

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Wednesday, 9 July 2025 10:44 PM

To: Submissions <Submissions@aemc.gov.au>

Subject: The Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future - Submission - Could not make a submission using AEMC form

The Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future - Submission

This submission is a necessary and unflinching response to what can only be described as the most spectacular regulatory failure in Australia's modern history.

The Australian Energy Market Commission (AEMC), alongside other so-called 'independent' energy regulators, has utterly failed in its fundamental duty to uphold the National Electricity Objective (NEO) and protect the Australian public from the dire consequences of reckless energy market manipulation.

The AEMC's "Pricing Review" is yet another hollow, bureaucratic distraction — a desperate attempt to retroactively rationalise a catastrophic policy trajectory built on ideology, not engineering, and driven by corporate lobbying, not consumer interest. It is little more than a public relations fig leaf to mask the Commission's active complicity in dismantling Australia's once world-class, reliable, secure, affordable electricity grid.

Regarding the Three Overarching Questions

1. Can we rely on competition in the retail market to deliver the mix of products and services that consumers value?

Absolutely not.

The notion that "competition" alone will deliver energy security, affordability, or consumer protection in this captured, heavily distorted market is farcical.

What exists today is a mirage of competition — dozens of retailers offering the same overpriced, convoluted plans that punish loyal customers and confuse vulnerable consumers.

Far from delivering value, "competition" is being weaponised to increase margins, hide true costs, and offload risk onto consumers who are now forced to buy overpriced electricity in a market manipulated by under-regulated generators and profiteering intermediaries.

The result is:

Austerity-level power bills

Unreliable energy supply

A rapid shift from energy security to energy serfdom

This cannot be described as “market failure” — it is a regulatory failure of grotesque proportions!

2. How can better outcomes for consumers be enabled through network tariff-setting processes?

Only through total regulatory overhaul and enforced public-interest auditing.

Network tariffs are not just inefficient — they are fundamentally inequitable, structured to penalise those without Consumer Energy Resources (CER) while silently enabling the theft of the benefits of CER from those who do own it.

Worse, the design is so complex and ever-changing that retailers and consumers alike are effectively disempowered, funneled into accepting opaque, risk-loaded pricing schemes.

There is no transparency. No fairness. No engineering-based rationale.

Instead:

Tariffs are designed to favour corporate hedging and “flexibility” for generators and retailers — not reliability or affordability for consumers.

Pricing signals actively undermine both CER investment returns and essential energy use by households and small business.

Tariffs should reflect true cost, real demand, and actual capacity constraints, not be used as instruments of social engineering or profit extraction.

3. What role can network tariffs play in meeting customer preferences while also contributing to lower overall costs?

None — under the current regulatory and market structure.

The present system ensures tariffs serve private profit, not public good.

The regulator has allowed infrastructure monopolies and financialised energy players to dictate pricing structures completely divorced from real-world engineering constraints or consumer welfare.

Any claim that tariffs today can or do contribute to lower overall costs is a dangerous fiction. In fact, they are deliberately designed to create consumer confusion, perverse signals, and wealth transfers from the many to the few.

Addressing Key Issues and Questions

On Enabling CER and Consumer Needs

Australian households did not purchase rooftop solar, batteries, and home energy systems so that regulators could then scheme to hijack those resources through "coordinated operation", unpaid grid support, or forcibly imposed price signals.

There is no consent.

There is no social license.

There is no equitable benefit sharing.

The current regulatory trajectory seeks to deceive, confiscate, and repurpose private investment in CER under the guise of “system optimisation” — when in reality, it is about shifting infrastructure failure risk to households, while protecting generator margins and ISP modelling fantasies.

On "Lowering System Costs"

Every justification for current CER and network policies is built on "Garbage In, Garbage Out" ISP modelling — speculative, non-engineered, and built on wildly optimistic assumptions that have already been proven wrong:->

Battery capacity overestimates

DER uptake fantasy forecasts

Underestimated grid instability

Overlooked curtailment issues

The regulator is negligently reliant on a modelling regime that is widely debunked, lacks peer-reviewed engineering scrutiny, and completely ignores actual supply/demand physics.

This fantasy economics has not reduced system costs — it has increased them by hundreds of billions:->

See: "The Energy Transition Masquerade: The \$360 Billion You Pay"

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x0NKDozvO58>

On Equity and Consumer Archetypes

The current system does not recognise consumer diversity — it actively exacerbates it.

CER-rich consumers get to bypass costs.

Vulnerable and low-income households are stuck with rising fixed charges and discriminatory time-of-use tariffs that punish those unable to shift usage.

Rural, regional, and disconnected communities are treated as afterthoughts — despite often paying the highest network charges in the NEM.

The Pricing Review's consumer archetypes are an academic exercise in bureaucratic box-ticking, not a pathway to real equity.

On AEMC's "Open and Transparent Process"

The AEMC's claim of "open, transparent consultation" is an insult to the intelligence of Australians.

Real transparency would mean:->

Publicly releasing all ISP model assumptions and datasets for third-party audit

Disclosing full stakeholder lobbying records

Publishing an audited financial impact assessment of current and proposed tariff structures

Presenting all engineering validation studies of claimed CER system benefits

None of this has occurred.

The process is opaque, elite-driven, and completely out of touch with real consumer and engineering realities!

Final Recommendations and Demand for Accountability

Immediate Moratorium on the Transition Disaster is Essential.

Suspend all renewable connections, interconnectors, and ISP-driven projects until a Royal Commission can properly audit the assumptions and impacts.

Halt all further AEMC rule changes related to pricing, CER, and DER until public trust is restored.

Reinstate Australian Energy Sovereignty

Restore baseload generation prioritisation using Australia's abundant coal and gas resources, ensuring synchronous inertia and dispatchable power is available on demand.

Remove the Nuclear Power Ban to enable a beneficial Nuclear Power Industry future.

End the forced dependency on weather-dependent, foreign-manufactured, unethical, insecure, toxic contaminating energy imports that serve the Chinese Communist Party's industrial strategy — not Australian national interests - as RenewaBULLs ARE THE ASBESTOS OF THE FUTURE!

As Patricia Adams warned in China's Energy Dream:

“Carbon dioxide reduction only makes sense for those it (China) wishes to harm and supplant.”

<https://www.thegwpc.org/content/uploads/2021/12/Adams-Chinas-Energy-Dream.pdf>

Hold a Royal Commission ASAP into the Regulator's Role.

Investigate how a supposed independent regulator could allow such sustained damage to Australia's electricity system.

Audit the economic, environmental, and national security impacts of the current regulatory framework and market rules.

Examine the AEMC, AER, AEMO, Energy Ministers, and market participants for conflicts of interest and breaches of the NEL objective.

The Regulator Has Catastrophically Failed

The AEMC's Pricing Review is not a genuine attempt at reform — it is a cover-up for a system in collapse.

It is time for Australians to demand and receive real accountability, real independence, and real engineering-led energy policy.

The regulator has had decades to get this right — and it has squandered every opportunity, enabling vested interests to sabotage our grid, extort consumers, and sell out the national interest.

Genuine, immediate, positive action is required - with an honest course correction — before Australia's lights go out for good - in more ways than one.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

