

# Minimum feed-in tariff review 2021-22

## Submission received through Engage Victoria

**Date submitted: 26 November 2020**

**Submission written by: Colin Westmore**

From 17 November 2020, we began accepting submissions on our Minimum feed-in tariff review 2021-22 via Engage Victoria ([www.engage.vic.gov.au](http://www.engage.vic.gov.au)). On this website, people were given the opportunity to send us a response to a set of questions we provided.

### **Your comments on this draft decision:**

The Proposed FIT price and the current FIT pricing is unreasonable, unfairly disadvantages consumers and is heavily and solely weighted in favour of promoting the interests of retailer profits rather than protecting and adequately compensating consumers. How is it equitable to allow retailers to acquire exported consumer derived renewable power at low FIT rates as compared to billing the consumer and imposing supply charges at disproportionately 4 to 5 times higher than the FIT rate? The FIT pricing model is simply flawed and if it was motivated to protect consumer interests, than it ought to be a direct compensatory offset, ie measured and paid at the retailer individual electricity rate, exchanged for Exported electricity. The wholesale rate test has no sufficient nexus connection to the consumer FIT rate, and it is unreasonable to be used as the basis of the FIT test. The consumer cannot buy electricity from the retailer at the wholesale rate, so why is the government protecting and favouring the retailer over the consumer. In this regard. The consumer is inadequately represented and is not fairly compensated for the power it exports as compared to the actual cost of the renewable asset It has invested in; yet the government is protecting the grids investment and electricity supply rates. Practically, no retailer is willing to offer nor is willing to negotiate FIT rates that are higher than the minimum FIT rate, so how does this advantage the consumer?