

Minimum feed-in tariff review 2021–22: Draft decision

Engagement snapshot

Consultation period

17 November 2020 – 8 January 2021

The engagement process and how we engaged

- We released our draft decision for public consultation on 17 November 2020. We gave stakeholders 7 weeks to make a submission.
- We published our draft decision paper on our website: www.esc.vic.gov.au and Engage Victoria website. Under the Engage Victoria website, stakeholders can choose to respond to a number of specific questions, leave a general comment or raise questions. We responded publicly to any questions raised.
- We also offered stakeholders to email their submissions to us via fitreview@esc.vic.gov.au.
- We held 2 public forums to discuss our draft decision and hear stakeholders' feedback. The forums were held on 3 December 2020 at 12.00pm-1.30pm and 6.00pm-7.30 pm.
- We also invited to the public forums 171 different stakeholders including those who have engaged with us previously about the feed-in tariff.

The number of submissions we received

We received a total of 79 submissions from 50 unique stakeholders.

The majority of submissions came from solar customers. Among retailers, Tango, Simply Energy and Energy Australia have made a submission. Here is a breakdown of submissions:

- Engage Victoria – 42 submissions
- Engage Victoria: Q&A – 32 questions
- Feed-in tariff review email – 5 submissions.

Questions raised by stakeholders through Engage Victoria website and our response are publicly available and can be accessed here: <https://engage.vic.gov.au/minimum-feedin-tariff-review-2021-22>.

The topics covered in the submissions

Topics covered in the submissions are:

Solar customers

- Solar customers disagree with proposed feed-in tariff. They said:
 - it is too low, unfair compensation, solar customers are worse off with this decision
 - it should be equal to retail electricity rates or between 12 to 25 cents per kilowatt-hour
 - the reduction in feed-in tariffs is inconsistent with 'unchanged' retail energy prices.
- The commission is protecting the (overseas) profits of retailers and not looking out for consumers.
- Low feed-in tariff discourages solar uptake; the commission is ignoring the environmental ramifications of a low feed-in tariff and therefore acting in opposition to government climate policy.
- Solar customers support the commission's proposed customer notification.
- Human health cost should not be zero.
- The feed-in tariff should be reviewed more frequently.
- Commission should take action beyond its jurisdiction such as subsidising batteries and lobbying for low income rebate to apply before feed-in tariff credit.

Retailers

- Retailers generally support the proposed reduction in feed-in tariff rates but still consider the rates to be high.
- Social cost of carbon is outdated, overstated; is contributing to inefficient feed-in tariff
- Two retailers suggested alternative views in relation to customer notification.
- A retailer suggested that the feed-in tariff should be deregulated; the commission should initiate discussion with the Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning.

A list of who has made a submission

Engage Victoria and fitreview email	Engage Victoria – Q&A ¹
Adrian Tusek	Hong Le
C-Loop Power and Thermal	Robert (submitted to 2 questions)

¹ Table shows screen name of the stakeholders.

Colin Westmore	Alby (submitted 2 questions)
David Blum	Jorge
Eugene Legat	Why????
Hong Le	Offgrid
Julie Mcculloch	Broke
Maria McKinnon	Phillip
Paolo Cardinali	Indar Ghikpal (submitted 2 questions)
Robert Bennet	Roland (submitted 4 questions)
Robert Owen	Whoisradkins (submitted 2 questions)
Roland Adkins	Dave
Stephen Jeremiah	Geoff (submitted 2 questions)
Simply Energy	Raymond Mifsud
Tango Energy	Stuart (submitted 2 questions)
Energy Australia	Spiros
Anonymous (21) ²	Rodney (submitted 7 questions)

² There are 22 Anonymous submissions uploaded (instead of 21). This is because one Anonymous stakeholder has made 2 separate submissions.