companies and not the General community Solar owners. With the drop in tariffs will there be a drop in on retail energy supply charge or a frees .All so are you dropping the commercial energy sector tariff or are you discriminating against solar home owners ?"	"The methodology should be a fluctuating tariff as parts of Victoria can be in full sun shine or dense clouds so on the tariff should go up for the on the days that are cloudy to be in line with the retail energy suppliers like wind ,solar and Gas . We all have put major investments in our energy production equipment home and retailers should be on pare with each other. Were will the home solar owners stand when the new Marinus link from Tasmania come on line in 2026 - 2030 stage 1 - 750 megawatt . also the new of shore wind projects of the south Gippsland coast .If this is not put in to batteries the day time grid will not need domestic solar . This is a huge M"
132	Yogesh Kumar Dhanuka	All of them	Increase feed in tariff	Nothing else needed.
133	Les Oates	None	Up the feed in tariff, why should we be giving a free ride to the power companies and solar farms.	"Make it a fair price compared to power companies like AGL, Origin. If the price is .04 cents we will not be feeding into the system. Why are we not setting up batteries near towns to absorb the exceed instead of building expensive transmission line to solar farms in good farming country."
134	Uby Woods	None	If a fixed tariff applies it needs to be substantially higher than proposed	Not fixed tariffs

135	Roger Sanders	None of it	All of it you bunch of thieving [redacted]. What incentive is there for any one to actually go out and buy solar if you just want to prop up the power companies. [redacted] you. You out of touch [redacted]. This broke state is [redacted]. This isn't about helping the environment, or lowering cost of living, it's about [redacted] profit and [redacted] AGL	Anything has to be better than [redacted] and writing the [redacted] you've produced here.
136	Mark Breyley	1. I support the concept of time-of-day FIT to highlight to the consumer the time-sensitive value of the power they can provide.	"1. I agree that a flat-rate FIT must reflect the overall market balance between supply and demand, but think it should be averaged across the whole solar generation time window 7am-5pm, not just the 11am-1pm peak. 2. The draft paper does not mention stored solar (ie, domestic batteries), but offers FIT rates for night-time hours when no one generates solar power. The methodology should clarify what the off-peak FIT covers. 3. Consumers see FIT as an incentive to invest in solar, but a near-zero FIT quickly becomes a disincentive if they perceive their retailer is making money out of at least half of the solar generation window. Consider dropping the flat rate FIT altogether and making all retailers use time of day rates (capped at three time periods so they don't get too complex for consumers). Then the perception of not getting anything for generating solar will be outweighed by the rates consumers get for their shoulder period."	"What does ""setting the wholesale price component"" mean? I thought the wholesale price is set by the market, not by the essential services commission. If this question is about the method of calculating the wholesale price as an input to setting the FIT, then I suggest only one addition to what you have described: Shape the time-of-day FIT as an incentive for consumers to invest in energy storage so that the current 'solar peak' can be moderated by delaying the energy fed into the grid. As one who has recently invested in a battery, I feel exploited by a flat FIT of 3.3c/kWh when the wholesale market price is up to 15c/kWh in the evenings when I would feed energy in. A near-zero FIT would make that even worse. I would prefer a time of day FIT that I can use to program my battery to feed in when most valuable, both to me and my retailer. Obviously, I don't expect to get 15c, but at least a share in the value of my kWh would make it worth while. Thanks!"

137	Philip Le Blanc	None	Retailers should not be given access to, essentially, free power and then have the ability to o sell it at full price.	The FIT should remain at its current level, or it should be demand driven. The rate could change, based on demand.
138	TREVOR BERGMAN	I support none of them.	Change the rate to 5 cents per kw/h for the feed in tariff.	The electricity market is not competitive. Jeff Kennett broke the SEC into wholesale areas of Victoria so there is no true competition. All retailers have to go to one wholesaler for their area. Allow retailers to get power from the lowest wholesaler and you will get better competition. The wholesalers can build a link to WA so all our excess power can be exported to them. Your feed in rate of .04 c/kwh will result in more people buying batteries and more house fires. You are simply rewarding power companies owned by overseas people like the Singapore Government with even more profits at our expense
139	Victor Choo	TOU Option 1	This should not be looked at in isolation. Pricing in this matter, needs to be looked at holistically and from a systematic view. This FIT pricing is only support if it comes together with the corresponding reduction in energy pricing for purchases. Otherwise, this kind of reducing in FIT only benefit the profits of energy retailers, and drive further disillusion and social injustice.	The minimum pricing for FIT should be considered together and holistically with max pricing for energy purchase.

140	ALAN FOX	None - you have had residents spending thousands to install solar to cut their electricity costs and now you literally remove the feed in tariff virtually to zero, what good is 0.04c to anyone. Residents are supplying electricity to the energy companies and getting noting back. The only solution for households is to outlay thousands more for a battery which we will definitely not be doing, that would be thousands more expense which would pay for a lot of electricity which not putting a solar system in would also have paid for increased electricity bills for many years. A sham put in place by misleading governments.	A fair price for all consumers would be .20c per kwhr considering the thousands of dollars paid by residents and business to install solar for a now return of zero cents. We have already had to replace our failed inverter at a further cost of $1700, then in the future when panels fail residents again will have to pay out thousands more for panel replacement. On top of this residents with batteries face another replacement cost when they fail. It is all a waste of residents money when the costs for a system and battery could pay for decades of electricity even with price increases.	A fair price for all consumers would be .20c per kwhr considering the thousands of dollars paid by residents and business to install solar for a now return of zero cents. We have already had to replace our failed inverter at a further cost of $1700, then in the future when panels fail residents again will have to pay out thousands more for panel replacement. On top of this residents with batteries face another replacement cost when they fail. It is all a waste of residents money when the costs for a system and battery could pay for decades of electricity even with price increases.

141	hamish cumming	none	You should give the solar supplier/ generator the same feed in tariff value per kw that the retailer charges the solar generating household at night. It is completely unfair to get the power into the grid for free, and then charge the consumer 40cents per kw to buy the same power back later on. The wholesaler/retailers get the power for nothing, so why should they be allowed to sell the same power to other consumers for an extraordinary profit.	Instead of paying anything, just credit the generators back kw, like for like at night. Instead of paying big companies subsidies to build industrial scale solar and wind, then pay generators not to generate as well, the Gov should instead use that money to install battery units in every household, so they are not relent on the grid. This would be a far cheaper method of ensuring household power at cheap rates, than the Gov propping up failing wind and solar installations that are losing money every year. Propping up failing solar and wind in stallions will lead to failure of the grid.. VICTORIA WOULD HAVE BEEN FAR BETTER OFF FINANCIALLY IF THEY HAD UNSUBSIDISED GAS GENERATORS BACKING UP HOUSEHOLD SOLAR AND BATTERY, WITH NO WINDFARMS AT ALL. Studies show wind farms in Australia will lose three trillion dollars over the next 20 years. Tax payers and consumers should not be paying for that loss, if they are not viable they should not be built, after all Vic electricity generation is only 0.02% of world ghg emissions.
142	Rachit Gupta	Strongly disagree to decrease fit to 0.04 cents.	Should revisit the proposed FiT of 0.04 and keep it as it is.	$/kwh price should come down if FiT is reduced. Gap between grid power and Fit should be considered.
143	Andrew Seymour	Quite Simply NONE	How the level of the FIT is calculated. If there is too much Solar been fed into the GRID, why are Solar Farms still been built? Why are Solar Farms still been paid for their power?	The price paid for the FIT should be comparable the price paid to the Solar Farms. How is it Fair, Just or reasonable to take power for free of 0.04c and sell it at a 800% increase.

144	Tim Fraser	None. This was not sold to us when we installed solar panels 5 years ago. You have been dishonest about the entire scheme.	FiT disspearing to zero is unfair on the community who in good faith installed solar panels to both help the environment and our own finances,	It is reasonable to expect a feed-in tariff to cover a portion of the daily connection charge.
145	Alina Najdovski	None	All - you are already proving very little back	No change to current
146	GARY ANDISON	None	If our feed in tariff is to reduce , so proportionally should the tariffs we are charged for the same hours given your argument that there is excess being generated. The power companies cannot have it both ways.you are supposed to be acting on the people's behalf not the retailer.	A fair percentage of what we are being charged.
147	William Burl	None all they are doing is putting more profits into energy retailers, who are making millions in profits already.	Victorians like me who have invested $1000's in solar need to have a return on their investment. I understand that rebates have been applied and used. In my situation I generate 6 times more power than I use over a 12 month period and now with the FIT at 3.3c and peak at 34c off peak at 18c I'm just putting profits into retailers pockets.	Well I'd like to know what the wholesale price is, I have written to Lily D'Ambrosio's office on several occasions and they could not tell me what the wholesale price for electricity is, saying it's up to the retailers to charge what they like. There should be a base FIT value to give home owners who have invested in solar to get a return on their investment.

148	Nicholas Knol	All of them, specifically having at least one option without negative tariffs. That keeps management simple for consumers, no need to avoid exports to avoid penalties at any time, because currently few people have the ability to control their export time.	"Add an even stronger option to incentivise (smart) battery purchases and make the economics stack up better. Go negative feed in tariffs during the day and higher positive tariffs during peak/overnight hours. The wholesale prices already support this with negative wholesale prices at midday and much higher wholesale prices than 7.5c during peak and/or overnight as appropriate. This would be a simpler and more approachable option for people that want/have a battery, but don't want the full complexity of a direct wholesale retailer like Amber. Many people don't want that complexity but would support the grid if they had more incentive. This would be a cheap/free option for the government to further support home battery adoption."	As above.
149	Christine Dam	Greater return for shoulder and overnight input. Returns for input when demand exists.	Allow greater return for daytime input when located in an area where the energy requirements would not otherwise be met. e.g. Merbein or Patchewollock	Consider the local areas supply needs, in particular on days of high demand - airconditioning and heating. A responsive method based on need. No just taking power for zero return to the producer.
150	Florence Micoud	It's important to address the situation as it is unsustainable	"Lower the buyback price minimally for continuous solar zero carbon energy uptake. Invest the money difference into local batteries to use that energy at night"	Promote local networks, cheaper to maintain, in public private partnerships

151	Mike Soccio	None. Zip. Nada. Niente. Zero. Nothing. Absolutely none of it.	All of it. I'd completely start from scratch. Throw everything out and put consumers, climate change and the environment at the centre which you don't seem to want to do with this proposed change.	"I have absolutely no idea. I have no knowledge of this area in any way shape or form. I just know that [redacted] consumers is a Grade A stupid move and won't do anything to arrest climate change, protect the environment or encourage people to take up electric vehicles. If you are determined to ignore science like Senator Malcolm Roberts, then either go hard or go home. Propose to reconnect gas. Propose to support coal-fire power stations and to invest in extending their life-span. Have the guts to come out and formally support Dutton and his nukes. Press the government to overturn the ban on fracking. Press the government to support opening more mines and overshore drilling projects. Hell, I just had a brilliant idea - why don't you propose keeping the coal-fire power stations open...AND BUILDING THE NUKE REACTORS RIGHT NEXT DOOR? Can't hurt to have a backup. But whatever you do, don't think about supporting consumers. Especially if they've already spent thousands on solar systems and getting electric car charging installed in their homes. Consumers are getting [redacted] by the banks.Consumers are getting [redacted] by the Reserve Bank.Consumers are getting [redacted] by the supermarkets.Consumers are getting [redacted] by the telecom giants.Consumers are getting [redacted] by insurance companies.Consumers have been getting [redacted] by electricity companies for years and now those companies can count on your support to [redacted] them even harder.

				Absolutely pathetic.
152	Thomas Naylor	The proposed flat and time-varying tariffs don't make sense and take away all benefit ing a solar system	The minimum feed-in tariff should remain the same or increase. The 0c per kilowatt varying tariff is ridiculous and shouldn't be proposed	Remain the same as current or improve
153	Sam Guyett	None	The miminum feed in should remain at least 3.3c	Consider that if the price gets lowered to 0.04c that the industry will be destroyed. I couldn't honestly sell a solar system and tell people its a good investment. So many small businesses will close their doors leaving only the big players in the industry to operate.
154	John Maxwell	I do not support the continual reduction in feed in tariffs	If feed in tariffs are being reduced and eventually eliminated then owners of domestic PV installations should derive a monetary benefit for the cost of domestic installations rather than being continually penalised.	You need to apply a discount factor for the capital cost of individual PV installations which have reduced the capital costs of augmentation of infrastructure otherwise required to meet the ever increasing demand of networks
155	MiLAN Knezevic	Time sensors to turn washing machine ON, during sun-hours (during very low tarif)	Main reason for investing 8,000 in solar panels in Sept 2019 was the feed in tarif... now this deal is cut to nonsence.	Micro plants - use solar generated power within my suburb - charge electro cars Only during sunny-day hours.
156	Geoffrey Perrin	None	The Victorian labour have completely destroyed the solar panel industry	Leave the process alone ,stop trying to invent ways to justify destroying solar panels
157	Anthony Maeder	Retaining two level and block pricing structure	Massive decrease in tarrifs compared with slow decrease as in prior levels is a loss of faith with consumers who have made long-term decisions to fit solar based on apparent govt regulated "fair" reimbursement. The	Set maximum threshold for dropping feedin flow. Localised shared storage facilities should be provided (eg flow battery).

158	Sean Ross	Would obviously prefer the tariff to be higher as a solar panels owner, but seems pretty reasonable given the explanation. I'm not phased if it is option A or B, both seem much of a muchness. I don't understand why prices keep rising if demand for a huge part of the day is increasingly limited though.	Given the huge uptake of solar, if this change is confirmed - it should be accompanied with a stronger grant program for battery uptake to spread the load over the day and fill the gap that obviously exists at night time.	NA
159	Seamus Hasson	None. who gets to sell my clean energy for reward and retail. The rate is below productive costs and a loss of investment costs.	Provide a rate that allows for my inverter to work at full capacity exporting unused power. Bonas allowance for clean power. Show a break of the rate, what are the allowances.	A negative rate allowance for {dirty} fossil fuel energy. An incentive for my units to work at full performance. A negative rate for {dirty} fossil fuel energy. An incentive for my units to work at full power. I have turned off my units to save overheating for no reward.
160	Holly Way	I support the time-varying minimums over flat rates, which incentivises investment into renewable energy and potentially batteries for homes.	Flat rate tariff should be increased or not changed from the status quo. Majority of retailers will default to this minimum, which will effectively disincentivise households from investing in solar.	Individual home owners should not be penalised for investing in renewable energy. Instead public and economic policy should encourage power companies to invest in more resilient infrastructure, such as batteries, to help mitigate impacts of oversupply. While operational costs should of course be considered and supported through any price-setting methodology, it should be secondary to the overall public good renewable energy contributes to Australia.

161	Timothy Adams	Nil	small scale feed in capacity needs to be amalgamated to participate in the wholesale market fairly with large scale generators. It is clearly unfair for small scale generators to have price caped below $0.10 per kWh or minimum $0.004 when the wholesale max figure is $17.50 per kWh	time of use and time of export pricing for small scale participants equal to large generators. Failure to create fair treatment of all will result in grid defection for those who can be self-sufficient and leave those less able to carry the total burden of maintaining the system. The total set up must provide solutions that encourage those who can become self-sufficient to remain connected. Off-grid sites are currently the tip of the iceberg, but more accessible/affordable hardware combined with high performance house designs and unfair tariffs can quickly tilt the scales in favor of large-scale grid defection.
162	Adrian Morrison	None	All of it, consumers should be supported by increasing the minimum feed in tariffs that consumers feed back to the grid otherwise where is the incentive to install solar!	Make Cost effectiveness for consumers a priority, by crediting consumers for unused solar power that is fed into the grid at a cost that makes it an incentive to install solar.
163	Jordan Knox	Flat Minimum only!	Removing time varying feed in all together. It’s insane to propose a system that punishes the investment of consumers over the last 2 decades.	Making residential battery rebates more competitive to bring battery storage to more consumers which would in effect alleviate the increase output into the grid.

164	Michael Mason	I support setting flat rates for electricity feed in provided the rates are fair and reasonable and that the system is easy to understand on electricity bills ie maximum of 3 different tariffs.	The feed in rates are not fair or reasonable. It is not the consumers fault that the electricity grid has limited capacity to soak up excess electricity when abundant and release it when it is needed. This could achieved by a plethora of mechanisms. Not giving consumers fair and reasonable feed in rates will encourage consumers to cut the energy retailers out by setting up their homes as off grid systems. This will not benefit anyone and result in higher costs and greater difficulty in maintaining the grid.	Help consumers with storing their excess solar so that it reduces grid feed in during the middle of the day and allow them to supplement the grid when it's needed. And for this service, pay them fair and reasonable rates, tiny fractions of a cent.
165	Hasan Mus	Flat rates are easier to understand and follow. Variable would be impossible for the average person to workout.	Feed in tarrif amounts. 4c is cutting into consumers time it would take to pay off their systems. If this happens they will say its not worth it. And solar update will stop.	5c flat rare should be a minimum and larger solar battery rebates.
166	Ian Drury	Nil	Increase the feed in tariff to encourage more businesses and homes to convert to solar.	Increase the solar feed in tariff. More homes and businesses with solar will lessen our reliance on fossil fuels, and reduce greenhouse gases.
167	Paul Mantella	I support the methodology but not the latest significant reductions to 3.3c and now 0.4c proposed for 2025/26	The minimum rates should be greatly increased.	There should be some sliding scale to account for users who have made significant solar investments. I spend $50k on a 40kw system in 2021 to help reduce and make our affordable/low-cost rentals easier for tenants when the rate was 7 cents (tenants don't pay any power bills). This proposed decrease to 0.3 cents for 2025/26 just means I will now need to put rentals up 15-20%. In my case - it is vulnerable tenants that end up paying more in rentals.

168	Benjamin Lincoln	basically none	I think the time-varying options should at a minimum be reversed, i do not believe that setting the daytime rate a 0 will have the desired effect of shifting demand from peak times to non-peak times.	balancing power demand with power production is a difficult job, but it is vital that we do not slow down a renewables transition by breaking the unit economics of residential solar power. We should increase the minimum off peak feed-in tariff to probably the range of 5-10c / kwh and the peak tariff to like 30c / kwh to encourage investment into residential energy storage, to capture the excess power production. additionally we should increase the cost of non-renewables to further disincentivize there use and to fund industrial scale energy capture owned by the state government.
169	Owen Earp	Nil	A point oh 4 cent feed in tarrif is absurd and simply exists to pander to the fossil fuel lobby. For shame	Set it at something remotely sustainable, like 10c
170	Jacques Rautenbach	None.	The rate should increase based on your feed in rate for households with Solar. Those with a higher feed rate should have a higher compensation rate. The more solar energy I produce should be reflective in how much I pay. I currently produce household electricity through my solar panels during the day. My "sold to grid" is 148kWh and I have used 172kWh. Surely, I should only pay the difference.	Feed in should be compensated 100% and not at any variable low minimum feed rate. If we are to have lower carbon emissions, the incentive should be only pay what you use!
171	Rose Taylor	None	Encourage solar panel owners to install and receive compensation for their outlay	Group purchase

172	Michael Dwyer	My general concern is with the changes that are continuously occurring with the FIT, it is making it more difficult for people trying to decide on whether to put solar panels on their roof to make a decision. In my case, making the proposed changes will add at least a year to the payback on my solar investment. Perhaps look at making the changes that are being proposed only for new solar installations and not current ones. The objective should be to provide people looking to invest in solar with more certainty on their investment decision.	I understand what you are trying to do and that is to encourage consumers to use the solar power when it is plentiful and to feed maximum power into the grid in the afternoon and evening and I think Option 1 is my preferred option to do this. Any change, however, should be implemented in conjunction with increased incentive to implement batteries for use in conjunction with the solar panels. This would allow the power to be fed into the grid at night.	Variable retail rates based on demand and time of day are a concern for retail power customers. I think the customers want certainty and consistency on power prices, not variable based on time of day and aggregate consumer demand in the system. If wholesale power prices to retailers are variable, this is something the retailers have to deal with as part of their business and they are surely equipped to do so.
173	Ian McCallum	I support the option 2 method	I would like for you to investigate what happens during the winter months when solar production is well down from the summer months. if we export during these times then we should have a higher rate of feed in.	Split the year up more to better represent the production of solar power to take into account the lesser periods of sunlight.
174	Simon Frazer	Reducing the minimum feed in tariff to .04c seems very unfair to consumers and very favourable to energy retailers. My energy retailer is charging me 38c in peak time and 23c in off peak time,	So I am effectively generating electricity from the panels and inverter I have purchased and giving it to the energy retailer for free, then they can onsell it back to me or to other consumers at a profit	Your methodology should be more biased towards a fairer deal for consumers and owners of solar systems. Will the energy retailers be required to lower their prices now that they will be getting free electricity. Also, maybe a bit more regulation of the wholesale market would help.
175	WILLIAM SCHMIDT	NONE	Give solar owners no less than 4 cent / kw or no one will install new solar , thus continued fossil pollution to the atmosphere, more global warming , more extreme weather	Flat rate minimum 4 CENTS , no timed rates or gimmicks or hard to understand rules

176	Marcus Keam	A time varying tariffs are a smart way to insensitivise users and the market to monitor there usage, generation at peak and promote storage options in the grid. It supports moving to time of use tariffs for load. It also supports solar export being curtailed/ramped down rather than being switched off.	Flat rate needs to be set at a minimum of 2 cents for the next 10 years. You can't have a policy wanting zero emissions and then not rewarding the thousands of households and businesses that are supporting this transition. It is mixed messaging and not supporting an industry that is very important to Victoria and the country. Where would Victoria's electrical generation sit without rooftop solar exporting. We would be the most expensive state to purchase electricity.	Controlled solar export as per South Australia. 2c minimum export feed in using the time of use rate model. Flat rate of 2c only to be used for smaller customers on flare rate load tariffs.
177	GARY WATSON	non of it - its a complete joke	all of it - the government cant incentivise homeowners to install solar panels and then [redacted]us over on the feed in tariff - proving yet again Gvenements / Government Agencies and politicians are all compete [redacted]	FIT should more accurately reflect the [redacted] rip off prices the electricity companies charge of us for buying [redacted] electricity when we are not able to use power we generated
178	Omkar Paranjpe	It's a legal way to loot people and give it to big corporations. When we get 3.3 cents per kW of export, other than Amber electric, consumers never get it anywhere close to 3.3 cents.	The ridiculous pricing of 0.03 cent per kW	Shutting down solar in case large scale production works.
179	Peter GILMORE	none	the whole thing as many years ago the government told us it would slowly go up to 15cents a KWH and all that they have done is rope people into solar and at the same time we are paying 32 cents KWH we are being robbed and should stop sending any to the grid as they are making money off us	A minimum of 75% of retail price and then would still be making money from it

180	Will Barger	Reduction of FIT during the midday period where solar power is most likely available fro the home owners system	The 2 scaled FITs include evening time frames where there for all but maybe 1 or 2 days a year, there is no possibility of solar energy generation due to the sun has set....	There is no consideration of the value to the overall supply of electricity by utilising battery storage and developing community supply systems, both wold further reduce the demand upon power generation and the infrastructure. I.E. Support the installation of solar batteries through a rebate that would result in home owners utilising stored power when during higher periods of network demand, evenings and cloudy days; this would also support the over night charging of electric vehicles.
181	Bruce Davie	It is a fine idea to have the tariffs vary by time of day	Having the minimum tariff fall to almost zero is a step too far. 0.04 cents is indistinguishable from zero - it almost seems designed to create confusion. And it sends a signal to the market that there's no use having solar panels, which will likely reduce the rate at which they are installed.	The current minimum feed in tariffs are low enough to send the signal that solar is best used to reduce local demand but should not be reduced further.
182	Paul McCosh	I don't support it, reducing the feed-in even further will warn-off many solar buyers and residential solar renewal.	The minimum feed-in tariff needs to be increased to promote a better rate of return for residential Solar system installations.	promote battery users with an attractive rate for feed-in during off-peak times. Assist in the ability to curtail solar feed-in from residential properties.
183	Andrew Morrall	I support the idea of trying to encourage people to minimize the amount of solar they send to the grid.	More public consultation and explanations. there is too much misinformation and not enough public advertisement.	I think the minimum feed in price should be the same as the minimum wholesale price that is charged by the energy generators.

184	Werner Theinert	We all have TOU Metering, if the FIT its to be lowered to 0.04c/kWh, and the wholesale price is in the below zero region, why can't the retail price also reflect this low price, thereby promoting the consumption of power during this "off peak" period. Thereby helping to flatten the "Duck Curve" further	1. Reduce the Retail price during this period, thereby reducing the potential evening peak of the Duck Curve, due to consumers being induced to consume more power during this "off Peak" period. 2. Provide a Battery incentive for consumers to help flatten the Duck Curve. 3. There are Power Stations on the Grid that have proven ability to two shift their operation - LYB in Victoria. 4. Promote the value of customers who are willing to have their Solar PV output and export energy reduced to Zero, either remotely controlled or local. We'll be there one day soon	The Wholesale price of Electricity should be reflected in the Retail price of Electricity. We have the technology with our Smart Metering. This will promote the consumption of electricity at midday and reduce consumption during the evening peak. Flattening the Duck Curve.
185	Peter Kaup	None.	I think if we are going to be payed .03 kWh the then the power we put into the grid should not be allowed to be sold forward for anything higher, otherwise it is blatant discrimination and outright thievery that people with solar panels are having to endure	Follow India. What we put in the the grid during the day, we redraw at night. That way we get zero for put into the grid. That is fair
186	David Bolton	None	Minimum rate is far too low	A fair price for people who have incurred a cost to purchase panels and battery

187	Lex Manning	None. Over the past years the Victorian Government has pushed the need to lower Green House gases to meet world standards or so they say and have tried to sell the idea of lowering our household energy bills. They have pushed for more Roof-top solar to help them archive this as well as give out Taxpayer money in the form of Grants to put these systems on and now that approx. half a million households have done this, they now see fit to charge us for trying to lower our power bills and help our State & Politicians look wonderful. Under the proposed input tariffs the average power bill will rise by approx. $430 per year. This is based on NIL money for generation during the day and with an average of $1.04 per day connection charge. There will be no chance to recoup this during the day in Summer and even less chance during the Winter months and shorter daylight hours at other times of the year.	Give us a reasonable feed-in tariff to help us to achieve what the Government said would happen in the first place. I would suggest a minimum of 6-8 cents a kilowatt hour across the board.	Your decisions on the added costs to households and the average person (we vote, might be an idea to remind Politicians of that fact) is becoming extreme especially on essentials things like energy.
188	David Paterson	It is a good idea to have flat and time varying minimum feed-in tariffs. Make sure that all retailers offer all options not just one tarrif.	The minimum feed-in feed in tariffs should remain at the current rates or be increased (not decreased).	Floating feed-in tarrif equal to the wholesale electricity price in the region/suburb at the time of feed-in.
189	Chris Fowler	NONE	LACK OF INNOVATION AND OTHER METHODS COMMUNITY STORAGE THROUGH LARGE COMMUNITY BATTERY STORAGE AS IN OTHER COUNTRIES GO FOR SCALE	SAVINGS FROM REDUCED FEES GOES INTO NEW COMMUNITY BATTERY BANK CONSTRUCTION COSTS AND LINES DON'T TAKE EASY WAY OUT THINK A LITTLE

190	David Williamson	Option 1 is preferred. This option provides the greater ability for small scale battery installations to shift solar generated power from peak generation, also low usage, to periods of high demand or overnight reduction of power generated from fossil fuel	Suggesting that households shift power consumption to peak solar generation times of day is not helpful. Peak household consumption is for cooking and house heating in the evening period. Only a very small proportion of household consumption can be time shifted. It is better to acknowledge in your reporting that this is a reality and that the household must accept the diminishing return on the investment in solar generation. Only with such a reality check can political pressure increase for realistic government support for battery installations, with and without accompanying solar array installation. Further to this, government support should shift for the foreseeable future away from solar installation and towards battery storage for the time-shifting of solar energy to low or non-generation periods of the day.	Consider the economic contribution of small scale (i.e. household, small business) battery installations to shift solar generated power from peak generation (which coincides with low household consumption) to peak usage periods and overnight demand. Consider within this that new potential small scale battery installations do not require accompanying solar array investment/installation in the hands of the household investor.
191	Malcolm Bramham	Longer period of paid in solar hours	Rate being offered for non solar hours would be battery. We have battery but would not sell power at proscribed rate as rate is far too low.	Consider making period 1100 to 1300 as low priced power for community
192	Terence Flynn	None of it	You need to give INCENTIVES to solar panel owners	That the feed in tariffs are NOT reduced to a miserable 0.04 cents per kilowatt so consumers have an incentive to fit solar panels
193	Ian Farr	None	You need to consider how the people with solar will react. You have not taken into account what the distributors should do.	You need to consider how the people with solar will react. You have not taken into account the fact that solar is most productive during the months October to April.

194	Dhugal Fletcher	Absolutely none of it. This is stealing from the masses to protect a few price gouging retailers	Consumers should receive a fair FIT for power supplied to the grid and should have two choices: Receive a FIT that is set to the annual average market price of electricity during peak solar generation hours or use a service like Amber to participate in the wholesale market.	Set the FIT to the annual average market price of electricity during peak solar generation hours. It can change annually based on that calculation.
195	Peter Holt	None	Feed in tariffs are already ridiculously low. Energy suppliers make huge profits by selling domestic generated solar energy to their customers.	You should be increasing tariffs to encourage more investment in rooftop solar, not bending over to power generation lobbyists.
196	Kym Houghton	I have read the accompanying information but this question does not make sense. People producing electricity deserve to be paid a fraction of the cost of producing electricity by traditional means.	See above response	Too complex
197	Lex Thomson	This is a ridiculous proposal. Is the Victoria's Essential Services Commission funded by Energy providers and fossil fools?	No need to make any change ...if its not broken it doesnt need fixing.	Subsidising the installation of batteries for households and businesses with rooftop solar.
198	Russell Vernon	none, unless you include the capital costs of home solar	include the capital investment cost of home solar	political decision like it used to be until the government betrayed us
199	Lea Cassai	None!	Households should be paid a fair price for the green energy that they are generating. The government (through the new SEC) should be investing in battery parks to store the generated power for use after hours.	Should be a % of the price households pay to purchase electricity. Say 30 - 50%. That way retailers are encouraged to keep prices down.

200	paul wade	none, idiotic idea	the whole idea is cost based, should be utilisation based. Everyone with an 'electric' hot water service has an 'energy storage' system. Reset the overnight hot water timings to use the excess solar, keep the feed in the same & the transmission costs will fall as more 'local' use of the solar.	Remodel the costs using the storage solution proposed above.
201	Matthew Wrigth	I don't support it	You should be providing a meaningful price signal for solar up until the point that no more fossil fuels are being burnt for power generation at a given time. Your current system is a signal that fossil fuels should provide there power first instead of solar	Work out a rate that stimulates the market similar to the German Feed in Tariff. 11-15c/kWh could be a good starting point.
202	Frank Carlus	I don't support this approach.	I'm not an expert, but your approach is acting as a major disincentive for domestic roof top solar panels. It will kill off demand and be a strong handbrake on this effective form of power generation.	I'm not an expert, but it seems to me that you need to have a methodology that supports and values domestic solar production.
203	David Risstrom	I do not support the currently very los in feed in tariff. Solar electricity producers primarily fund their own domestic infrastructure, but currently pay ~ 9 times the cost to buy electricity compared to what they are paid for to generate.	I do not support the proposed reductions in feed in tariff. Solar electricity producers primarily fund their own domestic infrastructure, but currently pay ~ 75 times the cost to buy electricity compared to what they are paid for to generate.	My science background is in climate change and I was Vice President 20 years ago of the International organisation that operated the Cities for Climate Protection program, one of the largest in the world. n my view, the past and proposed tariff reductions will undermine the economic motivation for people to install solar and will contribute to exacerbating climate change.
204	Helga Saunders	I don't think the feed in should be limited in this way	Customer feed in should be considered as an energy producer	Allow customers negotiate price

205	Angela Snow	NONE	MINIMUM RATES SHOULD BE 6C PER KWH	NOT SURE. BUT IT SHOULD BE IN THE INTRESTS OF CONSUMERS.
206	Marcus Percy	none	The bit that [redacted] over the consumers	Look after the little guy
207	Susan Cook	I don't support any feed-in tariffs that propose to pay less than $0.03 per kilowatt.	The current minimum tariff feed-in rate should remain the same	The government should increase support of household battery storage units. It should also consider installing battery storage units at all sub-stations. This would ensure some power for emergencies whenever power lines between sub-stations is damaged as well as a way to ensure that there is little or no overload of the system during peak summer periods when solar output is at its maximum.

208	David Myer	I support the principle of lower feed-in rates when demand is lower	You must simplify it. For a start, payments should be in whole cents. There is no need for decimal points. They merely suggest that some high-powered calculation has been done. It surely hasn't. The proposed amounts are derisory. Many people have 'invested' in solar panels with carefully calculated returns that are suddenly no longer valid. At best, this proposed change is unfair. At worst it is robbery.	Why did we introduce feed-in tariffs in the first place? Because we wanted to encourage uptake of solar installation. We want to encourage further installations so we should be prepared to subsidise feed-in tariffs. Otherwise people will stop installing. The solar powered public should receive the same treatment that the fossil fuel generators receive. The feed-in rate should vary in exactly the same way as the wholesale price varies. Domestic suppliers are no doubt more expensive to manage than the fossil fuel generators because there more of them, so a fair rate might be, I don't know, but say 80% of wholesale rates and that is what the feed-in tariff should be. What we really want is more storage and so we should really be giving incentives to people to take on batteries. We could introduce a program where instead of paying solar roof accounts with derisory amounts, we credit them (with my 80% formula) for their production and hold the funds in reserve so that they can use the accumulated credits to buy batteries. That way we reduce the load on the system in the evenings.
209	Michael Bohan	By giving solar panel owners zero feed in tariff you are giving retailers additional profit because they are going to sell that power at full price to unsuspecting consumers	Increase the tariff	Re-assess the quantum
210	Gregory Nolan	Keep minimum feed-in tariff at least 3.3 cents per Kw/hr, prefer a rate of 10 cents or more.	....	.... the feed-in tariff should be a rate of at minimum 8-10 cents per kw/Hr.

211	Cathie Clarke	I do not support such a low rate for feed-in tariffs, it completely deincentivises buying solar panels. I understand there are times when large amounts of energy is being sent to the grid, but that energy can be used and/or stored and then sold back to customers who require it. It is very unfair to not pay for energy that is being produced by people who have paid for their systems, and then charge them high prices for their own energy that has been stored. Charging lower feed-in tariffs at peak use times to encourage solar panel owners to maximise their energy use at peak production times, is something I do support	Higher feed-in tariffs overall - and not no tariff if energy is being fed in. That equates to theft for me.	A fair price for energy provided to the grid, with incentives for peak times. Home solar panel owners and electricity companies, should be encouraged and supported by government to obtain batteries.

212	Dieter Liebrich	I don't support any of it independently	I don't object any of them particularly, but :	The reason you put forward for the cutting of the feed-in tariff, is that the wholesale price during the middle of the day is negative. So far, it makes sense. However, if the wholesale price is negative, i.e. if there is not enough demand for power in the middle of the day, wouldn't it make more sense to put incentives for people to use power at that time? i.e. pay people to use power at that time??? If the wholesale price is negative, make the retail price negative, too. It's called capitalism, the price is determined by supply and demand. Not only when it suits some people, but full stop. If we apply the negative price to retail prices, then I expect we see very quickly an increased uptake during the day, therefor an increase in the price - wholesale and retail. Turn on you heater/ cooler during the middle of the day if you have a well insulated house, switch the electric Hot Water supply during the day, charge your electric car during the day and be paid for it will create a huge response from consumers. So, therefor, as I said, it's no use looking into one part of the system alone, you need to take it all together : wholesale, retail and feed-in tariffs, the are all connected. How do you even dare to ask about one part of the system, trying to ignore the others ???

213	Patricia Earnshaw	I believe it should be a flat rate but not the ludicrously low 0.04c. I have gone from .64c to 3.3. I have gone to the high expense of putting in solar panels, only to be paid a minimal amount while the electricity providers are profiting from my feed in.	Increase the feed in rate	A fair price where both the retailer and the roof top solar profit equally
214	Chandra Shah	None	The proposed feed-in tariff is set too low. It will discourage new customers. Without more widespread use of community batteries, it is difficult to use all the power genereated from rooftop solar for self consumption. Surely, you can encourage the development of better technology to turn off the coal and gas generators when rooftop solar is generating optimum power. Even if I connected a battery, I would not be able use all the power I am generating from a standard 6.6 kw system, but there are neighbours in the street who do not have solar and could benfit from the power I can donate/sell to them.	not sure but in this day and age there is better technology to enusre those who have invested in solar do get a reasonable return
215	John Mumford	Based on the decision made by the ESC, I do not support the methodology proposed by the ESC. For the ESC to make this decision, they are clearly using the wrong methodology. The ESC is failing to put customers first and is not recognising the community value of home based solar generation.	My understanding is that the Social Value of solar is 2.5c kWh. Clearly, the minimum feed-in tariff should be 2.5c kWh	The ESC should use a methodology that benefits customers to install solar. Taking action to address climate change must be the highest priority.

216	Robert Briggs	I don't know how to answer these questions. For me they are asking the wrong quesions. They presuppose an intimate knowledge of what is bombastically referred to here as "methodology". We've had rooftop solar on our house for 16 years now. It seems the authorities (i.e the people paid to plan ahead and administer the electricity network) have been grossly negligent in failing to cater for the increase in solar power going into the grid during the middle of the day. Wake up you guys! That was foreseeable decades ago. Why haven't you catered for it? To now claim that you can't cope with this household-generated solar power is a terrible indictment on the people whose job it is to plan for the future.	See above	See above
217	Charis Cheng	None	Let the private sector decide	Capitalism and the free market
218	Trevor Nuttall	None.	The proposal should have a fairer feed-in tariff.The comment when the plan was first proposed that it would cost more for for the wholesalers if feed in solar was used for Victorias system. This idea to take all fed in power and pay very little for it means solar systems are delivering a $ bonus as the power supply companies do not need to generate as much power in their generators.By using the feed in from solar systems power at a minimal cost for the company to buy they are going to make more profit.This appears to be the aim of this proposal.	I am not an engineer but their are several countries we could ask how they have succeeded in having a distribution system with a high % of solar feed in working successfully.South Australia is surviving with a high % of solar input.
219	Phillip Anstis	Refer to detailed Submission.	Refer to detailed Submission	Refer to detailed Submission

220	Rodney Chin	I support your efforts in explaining the situation in simple terms and trying to balance out all participants points of view. I also support there is no "Sun Tax" (ie negative feed in tariff" as that would have been like adding insult to injury.	The separation of "spot pricing of whole wholesale electricity/feed in tariffs" and "retail electricity". I understand there is a glut of energy at mid day, but there is still a demand. It is basic robbery that while the generators and PV owners get nothing at mid day, the retail companies still charge approx 66% of the retail price when electricity is supposedly "free/negative". They are an "overhead cost" in the system and are profiteering off the segment that actually does the "work".	If mid day electricity is worth nothing, make it so for everyone. I propose when wholesale electricity is zero or negative then apply the following: 1) Retail electricity should be free, or at the very least be close to "free". This will encourage more focus use of electricity when there is plenty of it. It will help small and large businesses hopefully, and help Australia to be a "low energy cost" industrial environment. It's about time we play to our strengths instead of hobbling our industries. I have solar panels and if my excess electricity is worth nothing, I want it to benefit those struggling now with cost of living, or contribute to Australia in more cost effective businesses, NOT energy retailers taking my electricity for profit. I hope the whole country would alter its time of use and within a few years there won't be any "negative spot prices". 2) I acknowledge that it will be the network companies that will transfer this free energy to where it is needed. From your "Minimum Electricity Feed-in Tariffs from 1 July 2025 Draft Decision 10 January 2025" page 15, there's a graph that shows the "Avoided transmission and distribution losses". I interpret this as PVs generate electricity closer to the homes/city so it doesn't have to travel as far, therefore less losses in the line. Well less travel distance from the PVs should also mean less maintenance. Therefore the network cost should be small for the above free electricity. There's no hard figures on this, but I hope you as the commission keep them honest. Frankly it's about time

				they demonstrate their investment in their network from the "Gold Plating" years from approx 2006-2013. 3) Maybe all "non cost" components of electricity should be a multiple of the whole sale price. This way earnings is shared between all parties. 4) This is not related to setting the whole sale price, but I think it's worth mentioning. As part of the government, we expect you to mange the state to minimise waste and to maximise benefits to all Victorians. While I suspect this is not your responsibility, I think it would go a long way if you passed on the following to the relevant part of the government, STOP the PV rebate NOW and change it to a Battery rebate. If the government doesn't have the money/will to build energy storage facilities then give incentives to the population. Don't get me wrong PVs are good, but right now it sounds like we have an over balance in generation at mid day and bugger all storage for night. Once we balance things out, return the rebate to PVs. BTW, why isn't the SEC building storage systems? It would at least give them a position in the Electricity industry again.
221	Lynn Jenkin	The feed in tariffs should remain the same BUT an increase in payment made not reduced to a few cents. It is disgusting to decrease the amount. I was receiving 60c and now 3c. It is robbery.	Leave as is but increase the amount paid.	Consumers are being ripped off with high electricity costs so it is only fair that the retailers increase the amount. The whole thing doesn't make sense. It is a load of [redacted].

222	Wayne Stewart	None.	All of it.	Feed-in tariffs should be set when the solar system is installed and frozen for the life of the system. Customers have relied upon this information to make the decision of whether or not to install solar based on system pay back, feed-in tariffs etc. I installed my system in December 2021 based on the attached quote which was a feed-in rate of $0.07 kWh. Most of our solar power production goes to the grid - they should be paying us more for using our own infrastructure and allowing them to wind theirs down.
223	Keith Wein	None.	The calculation regarding the feed in rate.	A percentage of the average cost charged by suppliers to the users for the hours being considered.
224	Peter Mills	None	Provide a realistic minimum feed-in tariff given that customers have spent thousands of dollars on their rooftop solar systems. They deserve to get paid for the electricity they provide into the grid.	At least take into account the capital value that consumers have spent on their solar systems and reward them for feeding into the grid system.
225	GEOFF HATTEN	The approach that uses supply and demand market forces to measure the price of electricity.	As a household solar owner without a battery I want to see the fit calculation (options1&2) for peak times increase to make a battery purchase attractive. The current proposed rates do not represent a realistic relationship to my current retail rate of $0.3531 /kWh.	The government must update the carbon price rate of 2.49c/kWh set in 2017. Consider a method which factors in the cost of generating rooftop solar. At the moment the draft esc report is saying solar has nearly no value to the electricity market.

226	Wendy Swaine	I don't support either of them. Power Companies are ripping off Australia's consumers and they get coal, solar power, and gas for free and don't pay taxes. It's time Power companies actually paid proper taxes , and paid proper prices for the free coal,gas and solar power they get for nothing and charge Australians huge inflated prices for.	Every thing. Power Companies are ripping Australian citizens and businesses off. People can't afford to pay the over inflated prices for energy in Australia. It also makes our manufacturing prices uncompetitive and our food prices expensive due to high power prices increasing production costs. The Australian economy is suffering because of largely foreign owned power Companies bleeding us dry financially. Families cannot even afford to pay their power bills. It's making Australia into a third world country and that's not right. It's very unAustralian to look after foreign companies at the expense of your own peoples welfare.	Make our energy companies become Government owned to have fair prices and a good Australian economy like before our gas and coal was privatised. The bad times started for Australian industries and citizens when the SEC and Gas and Fuel was privatised.

227	Matthew Corney	- Recognition of Market-Based Pricing: The ESC's approach of using solar-weighted wholesale prices aligns with real-world electricity market trends. It makes sense that high solar exports during the day reduce the wholesale price, leading to lower feed-in tariffs. - Time-Varying Tariffs Are an Improvement Over a Flat FiT: Having time-varying FiTs is a step in the right direction as it acknowledges that electricity is more valuable during peak demand hours (e.g., evenings). The inclusion of different time bands (day, peak, off-peak) allows for some differentiation in export value. - Consideration of Social Costs of Carbon: The inclusion of social cost of carbon (2.49c/kWh) is positive, as it recognizes the environmental benefits of solar generation but this costing is significantly outdated. At a minimum it should be updated to be at least 3.5 - 5.0c/kWh. By updating the modeling for an updated social cost of carbon between 3.5 - 5.0c/kWh, the FiT should be at least 1.1C - 2.6c/kWh.	A near-zero FiT discourages solar investment and fails to properly account for the long-term grid benefits of distributed solar. The "avoided cost" methodology alone is too narrow, as it does not consider how solar can reduce peak demand on fossil fuel plants or how batteries/VPPs can enhance grid stability. The current proposed peak rates (5.85c – 7.5c/kWh) are too low compared to actual evening wholesale prices, which can be 20c/kWh or more. Solution: Increase the peak period FiT to match actual wholesale market rates (e.g., 10c – 15c/kWh for 4 PM – 9 PM). The current methodology only reflects short-term wholesale prices and does not account for how solar reduces fossil fuel dependency in the long run. The negative wholesale price calculation is problematic because it: Disincentivizes battery and demand-shifting investments. Ignores grid resilience benefits provided by distributed solar.	1. Introduce a Market-Based Dynamic FiT Instead of a Fixed Wholesale Price Estimate - Instead of relying on forward wholesale price estimates, introduce a real-time market-driven FiT that adjusts based on actual supply and demand conditions. Example: - If wholesale prices are low or negative (midday) → FiT is low. - If wholesale prices are high (evening demand spikes) → FiT rises to match peak market rates (e.g., 10c – 20c/kWh). 2. Use a "Solar Dividend" Model Instead of Just a Wholesale Avoided Cost Approach A solar dividend rewards self-consumption and peak-time exports rather than just the wholesale price. This could be a fixed bonus (e.g., 2c – 3c/kWh) paid on top of the market-based FiT for customers who: - Use their own solar power instead of exporting midday. - Export during peak demand periods. - Participate in VPP or demand response programs. 3. Introduce a Storage Incentive Instead of a Pure FiT Reduction Rather than just lowering the FiT, introduce a battery storage incentive to encourage households to store their solar for later use instead of exporting at midday. Example:

				- Homeowners with batteries get a higher FiT for evening exports. - Government provides grants or low-interest loans for battery storage.
228	peter ryan	none	all of it	increase the feed in tariff to allow consumers to recoup the cost of their system
229	Stewart Gruneklee	The minimum feed-in tariff cannot be negative.	The human health cost benefit of the reduction of fossil fuels by the increase in solar must be greater than zero and factored into the methodology	There should be consideration given to the amortisation of the cost of installing solar and batteries over the life of systems owned by householders. This appears to be totally neglected in the current methodology of the proposal by referring to "free" electricity from exports. There is a capital cost to the consumer to make it possible to export and it is only fair that the exporter be reimbursed at a rate that takes amortisation of those capital costs into account in combination with the avoided cost of importing electricity.
230	Robert Brown	The time-varying component.	The solar feed-in tariff.	A fair return for those who have invested in solar installations including rooftop solar. See my proposed alternative solution.
231	Jon Sestokas	None, it is all based on forecast and ignores the real dollar value of electricity traded in the market	Use actual dollar settlement figures. Examine price paid for solar feed in and the price it is on sold for. New feed in tariffs are close to outright power theft.	Forget the fixation on wholesale price. Focus on contract settlement price and retail price.

232	Christopher Moss	Most of the time, rooftop solar is fed into the local electricity network, and is consumed locally. As the ESC notes, a PV owner pays full retail prices for electricity it imports and will be paid the (near zero) feed-in price for exports from July. However, a kilowatt-hour of electricity exported, for much of the time, is sold to a nearby neighbour for the full retail price, and the network operator is paid a 'postage stamp' price for use of the network averaged over the whole system, not the actual marginal cost of providing the local network.	The low feed in tariff rate should be accompanied by a low retail rate to encourage the use of surplus power during the summer daytime	Under the recent change in the National Energy Objective, policy makers must factor in a carbon price, at present around $70/tonne of emissions. If a kWh of PV export avoids the need for a kWh of gas generation, should it get credit for avoiding the social cost of about 4 cents/kWh? The ESC does incorporate a carbon price in its calculation. ESC says it allows 2.49 cents/kWh according to a 2017 ruling. It is 2025.
233	Robert Marston	None.	Change all to flat rate of 50% of current electricity supply tariff.	I don't know.

234	Shane McClelland	I can understand the need to help curtail the sheer amount of power being put into the grid from underutilised solar input and the inevitable rise in demand in the evening. However this proposed rate will completely undercut the savings that solar panels provide and will make the solar panels on our roof an expensive and ugly decoration with some small savings to be had. I agree with a splitting of the tariff for the times of day, but not to this level.	The rate of tariff is shocking. It has already dropped at a considerable rate from when it was first introduced. I understand this has to do with the amount of solar panels installed in the country. But surely electricity generated from homes is cheaper than what is generated at power plants? I understand there is ongoing costs of line maintenance, upgrades and expansion, but they would be there without the solar input. Households have borne most of the costs of the solar systems and there is no ongoing costs to you for the creation of this power. This tariff drop is to the point that homeowners will be turned off from installing or replacing solar panels. This would only increase the draw on the grid, the emissions produced and affect Australia's goal of reduced emissions and clean energy.	I believe the split tariff is a good idea. Provided it is paired with battery rebates. If more households have batteries, then the timing of power put into the grid can be released at the best times to avoid surges or lulls. If more households have batteries that can be used as house 'powerplants' by the grid by agreement - much like Tesla do - I believe this can alleviate most of the issues of power generation. It would provide a lot more relability and localise the power creation, potentially reducing the need for extensive lines crossing across the country. With the rebates, it will be come more affordable and economically viable to install batteries. Most installers I have talked to have told me that most batteries will be lucky to pay for themselves before they need to be replaced. This coupled with the large upfront cost is a major turnoff.
235	Louisa Marston	None. Energy providers will make money off our rooftop solar that they get for me. Yes they pay for the infrastructure, but we also pay for the GENERATING infrastructure. This is literal robbery.	All of it. First identify the profit per kw energy companies are charging for redirecting excess rooftop solar owners, then pay 70% profits (to cover infrastructure costs) to household and 30% to energy companies (to cover infrastructure costs).	Identify the profit per kw energy companies are charging for redirecting excess rooftop solar owners, then pay 70% profits (to cover infrastructure costs) to household and 30% to energy companies (to cover infrastructure costs. Set a minimum that energy companies have to pay for power, just like energy companies set our price.

236	Greg Robertson	None	All of them	Flat price for residential feed-in, anytime of the day. The feed-in should not be treated as 'free' energy by the wholesaler and we should recevie fair compensation for the solar power generation. An alterantive may be: 1) no feed in purchase, but 2) waive the daily grid conenction charge for customers with solar PV. That would provide a small compensation for our power generation.

Notes: Submissions that claimed confidentiality were considered in our decision-making process but cannot be displayed. We also provided redaction to offensive or defamatory content based on the ‘Submission and privacy collection statement’ on our Engage Victoria consultation webpage.