

Elizabeth Long

Submission to Draft Report (Energy Value) of Distributed Generation Inquiry

7/5/16

I've had a quick look at the report, but it is too long and complicated for me to spend more time on it. (I've got essays to write, already over my quota for boring texts to read.)

I think it is too complicated full stop. It is too easy for busy individual 'distributed generators' to be shafted by retailers if the calculations are convoluted. We simply don't have the time to devote to properly checking that we are getting what is due.

Why can't the state just mandate that the retailers pay what they charge? So the cost impact is the equivalent of the meter spinning backwards when more power is being generated than being used? The retailers will still make plenty of profit, since they will still be charging for service delivery, and the majority of users will not also be 'distributed generators'. In this way, the actual costs/benefits will be reflected by the feed-in tariff, since one presumes the retail price is determined by these, as well as market influences.

Having a feed-in tariff set lower than the retail cost encourages people to use batteries in order to save money. Battery use results in further inefficiencies, so are worse for the environment than power sharing.

We do not want a system that encourages un-sustainable behaviour and power hoarding, we want a system that supports increased efficiency and improved sustainability.

If we had a carbon price, we could use that as a price differential between grid generated power and 'distributed generation' power.

So the unit cost of power is a/kWh , and the carbon price is b/kWh , the retailers could retail power for $(a+b)/\text{kWh}$ and the feed-in tariff would be a/kWh and it would be transparent and fair and it would promote sustainable energy use.