From: joe lenzo

Submission:

"time of use" tariffs make a lot of sense. should help reduce load requirements during peak periods.

when my rebate expires I will be adding more solar and battery back up and put nothing back into the grid. cheaper to generate my own than buy from retailers at high price and get low price when they buy from me.

From: rhonda keogh

Submission:

im not in favour of a single f.i.t offered by retailers they would not pay a fair price if left to them my last $\,$ account i used 435 kwhs solar generated 1395kwh . i wouldlike to see a single price of around 18_20 c/kwh not 9.9 c/kwh its not a fair price for doing the right thing

From: Peter Galvin

Submission:

The only solar owners able to avail themselves of the proposed O/P (nightime) rates would be those with battery storage, ditto for the 6-9 half of the Mon - Fri peak time slot of 3-9, and ditto again for 40% of the shoulder timeslots. No incentive whatsoever.

From: Wendy Tanner

Submission:

Governments and businesses seem to support a user pays economy. I pay bank fees, gas fees, health insurance fees and have no input into the charges for same. As a generator if electricity provided to the grid however it is government and the end user, electricity supply companies recieving and storing generated electricity, that set the price for my generated electricity. The proposed feed in tariffs are best for periods after the sun has gone down for the better part of the year. On what basis is "shoulder" deemed to be the lions share of the electricity generating day from 7am to 3pm? The maximum rate of at least 29cents / kWh should be from 7.00 to 20.00.

A single feed in tariff rate of an appalling 9.9 c/kWh is an insult and does not recognise the benefits suppliers receive from generated solar power. Flat rate should be dropped from the proposal. Suppliers should all be bound by standard minimum rates which fairly value the service solar generators provide.

From: Tim Winter

Submission:

Dear Sir or Madam

At present I receive a Premium Feed in Tariff for my solar input into the grid. The is supposed to remain in place until 2024. As a retiree who invested in solar panels in 2007, I hope this is not under threat.

From: Liz Pain

Submission:

As a solar panel owner I find it disappointing that solar owners are being penalised with what the Essential Services Commission has proposed. The Essential Services Commission (ESC) has proposed the dropping of the single rate Feed in Tariff, currently standing at 11.3c/kWh, to a low 9.9c/kWh. This is well below the time varying of the off peak and shoulder tariffs proposed. I am also concerned that while the ESC expects that the offering of a "time-of-use" solar tariff will become compulsory over time, that there will be a transition period where retailers can offer a "single rate" FiT. If left to retailers to decide, will they end up only offering the single rate tariff with decreased benefit to solar owners?

I also find it incredulous that my power bill from 1st January 2018 has risen by 14.45% and yet my FEED IN TARIFF HAS NOT RISEN.

One other issue is that, James Clinch, manager of regulatory reform at the ESC, said for the consumers to 'orientate their panels to the west, rather than the north (to produce more later in the day), to change demand patterns, or to install battery storage'. I have a north facing roof. Again I am being penalised for doing the right thing in having solar panel on my roof.

My question to Mr James Clinch is who pays for this reorientation an battery storage? Is he proposing a change to the Government solar initiative to allow current north facing owners to be allowed to access a variation to also receive discounts on installing added west facing panels and batteries?

I also find it appalling that Mr James Clinch is more concerned about the service providers then those, small as it may be, who (are voters) are doing their part to reduce global warming.

Thank you for taking on board my concerns. Liz Pain

From: RICHARD BOUWMEESTER

Submission:

Encouragement must remain for the general public to maintain their enthusiasm of employing solar power. Rather than installation subsidies the focus should change to ongoing subsidy tied to the amount of power you generate from your solar panels. The more power you generate the higher should be the return. This is linked back to the higher installation costs of a larger system from the beginning

From: Carlo Canteri

Submission:

Meaningless structure? Think hours of Sunlight ...

Of Peak - to 7am: about 1 hourday available in summer, zero in winter.

Shoulder 7-3pm: 7-8 hours in summer @ 10.3 cKwH; 6-7 hrs winter...

Peak 3-7pm summer @ 29ckwh; 3-5pm winter

My rough calculation is that we would be better off about \$500 yr for our 3kw system with the 3 varied rates compared to the current 11.3 cday and less of course cf. the 'new' rate of 9.9.

And + or - for seasonal and meteorological factors ??!!

A battery + 2kw more of solar panels looks attractive ...

From: Peter Lightbody

Submission:

I would like to keep the feed in tariff at 11.3 cents at all costs thank you,

From: Wickham Gill

Submission:

I would like to see the week day periods as follows, Morning Shoulder - 7am to 10am Peak - 10am to 4pm Evening Shoulder - 4pm to 7am

During the winter most areas of Victoria only have PV effective sunshine from around 8:30am to 4:30pm so these times would maximize the advantage for most PV households.

Regards Wickham Gill Horsham Vic

From: Rosemary Jacobs

Submission:

I wish to advocate for a

variable feed in Tarif rate for rooftop solar power. Leaving power companies to a llow only a (reduced) flat rate decreases incentives to install solar panels. Solar e nergy is available and cheap and we should be encour

From: Chris Judd

Submission:

Concept is good, shoulder and off peak rates are atrocious, all rates should at least be what retailers are forcing us to pay for these times of use! Regards Chris Judd

From: Sharlene Williams

Submission:

I have yet to find a good deal for my solar feed in I had hoped when I put solar on I'd see a better return however I have not. I want a big better rise in percentage thanks. Sharlene

From: Bruce Atkin

Submission:

I don't support any proposal that would see a drop in the price paid by retailers to small scale suppliers of energy such as myself. A varying price - peak, shoulder and off-peak - has merit in encouraging battery storage, but I would consider it unfair should a flat rate decrease below the present level.

From: Siegfried Angerer

Submission:

The current proposal does not encourage nor reward the uptake of solar plus storage. A much better proposal would be a price cap on daily charges not exceeding 50 cents plus a fixed FIT of 15 cents per kwh to encourage not only storage but to transition the large energy companies into behind the meter technologies. In addition to this simplified plan we need to see a tax plan for industry, state government departments (e.g. Dept of education) that will integrate state Renewable energy zones into 40 MW self-generating and selfstorage zones. This would work similar to the policy I wrote for India. E.g a 20% self-generation and storage solution for each 40MW REZ would attract a 15 cent in the dollar tax for the duration of the project - typically four to 7 years. Industry and community groups can combine and stagger 20% self-generation and storage solution up to 100% until 2050. Upon completion of each 20% selfgeneration and storage project the tax reduction is no longer needed as the savings in energy costs deliver significant commercial and domestic cost reductions as well as grid integrity level. Combining a smart targeted tax plan at Federal level with a state based strategic localized DER generation and storage plan is the best way forward for Australia.

From: Mario Kohler

Submission:

Another rip off by the big company.

We make the investment and they enjoy the benefits
Is time we get a fair price for KW, because we help to support the electricity problem ,and we help the company,
to increase they profit
Is time the Authority take stand against this abuse.

From: GRAEME Walters

Submission:

The flat rate should stay at the present 11.3 cents. The peak rate of 29 cents will encourage the installation of PV cells on west facing walls which is OK

From: M. Georgiou

Submission:

I don't agree with energy retailers having the choice to pay a flat, single rate of 9.9c/kWh – a price that is less than the current 11.3c/kWh minimum, and even less than the 'shoulder' period price of 10.3c/kWh. There should be no disadvantage to the solar owner. There should also be no disadvantage to solar owners on the older 66 cent rebate. I also do not like the time-varying minimum feed-in tariff rates. It is too confusing and is only geared to those few who have battery storage as no-one generates solar at night without a battery. The flat rate should either remain as 11.3c or be higher. It is cheaper to pay these rates to solar owners than build and maintain a new power station!

From: Donald Ash

Submission:

I am not in favour of a single rate feed-in tariff of 9.9c/kWh at all times. I am however in favour of a time-varying feed-in tariff as per your draft. I consider it is a fairer deal for people like myself that have installed extra solar panels so as to help the environment and help by supplying extra to the grid.

From: Gabrielle Doolan

Submission:

Dear Essential Services Commission,

While I am glad that you are finally proposing a peak tariff for rooftop solar, I note that the proposed changes give retailers the option to offer 9.9c/kWh at all times. This is well below the 11.3 c/kWh tariff that is currently in place and is even lower than the shoulder rate offered on the time-varying feed-in tariff. Of course retailers are going to only end up offering the single rate tariff that you are proposing. This is obviously detrimental to solar owners and I fail to see why the single rate feed in tariff should be lower than the current tariff.

It's high time that solar owners stop being treated unfairly, so I recommend that only the time-varying feed-in tariff be made available to retailers.

From: sheila pollard

Submission:

The single rate tariff is below the 11.3c/kWh in place today and lower than the shoulder rate offered on the time-varying FiT. Retailers should not have the decision in any way to influence these figures, otherwise encourage greed, and decreased benefit to solar owners. The reverse should be to help these owners, not hinder them.

From: Robert & Anne Davie

Submission:

Solar power households should not be worse off under any new scheme Prices should be encouraging more solar.

From: Brenton Arnold

Submission:

time varying rates based on what major retailers get should be fair to everyone.

From: david gnaniah

Submission:

35.3c/kWh tariff

From: Barry Grant

Submission:

My Submission to:

Victorian Essential Services Commission Minimum Electricity Feed-In Tariffs to Apply From 1 July 2018 - Draft Decision

I lodge the following submission regarding your paper, with background, comments and suggestions as to the solar feed-in tariffs and time scales proposed.

Background

Renewable energy is not a passing fad nor is it going away. Residential Solar, hydro and wind farms are major components, with large scale solar and batteries catching up.

It is time for all energy industry parties to work collaboratively rather than in isolation. Renewable energy

and batteries alone are not the answer in the short term, we still need base-load generators to fill the gaps and ensure a stable reliable power supply. Reside ntial solar, being local, can reduce the need for more long distance interstate electricity inter-connectors from coal-fired generators.

The lack of a national energy policy has been detrimental, as has the political mis information being disseminated by both levels of government. And we won t mention natural gas!!

I have observed over the last 5 years, a confrontational attitude between the reta ilers (and governments) and their customers, both residential and business, with the energy industry calling the shots.

Residential (Small scale) solar has gained in popularity since about 2010. Feedin tariffs (FIT) have reduced dramatically, from the unrealistic 60c/kWh in the early days, to 25c, to 6c, and then recently increased up to 11.3c. The decision to in stall in the early days was often driven by the high PFIT (to help offset high instal lation costs), as well as the increasing price of retail electricity. Installations have continued to increase as solar costs reduce and electricity costs continue to clim b, even though the payback period lengthened because of the lower FIT.

I installed 2.4Kw of solar in 2012 with 25c FIT, and added another 2.0Kw in 2017 even with 6c FIT. My rationale was to reduce energy costs, contribute to reduce d base-

load power generation by feeding surplus power back into the grid for local cons umption, with a resulting environmental impact.

I see this proposal as an attempt to bring the major parties closer and work towards a common goal. There was a major objection among small retail customers, r

eceiving 6c/kWh for any excess power into the grid, to then see the retailers on-sell it for 25-40c/kWh, less network costs.

Feed-in Tariffs

Residential Solar owners have argued since the demise of the $25c\,FIT$, for a realistic rate. The $6c\,rate\,was$, frankly, insultin

From: kevin birchall

Submission:

Feed in tarrifs should remain unchanged.

From: James Chan

Submission:

Submission to the ESC re. Feed-in Tariff.

I congratulate the ESC in the initial draft proposal for a time-of-use solar tariff to more accurately reflect the demands on the electricity grid, and the role that solar can play in reducing the demands on other electricity producing sources. My concern is that there is an option that retailers may have to offer a single flat rate vs a time of use rate, and that the single flat rate of 9.9c/kWh is actually less than what is the minimum rate of 11.3c/kWh. Households who produce solar should not be worse off than the current situation. I suggest that the single rate should be the same as the current rate, and that the decision should be up to the consumer/solar household to decide which tariff they prefer based on their use, and encourage further take up of roof top solar.

Yours SIncerely,

James Chan

From: Seh Leong

Submission:

The new Tariff is a joke and a rip-off. Whilst it gives an illusion to have a much higher feed in rate at peak, the reality is that power generation drop to below 40% from 2pm. There will be a net reduction in feed in tariff. This is a trick to get people to agree to the new tariff because they knew there isn't much solar power in Victoria after 2pm.

From: Michael Gowty

Submission:

I ll go for the 3 to 10pm peak rate thanks. I think the 29 cent rate should be for everyone all the time. Thanks.

From: Wendy Mullett

Submission:

As we are on a high feed in tariff under contract until 2024, these changes will not affect us, but any changes to the actual amount we get for what we use will. I hope that it stays the same. Solar is becoming more popular and should not be vetted out of the system because governments get more from Coal producers.

From: john jarrott

Submission:

The proposal to offer a flat rate of 9.9 cents is manifestly inadequate in light of the current feed-in-tariff of 11.3 cents. Why should an electricity retailer be able to offer such a low feed in rate then sell my electricity to my neighbour for more than 30 cents per KW/hour. I choose time of day feed in rate.

From: Ian Dickson

Submission:

Retailers to submit any pricing scheme for domestic solar production rather than setting any price they choose. This latter scheme smacks of putting the fox in charge of the hen house. As of now we are subsidising the shareholders.

From: Johan de Bree

Submission:

The Essential Services Commission

Dear Commissioners,

I understand you are reviewing feed in tariffs for the exported power to the grid from domestic rooftop Solar.I'm very disappointed with how you have set up the proposed feedin rates.

The SHOULDER rate is far to low.

A rate of 20c/kWh which is about HALF of what retailers charge us would seem reasonable rate.

Roof top solar is taking the load off

the National Grid and at the same time reducing Australia's Carbon Dioxide output helping meet our Global Emissions target in the fight against Global Warming.

We deserve a better deal.

Thankyou

From: Rodney Waterman

Submission:

Since mid-2016 I have run a 4.1kWh home solar system. I have felt that, despite the recent increase in FiT to 11.3c/kWh, household solar grid input is undervalued and underpriced. In a smart, decentralised grid, the empowerment, fair and realistic remuneration of individual household, small business, regional and community input will be a key element to future grid efficiency and utility.

I support the concept of time varying feed-in tariffs (VFiT) for the following reasons:

- (1) VFiT would provide incentives for investment in batteries, thus reducing electricity costs to other consumers;
- (2) Consumers and businesses would respond to the initiative by feeding power to the grid at the times when it is most needed (i.e. peak);
- (3) Solar users, particularly those using batteries, would be paid a fairer remuneration for the power they feed in.
- (4) Electricity prices would therefore reduce due to these reforms.

I am opposed to any reduction in the the current FiT to a lesser single rate FiT (9.9c/kWh). This would be grossly unfair and undervalue the significant and growing input made by consumers.

Rodney Waterman

From: Buzz Rainbow Wolf

Submission:

Don't erode the FITif you change it to less only power companies will benefit ...Solar Citizen has worked hard to advocate on behalf of solar system owners and we who support renewables that mitigate climate change deserve full support in legislation and energy policy ,not greedy corporations

From: Robert Burdett

Submission:

A time-varied feed-in tariff is a good idea in principle.

On average I export three times the amount that I import.

If my retailer only offered me a 9.9 cent flat rate I would change to another retailer.

I am currently paying my retailer 33.33 c/kWh for peak time use (7am to 11pm Mon. to Fri.) and 17.66 cents all other times. (GST excluded).

The proposed shoulder rate seems low relative to the rates I pay for importing electricity.

From: Michael Wakefield

Submission:

More than happy to accept TOU fits. However instead of the flat rate being lowered perhaps it should be costed at shoulder rates. Also not much interested in either the Retailers or Distributors deciding who get what. I want to decide because I have zero faith in the ability of Retailers or Distributors to offer what is fair. Fair for them is what makes the most revenue. At least give me some say in how I wish my exports to be priced. Personally I prefer the spot price, when its low I will self consume and when it's high I will export and gouge much like the Generators do now. Thanks for the opportunity to make a submission. Mike.

From: Dr David Kennedy

Submission:

Australia is in the position to make an important decision: to support the long term move to a more renewable energy economy and potentially become an energy exporting country (as per the work of ARENA), or get left behind in this time of change. It is clear that moving from the current spoke-and-hub model of electricity generation to a more distributed system is economically viable and would lead to a more stable electrical distribution system where failures of current base load systems (coal and gas) are less likely to impact a large number of people or industries. Think of the distributed nature of the internet where bringing down one node does not impact the movement of data throughout the network. Our electricity system can be designed with that kind of redundancy built in to it. If it works for data, it would work for power. Both are fundamentally just electrons moving through a conductor. Why spend over \$2 billion building wires to move power from the Snowy Mountains to other states, when the \$2b could be spent on distributed pumped hydro as per the report from ARENA.

Clever policies that encourage people to spend their own money on solar PV/battery combinations save the government money and create a distributed electricity storage system that can mitigate power shortages. This would seem to be a 'no brainer': encouraging people to fund the development of a distributed electrical system for Australia.

I totally oppose allowing electrical companies to opt out of their responsibilities by allowing them to offer a low fixed tariff with NO premium tariff. It is beyond shortsighted that such a situation could even be considered by the review body.

Sincerely, Professor David M Kennedy

From: Sandra Firth-Williamson

Submission:

I do not believe we should be paid any less than the minimum of 11.3 cents per kWh. Given the chance, electricity companies ill pay as little as possible.

From: Diana Trainor

Submission:

The esc expects that the offering of a "Time of use "solar tariff will become compulsory over time but there will be a transition period where retailers can offer a single 'rate "Fit The single rate tariffs well below 11.3ck Wh tariff currently in place and even lower than the "shoulder" Rate offered on the time varying Fit. If left to retailers to decide, will they end up only offering the single rate tariff with decreased benefits to solar owners?

From: Hilary Gormley

Submission:

Definitely a no no. Why should current rooftop solar exporters keep giving into the retailers? They supply a cheap source of energy already, why should they be further penalised. If anything we should be paid more.

From: Barry Dingle

Submission:

Dear ESC,

The proposal for the 3 Tier Feed-In Tariff is Very Good. It better reflects the VALUE of Feed-In Power to the Grid.

From: Bill Little

Submission:

single rate tariff should be closer to the rate charged per kWh. At least 20 cents. All rates should be closer. When my panels went in I broke even for two quarters and made money in one, now I am flat breaking even in the summer quarter and I am on the premium rate.

From: Jenny Macgill

Submission:

It is disappointing that proposed changes to feed in tariffs for solar panel owners who invested in order to reduce dependence on dirty electricity production and therefore reduce emissions in order to help save our planet are once more a target. Why does the ESC wish to introduce Time of use tarriffs which may eventually be the lowest possible rate. Please respect the investment made by household solar owners whose generated electricity is worth less than that produced by the big companies.

From: Alison Wright

Submission:

I bought a solar system and battery late last year knowing then that the Victorian Government had implemented an 11.3c feed in tariff. This is not a huge tariff but for the good of the planet, we figured the 9+ years it will take us to pay it off assuming nothing goes wrong with the system was a cost we had to bare. My husband thinks he will be out of work in the next 3 to 5vyears which will make it very tough, but for you to pull the rug out from under us and say the hugely profiteering Electrical companies can set a transitional voluntary price of less than this is very cruel. The north side of our roof is shaded by the neighbors trees so we had to place our panels in a less than optimal spot on the wrong side of our roof. This means even if we were to be offered the higher peak rebate, we would not be producing any solar at that time therefore unable to take advantage of the higher price. The minimum price set for a solar feed in Tarif should not fall below the current 11.3c but rise if anything. Surely the people who are trying to do the right thing and help Australia reach its Targets for reducing Carbon should be given some recognition, not just looking after the already wealthy pockets of the coal industry. What insentive is there for people to buy solar or to do the right thing if tariffs can be reduced at any time. Government need to be encouraging the transition to green not penalising those who have already contributed or may wish to in the future. I applaud the peak rate but not at the cost of the minimum feed in rate.

From: Geoff Ward

Submission:

What a joke a feed in tariff of less than 29.0 at all times is only supporting the distributor not the person who has spent thousands of dollars who are supporting green energy. any government who supports the persons who feed into the system will bolt in on any election. I and others are angry that we support the lifestyles of just a few while we sit home in the cold getting little to no benefit from our solar systems.

From: Kelvin Anderson

Submission:

I would not like to lose my 11.3 c FIT . I'm open to the idea of a time of use FIT but wouldn't like to see energy companies having control of the minimum FIT . Solar users have spent a great deal of money for their solar and should be entitled to have the maximum payback for free energy put back into the gid especially during the summer period. Solar users already disadvantaged bypaying more to energy companies with their usage rates and supply charges . This summer I have seen a great difference in my energy bill simply because we have an 11.3c FIT since it was lifted from 5c FIT. Please if your going to have peak tariffs you must not let power companies have control of the minimum FIT . As it is energy prices have skyrocketed from the 1st jan this year .

From: laurie tuddin

Submission:

I think the elect companies make enough money and can pay 50% of the rates charged per peak period . it is elect feed into the grid with no charge at all to them and they can on sell for 50% gain . the householder pays for this investment not them so we should at least get this

From: Maureen Andrew

Submission:

As a lay person it is difficult to access enough information to confirm whether accepting the 'variable tariff feed in' would balance out annually against a 'one off single rate tariff' BUT I do not agree nor support that one off tariff being offered at the rate of 9.9c/kWh especially when I am under the impression that the power companies will then on-sell any excess power from my property at around 33c/kWh. At this rate it will take me 20 years to make it worthwhile to have purchased solar by balancing out the kWh benefits against the cost of panels.

From: WILLIAM ATTARD

Submission:

PV SOLAR POWER IS A SUSTAINABLE POWER SOURCE WHICH MEANS THAT RETAILERS BY IT AT MEASLEY 11.3C/KWH AND SELL IT AT 28C PER KWH . SOLAR PROVIDERS SHOULD BE PAID AT LEAST THE WHOLESALE RATE PER KWH

From: Jenny Smith

Submission:

Existing customers should not be worse off with the new proposals

From: Dolores Neilley

Submission:

Anything less than current 11.3 cents per K/H as a minimum is not acceptable. Encouraging battery purchase is unwise as most of us can not afford it and is an act of lack of solidarity towards those unable to install solar panels but willing to purchase 100% clean Solar energy.

Expecting people to switch off appliances between 3 and 7 pm is a fallacy: people can not do it if it is very hot. Wasn't to have enough energy supply? Help more people to get solar panels on their roofs. That is the only way.

From: Chrissy	Geddes
---------------	--------

Submission:

Give us something back

From: Peter Geddes

Submission:

Listen to the people that voted you in Victoria is getting to expensive to live in, give us something back!!!!

From: Warren McLaren

Submission:

The feed in tariff must consider the following benefits provided by roof top solar: Environmental:

Reduced CO2 emissions.

Reduced overall impact to the environment – land, water, and air.

Reduced cost of power to consumers:

Consider what new sources of power or upgrades to existing sources would be required to meet:

What power is not being consumed by residential customers with solar installations,

What power is being fed into the grid by residential customers with solar installations

Given the above – a fair feed in tariff – would be one that:

Is calculated as a % of the cost of power provided by the electricity providers – this allows the feed in tariff to vary with the retail price.

The feed in tariff must also be more during peak periods.

Therefore – a fair feed in tariff – would be as follows:

At least 50% during off peak times

At least 85% during peak times

From: Geoffrey Linnell

Submission:

The bottom line for this proposal is that solar owners feeding into the grid should not be worse off than present. The proposal to allow energy companies to offer a flat rate feed in tariff lower than the current minimum FiT during the transition period disadvantages solar owners.

From: Phil Oates

Submission:

I definitely oppose the single flat rate of 9.9c/kWh and would have to do the sums at the equinox to see if (that would give an average for the year) to see if the time-varying feed in tariff would leave consumers better or worse off.

From: Paul Webster

Submission:

Looking at the proposed figures I am surprised to see the farcical figure of 7.2c for any solar power fed in between 10:00am -7:00am. The facts are that no Solar is generated at this time so why even include it.

The shoulder rate of 10.3 would appear reasonable but again why make 9pm-10pm a shoulder figure – solar is rarely if ever generated at this time. The peak rate for fed in solar between 3pm and 9pm is a fitting acknowledgement for power fed into the grid. However, it is detrimental to say that this rate will not apply for weekend solar power fed into the grid. This peak rate should apply for all seven days of the week, not just Monday to Friday.

The reals test of this proposal will be the rates for which we are charged for power consumed and the daily supply charge. With power companies increasing their prices annually of between 9.5% and 14% there needs to be a more realistic control and limiting of these increases. They are not in keeping with inflation and are placing huge stress on those who can least afford it.

From: Norm Henry

Submission:

We have a 5kW Solar System which has been in operation since 2012. I have a spread sheet which I maintain as a means of evaluation of the system over time.

Since installation the system has generated approx 42,000 kWh. On average, the system has generated approx 1.8kWh / hr. In 2017 Solar generated was 4200kWh. The average FIT for this period was 10.3c/kWh. Our FIT rate to Jan 2017 was 28c/kWh. Our current FIT is 11.8c/kWh.

This generated Solar Power is not considered insignificant for a Small Scale Installation. Replicated across Australia, the reality is that Small Scale Solar is not given sufficient credit for how it is able to support Peak Loads. The issue is that the Supplier is able to access and sell the generated excess at a rate that is considered inadequate. My understanding is that independent and reliable assessment is that the true and reasonable FIT is in the vicinity of 15 – 18c /kWh. The rates included in the draft are assessed as follows.

The 9.9c would be 19% below the current rate we receive of 11.8c.

The variable rates are also significantly less than our current rate.

In my view the max rate of 29c suggested for the period 3-9pm, would seem only to be of value to Wind generation etc unless Battery storage is in place.

I would see little if any value to Small Scale Solar unless Battery Storage was in place. Off Peak and shoulder rates are also below our existing FIT rates and as such are disappointing.

This review does little to support current and future Small Scale Installations.

From: Lois Doeven

Submission:

I am totally off the grid and wish to just express the thought that people putting power into the grid should be paid what it costs for power companies to produce that same amount of power using their polluting methods. Solar owners have stepped up and paid for their systems, made a sound environmental decision for the good of us all, and should not be screwed in any way. If all households were strongly encouraged to have their own power supply, it would be a huge benefit to all concerned.

From: Kim McConchie

Submission:

While the variable rate has a few quirks - I'm not sure who is effectively producing solar power for the second shoulder period, 9pm-10pm - it is still a better proposition than the alternative flat rate; allowing a retailer to only offer a flat rate alternative which is, at best, paltry is almost an insult to the consumers. If this is an allowed option what retailer would offer the variable alternative? Seriously, the flat rate option is below current market prices paid, so either up it significantly if it is an option that can be offered, or make the offer of both types of rates mandatory. To do otherwise is unfair and ultimately self defeating for retailers if it pushes more consumers to alternatives such as community retailer/mini grid or off grid setups. They are the future, and for many of us outside of major city centres, they are quickly becoming the near future if not in progress already.

From: Antoinette Tidey

Submission:

I've been paying for electricity for 54yrs. I had solar installed in my home 5yrs ago after selling my previous house. I don't see the logic in cutting rebate again since I've only started getting 11cents just recently. My son won't install it because he says it's not reasonably any better. Not any incentive to be eco conscious for the next generation. My system cost me \$17000 which means I'll be lucky to break even before I die. But I had extra finance. I would have done it sooner because I believe in making the future better.

From: Bruce Chugg

Submission:

I can't believe the goal posts are now being shifted which to me are to discriminate against Solar Citizens. To suggest a "single rate" option of less than the current 11.3 c/kWh whilst purchased kWh's continue to increase at around 15% is not on.

The OFF PEAK proposal for Melbourne users is simply crazy and not applicable. And then I would demand that the SHOULDER be left at 11.3 c/kWh.

The proposal for the PEAK at 29 c/kWh is certainly acceptable even though consumers may receive a minimal benefit because of meal preparation where households rely on electricity for cooking...which is my situation. In summary 11.3 cents is a very modest return per kWh to people like myself who have recognized the need to supply renewable energy if we are to have any chance of arresting global warming. Quite simply electricity is an essential service for all, but where we now have private companies from generation through to transmission/poles & wires, distributors and in Victoria some 23 odd retailers all whose sole aim is to make a dollar for their shareholders. There are simply too many fingers in this essential service pie. Having installed solar in August 2017, I am still having great difficulty in resolving tariffs and smart meter configuration due to failures by both my retailer and distributor (United Energy). Like all my ex work associates...we all plead to please bring back the SECV

From: Dean Wheeler

Submission:

A fair price needs to be paid for energy supplied to the grid by consumers who have solar panels. The rate needs to be sufficient to encourage the installation of solar panels by consumers. The single rate tariff needs to be more in line with the current 11.3c/kWh rather than the 9.9c/kWh, as energy retailers will tend just to use the flat rate to reduce their costs, rather than what is best for the long term. The option of a time-varying feed in tariff is good, as if rates are set appropriately it will encourage investment in battery storage by consumers with solar panels, or investment in both by consumers. The peak tariff would need to be set at a good rate for this investment to take place by consumers, which in the long run will lead to lower energy costs for all.

From: John Herbert

Submission:

Suggest that single rate FiT should not be below our current 11.3 c tariff which as it is already too low.

From: Keith Altmann

Submission:

I support a TOU tariff as this will encourage the most efficient economic outcome to generate adequate supply. Yes, it will encourage a higher % of west facing PV and probably battery take-up. A flat tariff will discourage the most efficient investment in the PV energy generation and usage and slow the achievement of the urgent need for a lower emission output across the energy sector.

From: wayne Bolton

Submission:

My retailer is currently charging a peak and off peak tariff only with the offpeak only kicking in after 11pm.

All peak, off peak and shoulder periods should be consistent throughout the market.

i also support feed in tariffs as a proportion of the mean retail tariffs as per the proposed.

Setting the rate as a % of the retail rate would alleviate having to negotiations a new rate each year.

If there is to be a fixed rate for an interim period, it should not be less than the current 11.3c

From: Russell Vernon

Submission:

This proposal has not been well publicised. I don't think I would have known about it except for Solar Citizens. In principle the varying feed-in tariffs should benefit all consumers and the grid. My objection is that the choice of tariffs is transferred into the hands of the retailers and not the customer. It is madness to think that any retailer will not jump at the chance to reduce the feed-in tariff from the statutory 11.3 cents to the single rate FIT of 9.9 cents. The time varying FITs should be either the current statutory single rate of 11.3 or the proposed time of use tariffs – AT THE CHOICE OF THE CONSUMER NOT THE WHOLESALER OR RETAILER. After only a few months of the mandatory minimum FIT it looks like the ESC is already abdicating its responsibility to consumers and caving in to the energy lobby. It's a good proposal but only if the choice is in the hands of solar consumers. Russell Vernon

From: Jeremy Klitzing

Submission:

Dear Regulator

The potential of a time-varying feed-in tariff is very exciting for the following reasons:

- 1. In the short term, householders and businesses will be incented to feed power into the grid at the times of greatest need and in a distributed manner
- 2. In the long term, householders and businesses will be incented to remain connected to the grid
- 3. Into the future the periods and rates of the different feed-in tariff rates could be varied to provide a method of tuning the incentives to influence householder and business behaviour around grid feed-in timing, geometry of PV panel and investment in battery storage

Each of these is explored in more detail below.

1. Incentive to feed into the grid at times of greatest need and in a distributed manner

The peakiness of power consumption due to the nature of modern loads has made the management of the system increasingly difficult. Providing price signals to consumers to feed power into the grid at peak times will lower demand on centralised generators and reduce the duration of critical peak periods. Further this can provide significant savings and reduce the potential for shortfalls (https://energysynapse.com.au/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/Energy-Synapse-12Oct17-Impact-of-small-solar-PV-on-the-NSW-wholesale-electricity-market.pdf).

An additional benefit is that the power is produced in a distributed manner so network loads will be reduced, thus increasing reliability and reducing the potential for gold-plating of the network to cope with the critical peaks.

2. Incentive to remain connected to the grid

The vast majority of Australians recognise that the electricity grid is a critical social good. However, a massive risk to this social good is that the price /performance of photovoltaic panels and storage batteries is improving beyond all expectations. The up-front cost of going off-grid is falling. At the same time the price that consumers pay for electricity is soaring. (In addition, many consumers are tired of the energy company's cavalier attitude toward them.)

These two tends are already causing some consumers to embrace off-grid solutions. The barrier to this is the capital cost and that barrier is falling. At this point, only consumers with sufficient financial resources can go off-grid but the quantum of the necessary resources is falling. The danger is that this trickle to off-grid will become a torrent and the costs of maintaining the grid will need to be shared amongst a diminishing pool of customers.

This is also an issue of social justice.

3. Varying periods and rates to influence householder and business behaviour

A scheme of having time-varying feed-in tariffs has potential to be adaptive to any changing profile of supply and demand. Should it be beneficial to have more feed-in from photovoltaic panels at different times, the time periods and rates could be modified to incent customers in this direction. It could in fact be a "lever" to move photovoltaic panel / battery owners to feed into the grid at more beneficial times from an overall network perspective.

In summary, a time-varying feed-in tariff is a small step towards a more responsive network with the potential for cost savings and increased reliability. It also helps avoid the likelihood of a feedback loop of a diminishing number of grid customers with high network costs being shared amongst an increasingly impoverished residue. The alternative of a fixed feed-in tariff does not address any of these issues and risks accelerating the move to off-grid.

I strongly support a time-varying feed-in tariff.

Respectfully Jeremy Klitzing

From: Peter Hormann

Submission:

I don't like the time varying feed-in tarriffs. They appear to devalue my solar generation from an existing 0.118kWh and will be confusing to calculate and check on a monthly/daily basis.

From: Antoinette Tidey

Submission:

I want a less harmful future for my 6 grandchildren. But also more incentive for their parents to help into that future. Very interested in battery storage

From: Alan Kruger

Submission:

Time-varying minimum feed-in tariff -- draft tariff rates: Essential Services Commission (ESC) should not be allowed to have a flat rate less than the 11.3c/kWh tariff currently in place. Every turn the small man/woman makes in regard to solar, there is a "Big Brother" trying to screw the arms and legs of the little fellow. As individuals we are small but in numbers we are great and it is about time the various authorities realised this and give us a fair go.

From: Maggie Evison

Submission:

My husband & I are pensioners and had Solar installed to help ease the costs of electricity, so we do not believe we should be penalised with a very low rate of feed in tariffe considering what we send back to the grid. We really do need a much better feed in rate.

From: John Gardiner

Submission:

I believe a constant feed in rate of at least 15c per kWh is appropriate given the capital incurr in the installation and the savings to power producers on their capital costa

From: Wey Ho

Submission:

There is no rate for Weekend during the equivalent Weekday Peak period. It is not clear what the proposal is for Weekend rate.

Electricity retailers must offer clients the ability to choose either of the FiTs if they have been approved.

I am happy with the proposed rates if Weekend rate during the "Peak" is the same as Weekday peak rates.

From: Linda Rowley

Submission:

I object to changing to three different time periods, I do not believe that the base rate should fall below \$0.11. Thank you.

From: Jorg Koplin

Submission:

We believe that any new rates should not be less than the current rate of 11.3c/kW. Recently we invested into a Solar System based on the 11.3c rate. It would be very disappointing if the new rates would be below the 11.3c especially since the electricity companies in VIC have increased the prices since Jan 2018 (very steep increase)

From: Ian Armstrong

Submission:

I am writing to strongly highlight that the proposed new tariff system would leave me far worse off. I am a pensioner who invested a lot to put in a medium sized solar system. It helps me lower the escalating power bills. With the new proposal, I submit the following. During the off peak times, I would obviously generate NO POWER and therefor it is not applicable. For thew shoulder period, I would generate some from 7am to 3pm but nothing between 9pm and 10pm and the rate would be LESS than I currently get. For the peak time, I would not get much generation after 6pm and so it would be of minimal benefit even at the higher tariff, and I note it is not applicable on the weekends!! All in all, I am far better of with the current 11.3 cent tariff than to enter into the new scheme and be obviously WORSE OFF. I appears to me that this proposal has not been worked out with the householder in mind. We are in the mountain areas of Melbourne and get more cloud and fog than most. I can see that I will be a looser out of this proposal and as such, I reject it as being not fair on anyone's analysis.

Submission to the Victorian Essential Services Commission: Minimum electricity feed-in tariffs to apply from 1 July 2018
From: Glenn Osboldstone
Submission:

Dear ESC

This is my submission on the proposed new FiTs.

My family and I own a solar system and have done so for almost 10 years. We have long been disappointed with the mandated FiTs.

We support the proposal for time-based minimum FiTs.

We do not support the single rate tariff being so low and ask that the ESC recommends that retailers NOT be allowed the choice to pay a flat, single rate of 9.9c/kWh – a price less than the current 11.3c/kWh minimum, and even less than the proposed 'shoulder' period price of 10.3c/kWh under the time-based scheme.

The ESC should recommend the single rate be bumped up to around 15c/kWh, as a minimum.

Sincerely

Glenn

From: Peter Gladwell

Submission:

I disagree with the proposals by the ESC to introduce a time of use solar tariff. As far as I am concerned the power I produce from my solar system is my power and I should be able to sell it to who I like at the best price. The ESC are only pandering to the large generating companies whereas there should be more encouragement to push for an increase in solar by offering better returns as there once was.

From: Graeme Harvey

Submission:

While I am in favour of increasing the feed in tarriff. I am not in support of this proposal.

Most of the electricity that will be exported over a 12 month period will be exported at a lesser average rate for the year.

I see this is another dirty trick by generators to wind back feed in tariffs. Solar owners supply electricity to the retailers that have provided not one dollar and on sell at up to four times or more than they purchase it for. They then sell it to my neighbor that lives next door. What an unfair racket. The retailers also charge higher rates to me as a solar owner. I live in the Latrobe Valley close to the now shut Hazelwood Power Station. Since shutting my house and cars are no longer covered in black dust every day.

Do the generators pay any thing for polluting the air water. Everything in the Valley is covered in pollution. Its about time solar owners were acknowledged for the part they pay in the health of citizens. Solar owners should be paid a a rate to reflect health benefits not forced to provide assistance to polluters. So unfair

From: Greg Tanner

Submission:

The proposal to pay ramped solar feed in tariffs would effectively mean a reduction for the period that my solar cells generate 11am -4pm. This is not fair - at least we shouldnt go backward from the 11c/kwhr that I receive at present.

Greg Tanner

From: Russell Ritchie

Submission:

I am not interest in any rate proposed below the rate I receive at present - 16cents per KW.

The proposed rate of 29 c $\!$. for Peak Time would be very acceptable, if it is proposed to introduce a 3 time / day approach.

From: William Hutchison

Submission:

PLEASE.....leave Fit at the current rate of 0.113 I have 8.6KwH battery storage but do not want to sell it. That is for my overnight use. William

From: Gary Linley

Submission:

Dear ESC.

I support any increase in the feed in tariff however this proposed single rate is lower than we currently get. I strongly approve of a peak tariff at peak demand times. However I do believe that this rate should be 40c or more as power imported at critical times costs ditibutors more than 90c. Solar owners have been ripped off blind to date by greedy power companies that change the blurry rules to suit them. My power co used to pay me \$ for \$ for all power produced by my panels as did other companies. They soon took advantage of a law that could be read 2 ways to rig it in their favour. Already I have been ripped off over \$1000 that should have gone toward paying off the \$5000 it cost me to install.

So yes peak feed in tariff but it should match the actual price paid at critical peak times as well.

From: Jenny Edgar

Submission:

I support the 29c/kW

It has cost us to put on Solar which benefits the Electricity supplier and pays us a pittance.

We have recently put in a Solar Battery as well to offset electricity costs though it will take us years to pay for it.

Why should I give big business a boost when costs to consumers has skyrocketed.

Make them pay the most, anything less is robbery

From: Mario Santos

Submission:

Dear Essential Services Commission,

I am writing to comment on the new proposed feed-in tariffs for Victoria.

- 1. The introduction of a peak feed-in tariff at 29c/KWh will be a very positive development that will lead to a better management of our energy supply at household, business, and state levels.
- 2. It is disappointing to see a single rate tariff option at a lower level than the current 11.3c/KWh. If there is an expectation that prices will come down in the future, then a provision can be built in to review tariffs accordingly, but setting the new tariff at a level lower than the current one (which is already too low) would only discourage the sort of behavioural change that we need for a sustainable energy future.
- 3. It is also disappointing to see the single rate tariff set at a lower level than the off-peak and shoulder levels. There will be no incentive for retailers to offer anything other than the single rate tariff, thus making citizens of VIC even worse off than they already are.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of these comments

Yours sincerely Mario Santos

From: Peter Baillie

Submission:

We should get a higher feed in tariff as we get charged a much higher rate for using there power.My feed in tariff 11.3 cents but using there power is 41.45 which is a joke.

From: Peter Essex

Submission:

- The proposed move to time varying FIT rates is a good idea, however:
- the proposed FIT rates for shoulder & off peak times (and all weekend) are well below what is currently the offered situation. That is not acceptable.
- retailers should not be allowed to choose which tariff system they offer. That will only encourage then to offer the lowest.
- solar owners should not be penalised now for possible future (I repeat possible future) reductions in electricity costs. That should happen only when those reductions actually occur. Can you imagine the outcry from retailers if electricity users said "No, no, we'll not accept a rate increase now. We'll wait for 6 months (or more) before paying them just to be sure that those costs increases you say are justified are actually occurring". The retailers would go ballistic. So it shouldn't apply in reverse.
- I also have a solar system on our holiday house at Wandiligong 3744 & the retailer there is offering flat 15c FIT because the distributor is also providing same FIT rebate. That is good sense but when I checked another retailer they were not doing so. That only supports the comment that retailers will generally go for the lower possible FIT.

From: Nick Konstantinidis

Submission:

This is a step in the right direction for all rooftop solar homeusers, but some adjustments still need to be made in order for it to be sustainable and for the solar systems to actually pay for themselves, eg. with the new proposal, in order to make something, i will need to move all solar panels to the west facing side of my house.

From: Dirk Kurpershoek

Submission:

If a time varying rate is to be applied then surely the FIT should match the wholesale spot price on a half hourly basis. Smart meters report the half hourly export already so. This would be fair to all parties. To do otherwise is blatant discrimination.

From: Helen Franks

Submission:

I find it concerning the ESC appear to be colluding with the coal lobbyists in proposing a "time of use" tariff for solar.

The current 11.3/kh is far too low and does not recognise the genuine contribtion being made into power needs of our community.

To propose this tarrif commence at a lower rate is disingenuous of ESC and its regard for the contributors.

Is it possible this proposed structure is part of a more significant move being developed with the coal companies? It gives rise cause for concern as generally these type of actions are not stand alone moves.

The current feed in tarrif is appauling and a lower off peak feed in tarrif is inequitable.

Instead of proposing a time of use approach the ESC would serve our community better by requiring an increase of the current feed in tariff to 30/kh.

The profit margins for power companies and the retailers could certainly afford this based on the rates being offered.

I am opposed to a "time of use" feedin tarrif.

I am in favour of an increase in the base feedin tarrif. This would reflect the significant contribution being made to the community by those generating energy for the grid.

There appears to be nothing equitable about this proposal.

Regards

Helen Franks

From: Dave Clarke

Submission:

It is unfair that retailers will have the choice of offering a 'single FiT rate' that is well below the current 11.3c/kWh tariff during the transition to 'time-of-use' solar tariff. The proposed flat rate of 9.9c/kWh is lower than the current off-peak and shoulder rates.

From: Brett Factor

Submission:

This is a backward step. The government really needs to show some courage and provide a time varying tariff that providers cannot opt out of. This half-half approach is really quite pathetic.

From: Carol Wicks

Submission:

To the ESC

Pleaae make it mandatory that electricity retailers offer both single rate feed in tariffs as well as the time varying FIT to ALL SOLAR HOUSEHOLDS.

Thank you Carol Wicks

From: Wal St Clair

Submission:

To whom it may concern, why are you planning to make us solar investors worse off than we are at the moment. The 9.9 c/kWh single rate is much lower than the current rate and will lower my benefit of having solar Why do many Australian organizations such as yours want to stifle the growth of solar in our country. Don't BS me and say this will increase the benefit of having solar. You know this is detrimental to solar owners who can see the way to lower our carbon footprint is through solar power production

From: Matt Campbell

Submission:

I believe that while such a system may work, the minimum rate should be equal to the minimum single tariff we currently have. I feed a lot more into the grid than what I take yet I still have to pay the supplier. This just isn't right and is nothing more than the coal industry ripping people off for clean power.

From: David Tomkins
Submission:
Dear Regulator
I have read of your proposed solar feed-in taffic changes.
I support the introduction of a time-varying feed-in tariff.
I don't support a single rate feed-in tarriff which is below the current minimum feed-in tarriff.
Solar owners shouldn't be worse off under a new scheme!
Yours sincerely
David Tomkins

From: Gabriella Hont Hont

Submission:

Currently the FiT in Victoria is 11.3c/kWh based on previous calculations of the value added by rooftop generation.

This draft allows retailers to offer significantly less if they so choose. It might be argued that electricity prices will reduce in the future, but this has not yet happened. When it does, then it might be appropriate to review FiT. Or when more sophisticated Time of Use measures are adopted. Until then please ensure that solar owners are not worse off. Gabriella Hont

From: damien jensen

Submission:

I do not agree with any proposal to reduce feed-in rates. The current proposal is just another way to increase the revenue and enrich the power companies

From: Bruce Taylor

Submission:

I think that this proposal is a very bad idea. Only the very rich can afford batteries and they are a small minority of solar owners. If this proposal goes ahead, I can see solar uptake falling rapidly.

From: kelvin carnegie

Submission:

I have worked hard to get where I am with electricity prices not to see it taken away by greedy overseas company's who are only interested in profits at the exspence of comsumers. We should never have allowed our electricity companys to be sold to overseas multinationals.

From: Felix Ebeyer

Submission:

This seems to be a rip

off, perhaps we should give back a alternative offer to show what a real honest deal is all about, let us show the sun solar hours generated for summer and also for winter, as 3pm to 9pm in winter is no sun or maybe 2 hours max, but 9am to 3pm is lots of sun in winter 6 hours of sun goes for free?

And summer solar sun from 7am to 3 pm is 8 hours of the best sun and they want that free? This is just a bit to one sided a deal, let us all look at the big picture what sun solar generated power is made into solar energy and then make the deals. As I said before this is to one sided let us see about swapping the times they want to give us for the times they want, if this is s fair deal it should not be a problem ,I am a CEC solar installer so I know a bit about this solar situation with 3000 systems installed by my company

Thanks Felix Ebeyer

From: David Skerry

Submission:

The idea of a varied FIT that offers more for peak periods is quite good, and will encourage home owners to maximize the value of their solar while also providing much needed power when the grid needs it the most. However, to offer either flat rates or peak and shoulder rates that are lower that the current 11.3 cents FIT is a bit poor, as the value of home solar power to the grid has been proven and is worth at least the 11.3 cents currently on offer.

From: Russell Peel

Submission:

Dear Sirs,

The proposed tariffs concern me in that since virtually all solar power is generated between 7 am and 5 pm, the off-peak is only relevant to parties with battery storage which for some time will be a very small proportion of the total.

And many domestic residences with panels installed facing north will be unable to reorientate them to the west to be able to export during most of the peak period.

Further, anyone electing for the time-varying tariff without batteries would be paid between 10.3 and 29.0 c/kWh. Thus a single rate feed-in tariff of 9.9 c/kWh seems to be completely pointless as it would always yield a lower return, aside from the fact that it is lower than the current rate of 11.3 c/kWh.

An argument that prices are expected to fall in the future, thus justifying paying lower prices now, is fallacious. To start with, the recent period has demonstrated that predicting future power pricing is fraught with uncertainty, and if prices do fall, then the prices paid for solar should be adjusted then, not pre-emptively on assumptions about future pricing.

The overall principle is commended, but the single rate tariff seems a significant backward step.

Kind regards

From: Jim Haine

Submission:

Many Solar Grid owners are elderly and unable to ever purchase a battery. Therefor any new proposal must not drop below the present FIT.

From: robert potts

Submission:

so the solar con continues just notified that my tarrifs are rising now you want to reduce feed in tarrlfs as well . This 29c con at the time of day when the sun is either not out or is hardly shining on our panels so Electricity companies get even more income charging us premium rates at that time. So much for promoting renewable energy

From: Andrea Lindsay

Submission:

The proposed changes would suit me well as I do not have back up batteries and my most significant generation is during the peak generation period (and maximum use by the Victorians).

From: Peter Sommers

Submission:

I think it's totally despicable that they are thinking of ripping us off again ,they already don't pay enough for the power we feed in !! If the ordinary people tried to do this they would be up for FRAUD!! I'm ANGRY!!

From:	steve	kearney
-------	-------	---------

Submission:

don't do it!

From: Steven Adams

Submission:

I am pleased with the idea that there will be differentiated feed-in tariff based on the time of day. It makes sense that feeding into the grid in peak times should result in a much higher tariff. I am however, dismayed with the proposal of a flat 9.9c kwh. This is a major step backwards and less than that current feed in tariff. The fact that the supplier has the choice of which one to off seems like a false choice because every supplier is going to choice the 9.9c kwh flat rate. For years the ESC has talked about reward those who feed into the grid at peak times and for years the ESC has failed to deliver. Electrical companies have had enough time to adjust and it is just time to implement the differential feed in tariff as soon as possible. The flat rate tariff simply makes no sense.

From: Geoff Cumming

Submission:

Urgent action to limit warming to 2 degrees, far better 1.5 degrees is the really vital issue for everyone, especially our children and grandchildren. Any energy policy must further that aim as it's first priority. Therefore:

- 1. Any new tariff regime for solar feed-in must not disadvantage any current solar PV owner.
- 2. Variation of feed-in tariff by time is an excellent principle, and the proposed several-step tariff is a small but worthwhile step towards having feed-in tariffs that reflect current (meaning moment-by-moment, or at least minute-by-minute) value of the energy being exported by the PV owner. Geoff Cumming DPhil

From: Keith Graham

Submission:

I am very concerned with the shoulder rate it is very much less than the rate we are on now.

The peak rate is ok but it will very much depend on were your panels are facing Eg if they are facing west there will be a greater benefit if you can keep your consumption low at this time. Even throw the most of the panels in Australia are facing Nth so this is disadvantage to them.

The Week day shoulder rate 7am to 9pm is the time industry is wanting more power and our solar panels are working at there best so we should be being paid more than 10.3 c for our export power.

The weekend Shoulder rate is complete rubbish our solar is supporting Every won with there air conditioner and heating this rate is totally in support of Coal power company. We as country should be moving away from Coal.

The weekend rate should be as good as the week rate.

The rate should be 10.00pm to 6.am as the 10 to 7am rate would very much disadvantage owners of Eastern facing panels they are working at the break of dawn supporting the early morning industry start upas we know there is a morning spike in the morning. I know its only a hours difference but Solar owner are wanting there every cent we can get.

At times like this I think about batteries as the prospect of another decrees in our FIT and the power companies are upping there power price EG my new charge is 23.606 Inc GST and now 27.544Inc GST and my solar Rate is not rising so with our FIT credit we get is getting smaller and smaller and this is totally not fair as I suspect in time it will not be a credit. If we were getting the 29c a KWh it would be so much fairer and maybe battery would not be thought of about at this time.

Just think about it if the majority of solar owner go to battery you will have blackout and building more coal power stations.

You need our solar and we need to be payed for our power.

From: John Nairn

Submission:

The offered flat rate must be at least 20% more than the current minimum, otherwise the retailers will have us all on it.

The suggested peak rate offers little encouragement for solar; it should be at least 50% more than the "buy-in" rate. Look at what retailers pay for "peak"; what I'm suggesting is cheap.

The suggested "shoulder" offers little encouragement; it's just the retailers trying to claw back our recent increases. We may well go off grid and on to batteries.

From: Margaret Hartley

Submission:

I supportive proposal to move to "time of use" solar tariff for households that supply electricity to the grid. The "time of use" tariff provides an incentive to solar households to provide power at a time when it is most needed in the grid. However, the proposed price for shoulder, which includes much of the day, does not reflect the value of the electricity being produced. It should be no lower than the current 11.3c/kWh.

A flat rate (as suggested) provides no incentive at a time when the grid needs the support of solar owners, and does no reflect a fair price. It even offers incentive for solar owners to go off-grid altogether, thus providing no support to energy supplier companies.

I thereby support a "time of day" proposal, with the proviso that the shoulder price reflects a fairer return to solar owners.

From: Russel Obrien

Submission:

It is only recently that we received 13 cents so to receive less doesn't seem fair. The proposed system seems unduly complicated. A fair price for what we produce is all we want.

From: John Nairn

Submission:

Single rate must be better than the current minimum by at least 20%; if not, we'll all be put on it by the retailers and solar will again be discouraged! Peak to be fair and to encourage us, should be at least 50% greater than the current buy-in. Look what retailers have pay the majors for peak. Shoulder rates again are not encouraging; retaillers are trying to claw back our recent gains.

Enough to drive us off the grid and on to batteries!

From: Graham Murray

Submission:

Solar owners, who are doing the right thing by themselves, the environment and the community, should never be penalised by allowing retailers to pay them less than the current flat rate of 11.3c/kWh.

From: Joseph Posterino

Submission:

We by doing the right thing by the environment were ment to safe on our bills. The outlay has still not been repaid in savings as the retailers wont buy back at a reasonable rate. If people are to invest in the future our governments are going to have to reasure the we are not going to be ripped off by corporate greed.

From: Robert Olds

Submission:

Fully support submission for tiered Feed In Tariffs

From: Stephen Murphy

Submission:

I wish to express my concern about the low pay in tariff rates that are being offered under the new singe feed in tariff option for solar suppliers.

It has been too long that home solar power producers of clean energy have been discriminated against in favor of the dirty coal industry.

Reducing the feed in tariff smells of another dirty deal with the coal industry.

I thought the present Victorian Government was better than that.

Please pay solar producers a fair tariff to encourage more more home solar and a clean renewable energy future for all Victorians.

Regards, Stephen Murphy

From: Wendy James

Submission:

While an increase in a fair price for the Solar power generated from our Solar Panels is always welcome BUT I do not think an Off Peak or Shoulder Rate lower than the current 11cents rate is not a fair return for the cheap power you purchase from home owners. Wendy James

From: Glenn Dernaj

Submission:

I am excited to see the prospect of how important it is to have renewable such as solar increase their tariff to the grid. The proposed tariff is a good start, but falls short in terms of making both tariffs available from the single retailer. If that cannot be introduced that the retailer must offer both, a higher single rate would be fairer. If retailers have a choice to choose either tariff or both, I know which one it will be. It would be the worst case for consumers and providers of solar power. I would like to see the base rate single rate higher than the proposed 9.9 c/kwh. For people like myself with north facing panels, a flat rate would be more suited, but now moving to a lower rate of 9.9 c/kwh is not fair. You should consider the 11.3 c/kwh as the base rate. With the tariffs higher during peak time this will help the electrical load, but more solar installations will be West facing to maximize the return. Since I'm north facing I cannot turn my installation around to the west therefore cannot get a better return than currently available. If both proposed tariffs are not offered by the retailer, I think my tariff with be lowered to 9.9c/kwh without any other choice from the free market. I'm purchasing solar panels on behalf of all citizens for a greener future only to find longer returns on my investment. I don't see any large scale government green electric projects. I pay my taxes and have purchased solar panels, then retailers benefit for me for their green energy targets. Please reconsider the single tariff to a higher rate. This will help more people to think about green alternative power than coal powered stations. I can help the environment, so can others be encouraged to help the environment with a better tariff system.

From: Neville Hunter

Submission:

11.3 is low enough. We have been dudded enough already with this scheme which falls far short of the original proposal. With some still getting 66 cents why is this 11.3 Cents level being affected adversely at this time so soon after the last change? People plan on the figures supplied. Uncertainty stifles trust and further investment in this important power source.

From: julie fisher

Submission:

We have solar panels and were excited by the change in the feedin tariff. Currently we draw power from the grid in the evening sending a significant amount of power back to the grid during the day - particularly summer. Given during the day use is much higher than at night, we sell power at 11c pkwh with others paying nearly 30c to access this power. I have no problem with that but if the price per kwh is decreased we will look to store our own power and not feed it back into the grid when the system needs it most. This proposed change does not make sense. We need to encourage solar

From: Graeme Hattwell

Submission:

Do you people think we are all morons? Since did the sun shine between 10.00pm and 7.00 am long enough to generate any meaningful amount of solar energy?

We should be getting a FIT the same as you pay the wholesale generators and not 1 cent less.

I have no problem with the peak rate except that the sun shines on the weekend too. You lot are nothing but a lot of thieving rogues trading in breach of anti-discrimination laws.

From: alison marchant

Submission:

I am pleased to see the Labor government investing in renewables, but to encourage and continue the uptake of renewables, there needs to be incentives. Choice is great, but to let single rate FiT be decreased, it not a fair system. The playing field needs to be equal.

From: Frances Mackieson

Submission:

I am concerned that solar solar panel owners will be disadvantaged by the new time of use proposals and would prefer the current system.

From: Graham McAnalley

Submission:

I support the time-varying minimum feed-in tariff - it is only right that solar panel owners should be better compensated for what they feed into the grid. However, the option of the single rate feed-in tariff is quite unacceptable and could further penalize those who have invested in solar panels for their homes.

From: Jack McCaughan

Submission:

Since I consistently produce more electricity than I consume I fail to see why I should pay anything. My considerable investment in renewable energy is not rewarding me.

From: Paul Priems

Submission:

The minimum overall tariff should not be less than the 11.3c/kwh. otherwise it opens up manipulation by the power providers. Due payment for the power we put back into the system, after all we are generators of electricity that have invested in

solar power generation.

From: Malcolm Rickarby

Submission:

I think that this proposal would be of benefit to many owners of solar PV systems..

From: Noelene Carr

Submission:

In order to encourage the use of renewables a financial reward should be given to solar panel owners. We have to stop digging great holes in the ground which can never be adequately rehabilitated and reduce carbon dioxide emissions in to the atmosphere.

From: Jill O'Callaghan

Submission:

Feed in tarriff is too low even at 11c. Why allow a single rate tarriff less than is currently compulsory?

The peak tarriff applies as the sun goes down and there is less power generated and maximum usage occurs by the householder thus the fee is illusory.

The only way this would be economic is if you installed batteries(at substantial cost) and fed saved shoulder electricity into the grid at peak times.

Is the govt proposing a subsidy for batteries??

From: Tim adams

Submission:

Home energy storage and west facing roofs just became valuable property. Maybe?

If the fair and reasonable business case model supports the implicit valuation of proposed feed-in rates then they may be adopted.

Constant tinkering with these things may seriously impact on carefully considered decision making and consumer confidence in household investment decisions.

Given the life span on PV equipment it will be disastrous to perception of Government capacity to implement correct policy if people find decisions around optimal orientation of PV panel mounting keep changing.

There will be mass exodus from the grid by those who can (ever growing numbers) if household installations turn out to be better for on-site use than for export. (north facing panels vs west facing).

Tread carefully the tightrope is narrow.

From: Anne Makhijani

Submission:

I think the timings of the Off peak, Shoulder and Peak tariffs are unfair. If three different tariffs are to be applied, the timings for each on weekdays and weekends should be the same as the retailers apply for energy they sell to customers. For example Peak rates charged to customers are from 7am - 11pm on weekdays, yet the peak rate period they propose to pay solar producers is only from 3pm - 9pm on weekdays. This is blatantly inequitable and grossly unfair and the ESC should not allow it.

From: Ray Cowling

Submission:

A low overnight tariff should not be used to subsidize coal fired generators which cannot be turned off? There is no allowance for the community value of pollution free energy with low cost of distribution

From: James Parsons

Submission:

I do not approve of changes to the Feed-in tariff, which now stands et 11.3c/kwh, which is better than proposed

From: Raymond Woods

Submission:

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on rooftop solar imputs. I feel the time caring feed in tariff is the fairest option, but don't understand that you give retailers a choice with single rate feedin tariff well below the current solar rates.

We need to encourage green sustainable energy.

From: Gordon Wallace

Submission:

I am writing to voice my concerns about the proposal for changing the solar feed in tariff scheme. I have north facing panels and under the new scheme it seems likely that my feed in tariff will be reduced from 11.3 cents per kwh to 9.9 cents. I am unable to reconfigure my panels to face west thus taking advantage of the higher peak rate.

I have just received notifation that my peak charge for electricity if going up to 41.4 cents a kwh. I receive just 11.3 cents per khw now and your proposal is the reduce that to much less. Hardly seems fair when my retailer is able to charge 41 cents for my power exported to the grid. This proposal will only encourage people like myself to leave the grid to the detriment of other users. I regularly export over 30 kwh and there are many small solar generators like me. Please leave the basic tariff at 11.3 cents and offer the peak tariff to new systems that can take advantage of it.

From: Paul Mannings

Submission:

I am strongly opposing the proposal to allow retailers to offer a flat feed-in tariff of 9.9c that is even lower than the meagre 11.3c we're getting now (meagre because because after the latest recent price increase we're paying 39c for imported energy, which is an outrageously unfair support for retailers). This new proposal shifting the balance even more in favour of those retailers. It seems to be solely geared to bolster the coffers of the energy industry.

From: Gerry Ward

Submission:

solar customer, Red Energy charge almost 20c OP and 40c Peak this suggestion seems fair.

From: Mario Farrugia

Submission:

A solar Feed in Tariff of anything less than what consumers pay for their energy from power companies is just totally unfair and not conducive/encouraging to consumers installing solar on their rooftops let alone staying with the grid. Current feed in tariffis of \$0.113 are grossly unfair. To offer the proposed two options which are both still below what consumers pay for their power peak/off peak is down right unjust.

Especially since power companies have increased energy costs to consumers and are allowed to continue to do so. Making a feed in tariff tiered to give back to consumers what they pay for their power is the better option. It may even help to keep power costs down by giving consumers more for their solar input and may even help avoid price increases.

From: Lee Coleman

Submission:

Ion my opinion these variable rates questionable. Peak use age is different to peak power production time ie 3pm to 8 pm. Therefore the producers of solar power are being underpaid for their energy through the remainder of the day. My concern is the power companies are not honest and still want a large inappropriate profit. They should be paying appropriate rates for every produced and put into grid especially when they charge 31 cents per kilowatt hour. A better scheme is maybe 15 c per watt hour without a graded system.

Regards lee coleman

From: Carol Barrie

Submission:

A great innovation to have time of use feed in tariffs. Two points:

- 1. The minimum feed in tariff must be at least equal to the current (low) feed in tariff
- 2. Peak rates should be the same on weekends as during the week.

From: chris Ryan

Submission:

Citizens, households, have contributed over \$8b (AUD) to remaking the energy system in Australia. They have done so from household budgets. It is time that these citizens and this investment is recognised and the role of PV owners if accepted as a critical component of the State's energy system. The time of use solar tariff is a significant step towards the recognition of household electricity producers. However the single rate alternative continues the punishment of household investors as it is well below the 11-12 cents that we currently get for exported power. The retailers will have an incentive to only offer the fixed rate.

From: Morry Leyland

Submission:

I think we should be getting a minimum of 15c/kWh.

From: Brian Jenkins

Submission:

This is an unfair proposal a flat rate should be at least 20c a kw as we pay up to 38c a kw for our power the companies raise supply rates every 6 months but solar stays the same we also need an increase BRIAN

From: Nicolas Fontaine

Submission:

To whom it may concern,

I would like to take this opportunity to voice my opinion on the feed in tariff proposal. Any proposal to reduce the single rate tariff, whether it be short term or long term, should not be put forward. Any reduction to the existing rate is absolutely objectionable and such action defies any logic with regard to improving the state's renewable energy energy input. It is also without saying that a reduced rate would only benefit the retailers at the expense of households further reducing the up take of solar.

I sincerely hope that any such move is scraped in the interest of the people and the country.

Regards,

N Fontaine

From: Thomas Williams

Submission:

Like any other investor, those of us who have invested in solar panels are entitled to a return on that investment. So far I feel exploited by the power companies who now run electricity generation, distribution and retail sales. This needs to end, and the various staffing arrangements brought back into line with organisations operating total systems of providing electricity to the people. Like water, gas, railways health and education, electricity should be supplied by the public centre.

From: kevin Thorpe

Submission:

Why cant the vic Government leave feed in tarrif a alone 11.3 a kw is not enough it should be at least 15 cents a kw, and increased to power price rises. And if any stage in future i can exit the grid i will so ,a loss of 550 kw a month to the grid in summer mths.i spent \$18000 for a 5kw system with batt storage what about a fair go for consumers.

From: David Steele

Submission:

Solar owners should not be worse off under the new proposed scheme.

From: Rob Wellington

Submission:

Peak pricing encourages sensible deployment of distributed home solar

From: Terry Collie

Submission:

What good is 29.0 cents 3pm-9pm when this is not the time when I will be producing any feed in. And at the same time they want to pay LESS than I'm currently getting for the power I do feed in. this is a BAD deal.

From: John Bagnati

Submission:

I am currently feeding in more energy into the grid than what I am consuming and I am being charged by my retailer just so they can make more profit from the cheap energy they purchasing off me, which should not be permitted, therefore the proposed time-varying rates should not be set so those that take this option are worse off. Moreover, If there is no increased financial benefit to those with solar systems in taking up either of the two options, then the current, single rate of 11.7c/kWh should remain.

From: Michael Rush

Submission:

Solar power generated by homeowners is vital to meeting the electricity needs of all the community and should not be discouraged by making changes to the rebate tariff that leaves average people financially worse - off.

The Government should continue to support and encourage the home generation and use of solar power.

From: Marcus Barber

Submission:

As approximately 50-60% of electricity demand occurs during the 'peak times', the tariff payment should reflect that volume. With current peak tariff at 29ckwh that would mean customers putting back into the grid should get paid between 14c and 17c per kwh. Customers helping to stabilise demand in Victoria should NOT get ripped off by energy firms paying below value

From: mario lupieri lupieri

Submission:

Why do we keep mucking around? Because of my solar panels I am improving the environment for my grandchildren!!! When, oh when will money stop talking for everyone? Please take a stand!!!

From: Geoff Randall

Submission:

I would prefer the time varying feed in tariff as the extra money generated would encourage more people to take up solar power which in turn would help fight global warming.

From: Peter Margate

Submission:

I believe that a "time-of-use" solar FiT is a definite step in the right direction - particularly given the proposed peak rate. In my view this should be the only FiT available. It would promote battery take up and would encourage owners of rooftop solar systems to feed power into the grid when it is most needed. Allowing retailers to offer a single rate FiT that is actually lower than what is available would be a massive backwards step. If you are proposing to give power retailers an option, then at the very least you should leave the current FiT as the single rate option with the proposed time-of-use option as the alternative.

From: Benjamin O'Connor

Submission:

Hi,

Although I am supportive of a move to time-varying minimum feed-in-tariffs, I do not support the option for retailers to offer a single tariff that is below the current minimum feed-in-tariff rate of 11.3c.

The move to a "time-of-use" solar tariff is a great move and allows solar households to be properly rewarded for the power they are providing to the grid, particular at times of high demand. It also improves the business case to install home battery storage systems.

Regards Ben O'Connor

From: Deniz Mutlu

Submission:

Its wrong thats even worse then current I believe it should be what ever retailer charging you it should be that. They take it from us and sell it for triple the prize its wrong

From: Peter Richardson

Submission:

Feed in Tariffs.

There is nothing in the proposed new tariffs that are incentive to stay in the grid, supplying clean energy to the state.

I feel that I have been deceived by the Government, and lied to, regarding the hype around participating in the move to clean energy.

Australia will need to develop a strong clean energy capacity to overcome to decline of polluting and unprofitable coal and resource consuming power generation.

Unless there is a change in strategy, and expectation of private sector involvement, Victoria will lose the benefit of what private households can contribute, as the alternative of going off the grid becomes increasingly viable.

Do not let the supply companies dictate what they will offer as feed-in tariffs, and enable private households receive a better return for the investment which the government initially encouraged.

From: Diane McInerney

Submission:

I think under any future changes Solar citizens should not be worse off.

From: Peter Reeves

Submission:

The ESC should be encouraging more homeowners to fit PV arrays to further reduce impact on the environment from dirty coal fired power stations. Their proposed reduction in FiT will only encourage people with PV arrays connected to the grid to install a battery and completely disconnect from the grid.

People who are considering the fitting of a PV array to their home will more than likely consider the potential benefit does not justify the cost of fitting a new PV array at their home.

From: Renee Carruthers

Submission:

As a solar system owner and manager of a solar business I do not think the new single rate FIT should be lower than the current 11.3c. I talk to customers about this everyday and find everyone is happy with the current rate.

From: Kevin Close

Submission:

Why should retailers profit from solar generation, power generated among the customers moves a short distance to customers who pay twice the FeedIn tariff.

From: Jim Szymanski

Submission:

I welcome any increase in feed in tariffs. However the starting rate for this should be at least the current 11.3c/kwh for off peak and be set higher for shoulder and peak. That way nobody is disadvantaged. Most people have adopted solar with the idea of a certain return on their investment. Current feed in tariff is way below the price the utilities sell the people's power back to them without the utilities making any investment in the the home infrastructure they benefit from. Achieving a fairer balance is great for many things not the least of which is the peoples faith in governments actually looking after their interests rather than a bias toward big money.

From: Geoff Harvey

Submission:

With power prices increasing at least 15% to 20% it should be expected that the single rate FIT should increase by a similar amount. and not decrease as proposed. Similarly for the multi rate FIT, the shoulder tariff should not be less than the current FIT. Under the proposals it is less than the current FIT of 11.3c/KWh. With power prices increasing by 15 to 20% FIT should be increased by a similar amount

From: Leigh Adamson

Submission:

I would like to submit that while the peak feed in tariff of 29 c/kwh seems fair, the off peak and shoulder tariffs are both woefully inadequate. I submit that a 12c/kwh off peak tariff and a 20c/kwh shoulder tariff would be a much fairer return for the expensive investment householders make and the crucial part that rooftop solar now plays in stabilising the grid. Far too long an overly expensive source of electricity.

From: George Stevenson

Submission:

The proposed single rate tariff is well below the 11.3c/kWh tariff currently in place and even lower than the off-peak and 'shoulder' rates offered. At a time when each year retailers increase their rates by almost 10% why are we being treated unfairly. High time the government implemented a system that was fair on all.

From: John Hardy

Submission:

I oppose any changes to the existing tariff agreement

From: Michael Webster

Submission:

I would comment about your suggested rates that would disadvantage many people with solar systems. The single rate of 9.9c, which I presume would be the default, is well below the Sate mandated 11.3c. Even the weekend rate of 10.3c is below 11.3., so 2/7ths of any week's feed-in would attract a lower feed-in rate - this is inequitable with as I can't see demand of electricity being much lower at weekends than during the week - factories don't operate, but people are home using aircon. The 29c top rate is deceptive in my opinion as most solar systems (like mine) slow output of power after 4 or 5pm, especially in winter, so people might only get 2 or at most 3 hours of the peak rate. How about a rethink?!

From: John Elliott

Submission:

We should not be whose of with any new feed in schemes. Price should be one for one on what you use and then price work out on excess to grid. Example I made 600 kw and used 300 kw the balance at f i t price no matter whate time of day you use it.

From: Janice Maltby

Submission:

We think these changes would very likely make us and many others worse off. We are happy with the current feed in tariff and hope that these changes do not happen.

From: Carol Barrie

Submission:

I would strongly encourage a "time of use" solar tariff. However, the minimum FIT should certainly NOT be less than the current low rate of 11.3 cents/kw.

From: Keith Patton

Submission:

The introduction of a peak tariff for rooftop solar is a great development, but do not reduce the flat rate. If left to retailers to decide, will they end up only offering the single rate tariff with decreased benefit to solar owners

From: Maxwell Howe

Submission:

Please stop pandering to big power the margins for them are far to large already.

From: Noel Stone

Submission:

Electricity consumers with solar panels are in thrall of the retailers who think they are the only players. It is high time consumers voice their opinion, which in my case is to seek a flat rate which is above the current 11.3c/kWh.

From: Matthew Wright

Submission:

11.8c/kWh does not reflect the weighted average wholesale cost + the benefits of transformer pre-cooling from more solar PV added to the grid. Reducing this further is akin to theft from solar owners who should be adequately compensated. FiTs should be up not down and the proposed time of use tariff is ok for TOU customers but the flat rate reduced offer is not acceptable and the ESC backing the industry against consumers.

From: neil hallam

Submission:

When I got solar I had the impression I was helping the greenhouse and energy ballance of australis. Since that that rebate has been whittled away purely for profit

From: Irene Noon

Submission:

FITs should equate to the same rates being charged to solar owners by the power companies

From: Robert Schilt

Submission:

I had my 8 solar panels installed in March 2012. My provider AGL gave me a verbal agreement that i would receive a feed in tariff of 68 cents per KWh . That would stay in place until 2024. I outlayed just on \$4000 to have them installed. I did that to offset our power cost , and to do my small bit towards clean air. I would totally reject any plan that would decimate my already miserable feed in tariff.

From: Peter Rice

Submission:

Firstly, I live in a town.

There is only provision on here for people that live in Cities.

Rather unfair! Get with it!!?

I am concerned with this proposal re FIT so called.

Effectively means a decrease.

I believe we will be worse off and it will be uneconomic to provide power to the grid.

Need a minimum of 20c per kwh

All the time For it to be fair and an economic proposition.

This new proposal is madness.

We will not support it and will fight against it.

From: Michael Bissett

Submission:

Solar feed single rate ishould not be less than the current level and it should be automatically increased in line with the average retail increase each year

From: Bodo von Billerbeck

Submission:

The single rate should not be below or even close to the shoulder rate - that makes no sense. I would advocate to there not being a flat rate on offer, but rather that generators get paid a substantial percentage of market rates (which of course will have an effect on market rates themselves, but I will let someone else sort that out)

From: Joan McColl

Submission:

We need a fair FIT that makes renewable energy more and more popular so the variable tariff is the way to go