

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 7.0000000
User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: .0000000
User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 47.0000000
User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] y Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help

deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission and trust this makes common, rational sense to the relevant decision makers.

[REDACTED]

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: [REDACTED] 000
User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] t Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use. I have, just last year installed solar panels with a battery to do my fair share for the climate crisis and to minimise my electricity usage from the grid. I really don't feel that it is fair to penalise the many people like myself who have spent their hard-earned money trying to do the right thing to prop up fossil fuel companies and the grid owners.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: [Redacted] 00000
User: [Redacted]
To the [Redacted] ket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for

a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 0000
User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: [REDACTED] 00
User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them

with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000000

[REDACTED]
To the Australian Energy Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help

deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 2026-02-08T13:53:14.0000000

This is a very cunning ploy by the retailers to sell huge amounts of fossil fuel generated power at a cheap price and load the network costs onto pensioners and solar owners.

If this was to come to fruition for me the obvious choice will be to add

[Redacted] kw of panels, make my next car electric and disconnect from the grid and leave all the state governments to sort out the problems

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
000000

[Redacted signature] rket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
0000000

[REDACTED]arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals,

support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
.0000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5. The sooner companies such as Origin, Energy Australia, Alinta either streamline, reduce their profits or get out of the Market the better we will all be.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake. This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges. One of our options would be to go off-grid , which would deprive the grid of our considerable excess generation.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00

[REDACTED]

Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake. Recommendation 5 appears to follow the principle of the USA intentions which show no consideration for normal electricity users. There should be a balancing rate for both electricity charges and the daily charges applied by retailers

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00000

[REDACTED]

ket Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Pricing Review for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

I am concerned about the negative impact on solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

People who use theEven households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they

are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
0000000

[REDACTED]

arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

It is grossly unfair that households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees,

and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity. It's elitist and is slowing our transition to clean energy.

With household economics under pressure, higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is confusing to say the least and at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted address]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
0000000

[Redacted name]

arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for

a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
22.0000000

[REDACTED] y Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000000

[REDACTED]

arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them

with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 000000
User: [REDACTED]
To the Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help

deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00000

[REDACTED]

ket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
4.0000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

I am writing to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

If we increase fixed network charges it would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high

grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au 00000

[REDACTED]

ket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000000

[Redacted]

arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00000



ket Commission

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. I have already invested thousands of dollars to be able to reduce my energy consumption and that would be all wasted as I could not do anything about the increased fixed network charges (apart from going off grid). Living rural also adds to the disadvantage as there are fewer energy providers which leads to higher costs as there is less competition.

People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
2.0000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery

payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00000

[Redacted]

ket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00000

[REDACTED]

ket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery

owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: [Redacted] 00
User: [Redacted]

To the Australian Energy Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

Australia is world leader in using solar energy, a cleaner alternative to decades of using fossil fuels and as such consumers who have chosen to invest in cleaner alternatives should not be further penalised by increasing the fixed network charges.

As constantly reported, almost on a daily basis, Australians are suffering and struggling with a cost of living crisis, why add to their current burden.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: :24.0000000
User: [REDACTED]
To the Energy Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down

wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 0000000
User: [REDACTED] u
To the [REDACTED] Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000000

[REDACTED]

arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar owners and potential battery owners like myself, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

The proposal is particularly egregious as people who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal. These people are already under severe financial strain from increased mortgage

interest and rental charges.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted address]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
000000

[Redacted name]

arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

As someone who has made a significant investment in rooftop solar, on the

understanding that this investment would, over time, pay for itself, these proposed changes would completely destroy the fundamentals of the economic decision I and millions of others have made. It would constitute a massive breach of trust with the consumer who wants to decrease grid reliance and embrace renewable generation.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Pricing systems should be based on usage, not access. If I go to a supermarket, I don't pay a \$50 entry fee and get my goods at lower prices. If I go to a restaurant I don't pay \$100 to sit down and get a \$10 steak. Given we (almost) all have to be on the grid, this seems a ill thought out, biased, retrograde proposition which would hinder further efforts to address climate change, and give windfalls to private companies, in a market where I cannot choose not to pay for their services.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000

[REDACTED]

t Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - (I fit into this category) would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades. AND MOST IMPORTANTLY, HELPS IN THE FIGHT AGAINST CLIMATE CHANGE.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households. AND A BETTER ENVIRONMENTAL OUTCOME8

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00000

ket Commission,

Disappointed with your future plans.
I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

r considering my submission.

d retiree trying to survive with our current inflationary cycle.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]
[Redacted]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
.0000000

[Redacted] Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

[REDACTED]

mission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

I live in the country and already pay double what my family who live in the city pay. Network charges are already way too expensive where I live and are an unavoidable cost.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
00.0000000

[REDACTED]

y Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery

owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
000000

[Redacted footer]

To the Australian Energy Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,



From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
6.0000000

Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to

properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
:32.0000000

[REDACTED]

gy Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: [REDACTED] 000
User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] t Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery

payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000

[REDACTED]

et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 0000
User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery

owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted address]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: S
Date: [Redacted]
User:

To the Australian Energy Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

There must be more options available that do not penalize people who have invested in renewables and also not create an added burden for people struggling with the cost of living. Government inaction over decades has created this

situation but there must be a way to get an outcome without penalizing energy users.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date:

User:

To the [REDACTED] Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00000

[REDACTED]

ket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy

resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

[REDACTED]

Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high

grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
7.0000000

[Redacted]

Market Commission,

Please find my submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

I am seriously concerned that increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity. Pricing should encourage high consumption households to reduce their consumption not favour not encourage them to increase consumption.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake. I wish to increase my solar panel installation and add a battery to my system but higher fixed charges is going to make this harder.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

It makes sense that electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges. It is likely that this

_____ e would increase charges for solar households _____

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
:58.0000000



Energy Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals,

support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00000

[REDACTED]

ket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

We currently have a [REDACTED] solar system, which means we export quite a bit of power to the grid. We're in the process of moving to a battery to give us access to our own solar-generated energy when the sun is not shining, and also to reduce pressure on the grid during high solar generation times. This increase in fixed charges means that we will be paying more and means we will need to think again going ahead with the battery, as we will be charged regardless of how much energy we take from the grid.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: [REDACTED] 0000
User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00000

[Redacted]

ket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery

owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au 00000

[REDACTED]

To the Australian Energy Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,



From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 8.0000000
User: [REDACTED]
To the Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar panel owners, and people trying to reduce their electricity use.

I was considering installing a battery, but now I am hesitant if there will be little to no impact on my bill. I only spend [REDACTED] on electricity, so currently a battery will take [REDACTED] to pay off. If you increase the daily rate, then that will take longer, making the investment worthless.

Houses without solar or batteries, or people who use the least electricity will be forced to pay more under this proposal.

It is only the distribution network, and those with high grid consumption that will benefit from this proposal.

This goes against other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increased fixed network charges and look at alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources.

Thank you.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: [REDACTED] 00000
User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] ket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
0000000

[REDACTED]

arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Since moving from a remote, off-grid location (where we generated and managed our own solar electricity system) we have invested in solar and battery in an over-50s Village. Here we on an embedded system which results in our being unable to choose our supplier. Other suppliers are denied access to the embedded system so we are in a monopoly situation. essentially our only electricity charges are the fixed connection to the grid charges; we cannot avoid these in this embedded system.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners like us, energy-efficient households, and all people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal. My brother who lives in a single bedroom unit is in this situation; he does all he can to reduce his electricity use but is precluded from installing solar as a renter.

Increasing fixed charges will drive pensioners like him to consider cutting is health care costs when he cannot avoid keeping the electricity on but may consider not filling prescription/s to stay within his very limited income.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
6.0000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for

a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
0000000

[REDACTED] Market Commission,

I am concerned that the rules are being changed which affect the feedin tariff, therefore I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals,

support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000

[REDACTED]

et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]
[Redacted]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
0000000

[Redacted]arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy

resources, rising slower uptake. We have already lost our feed in tariff, which means our input already benefits power companies with free generation.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges. I would have thought when determining supply costs that the poles and wires would already be factored in, and increasing fixed charges would be "double dipping".

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: [REDACTED] 000
User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] t Commission,

I am an Australian senior citizen who in recent years installed solar panels on my roof - at great expense, but trusting that this investment would reduce my power bills in the current cost-of-living crisis.

I am now writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery

owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People like me who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 2026-02-08T12:38:27.000000

[REDACTED] et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date:
User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my outrage about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use. In fact, solar home owners do not get compensated for their infrastructure investment that other generators are able to claim a depreciation charge over!

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

I live in a property with an embedded network. I'm essentially stuck on their supply arrangement and every cost they pass on and I'm prevented from selling my energy and battery storage through an energy loop. This is anti-competitive and anti-consumer and you wish to tilt the system more in their favour at the inequitable disadvantage of micro suppliers of renewable home energy. Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
0000000

[REDACTED]

arket Commission,

Here's my submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future.

Fact 1 - Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use. Many people now fit into this category including my family

Fact 2 - Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Fact 3 -, the infrastructure companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity. No fairness here.

Fact 4 -higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

Conclusion - All of these facts are at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

The AEMC should not proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Please consider my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted address]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

[Redacted phone number] 0000

et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
:32.0000000

[REDACTED]

gy Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery

owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
4.0000000

[REDACTED]

To the Australian Energy Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

I invested in solar and batteries to save money and would seriously consider going fully off grid if the fixed charges increase as proposed.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

If enough of us go fully off grid as a result of increased fixed charges, the public electricity grid will become much less viable. The proposal needs to be fully reworked or ditched.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
:38.0000000

[REDACTED]

gy Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down

wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 00000
User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
000000

[REDACTED]

arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
1.0000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my grave concerns about Recommendation #5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar & battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000

[REDACTED] t Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000

[REDACTED] et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 6.0000000
User: [REDACTED]
To the Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down

wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00000

[REDACTED]

et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00

[Redacted]

Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: .0000000
User: [REDACTED]
To th [REDACTED] Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery

owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted address]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
9.0000000

[Redacted footer]

To the Australian Energy Market Commission,

As a retired former business founder and director, I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

I have always encouraged my adult children and grandchildren to contribute to their communities and to society in every way they can. They did this enthusiastically by reducing their electricity use and by relying on alternate energy production with solar, batteries, and energy efficiency, such as EVs.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted by Recommendation 5. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and will definitely weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies elsewhere in the world. I have lived in Europe, Asia, and Australia and I know of this first hand. Other governments, even in China, encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
2.0000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down

wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000

[REDACTED]

t Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000

[REDACTED]

et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Any proposal to increase fixed network charges negatively impacts solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes will also be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
.0000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery

owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Far preferable to this proposal 6 by AEMC would be government nationalisation of the Eastern Grid.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00000

[REDACTED] ket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000

[REDACTED]

et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Us who have invested in "the right thing", should be rewarded - not punished.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000

[REDACTED]

t Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy

resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: .0000000
User: [REDACTED]
To the Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high

grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted address]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: [Redacted] 0000
User: [Redacted]
To the [Redacted] et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

As a retiree I used a portion of my "superannuation Funds" to install a home Solar and battery system and energy efficient equipment and materials. It has

been very successfully and resulted in significant savings for the last couple of years. My objective was to try and reduce my ongoing costs as I will receive minimal income in the future.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact all solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

The peak usage and associated production requirements and associated costs for the whole Electricity system was determined by the middle of the day usage and demand. The investment in Home "Solar" has been instrumental in providing a large portion of this supply (and associated reduced demand). This has resulted in the peak grid demand being transferred to later in the evening and the middle of the day becoming the trough in demand on the major generators. The recent investment in batteries is now reducing the evening peak and its associated costs for the system and thereby the competitive price and income of the generators and distributors.

Recommendation 5 is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower their demand and costs. This includes energy efficient projects, eg insulation, draught exclusion, but also installing more efficient electric equipment, eg High efficiency heat pumps. The system should not punish consumers with higher unavoidable charges and deter taking action to improve efficiency and reduce their adverse climate impacts.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery

payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, resulting in a slower uptake. Distributed (Home) systems results in reducing the demand on the overall grid as the fed-in power going into the grid will only need to be transferred to the neighbours or immediate area.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity. Some of these companies and the associated retailers are the most profitable energy companies in the world and have not adjusted or invested sufficiently in the new technologies.

It is intriguing that these major corporations which are overseas owned appear to be getting protection, perhaps from potential ISDS rulings, whilst local consumers are being directly penalized.

Recommendation 5 will result in a further loss in Trust in Government and Industry Bodies. When the initial Feed-In tariffs were introduced they were at a high rate to incentivise investments and the development of the whole industry. It was very successful and the feed-in tariff rates were progressively reduced but the original tariffs continued for those original investors which is a fair and honest arrangement.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households and the environment.

Thank you for considering my submission

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 2026-02-08T12:17:20.000000

[REDACTED] Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
:16:57.0000000

energy Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to

properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00

[REDACTED]

Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

It genuinely feels like the agency is favouring the companies it has been put in place to regulate and not supporting affordability and productivity of the Australian people.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.e

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 18.0000000
User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] Market Commission,

I wish to express my concerns about Recommendation 5 in relation to the proposal to increase fixed network charges.

I can only foresee this action would negatively impact most consumers trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees like me, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal and there are very few ways I can offset this network charge increase.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal.

I am particularly concerned that higher fixed charges would extend my solar and battery payback period that I am about to incur to take advantage of the govt battery rebate scheme.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to

properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households with more incentives given to consumers who are helping Australia to deliver a cleaner energy system.

Thank you for considering my submission

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 5:06.0000000
User: [REDACTED]
To the Energy Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help

deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000

[REDACTED]

t Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00000

[REDACTED]

ket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income

households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
000000

[REDACTED]

arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact me as a retired solar owner, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted address]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000

[REDACTED] et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
000000

[REDACTED] rket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
.0000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down

wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
:42.0000000

[REDACTED]

y Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

[REDACTED]

ommission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00000

[Redacted]

ket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery

owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 2026-02-08T12:02:38.0000000

User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
000000

Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

I have solar. This seemingly is supposed to be my contribution to reducing climate change and reducing my demand on the central supply.

It is a real abuse that an intrinsic cog in the central power supply can't get its act together, and has to grub the population which is trying to assist correct both the appalling government oversight of our centralised power system and come off-grid in-so-far as funds might allow.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would likely be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Higher fixed charges will extend solar and battery payback periods and substantially weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources. Brilliant result - Not.

You might compare other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - cutting emissions, bringing down energy prices, and reducing the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

Australia should have the cheapest power on the planet, but continued fluffing around by governments including the possibility of this appalling addition to our costings is unacceptable, and a display of total incompetence on how our power is managed and delivered.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000

[REDACTED]

et Commission,

I have just added a battery to my rooftop solar system, inspired by the govt rebate.

So am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

It seems unfair that increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
.0000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

I know this is. Form Letter but if does not take away from how we all feel and what is ultimately right for Australia and not big greedy power companies.

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000

[REDACTED]

et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery

owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
0000000

[Redacted footer]

To the Australian Energy Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,



From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
:04.0000000

gy Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to

properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 000000
User: [REDACTED]
To the Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
0000000

[REDACTED]

arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery

payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000000

[REDACTED]

arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000

[REDACTED]

et Commission,

The following is a template by Solar Citizens. I thoroughly agree with it, so am forwarding it for your consideration. It would be deeply disappointing & retrograde, not to mention unfair, for fixed charges for poles & wires to be increased. Find the necessary revenue elsewhere (maybe by taxing major polluters).

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
000000

[REDACTED] rket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals,

support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000000

[REDACTED]

arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Higher fixed network charges will likely incentivise people and companies to be less efficient in their energy usage: even to waste electricity.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down

wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
4.0000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be Forced to pay More under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00000

[REDACTED]

Energy Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000

[REDACTED]

et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery

owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted address]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
000000

[Redacted footer]

To the Australian Energy Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and in particular to express concerns about Recommendation 5.

The proposal to increase fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am additionally concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, causing a slower uptake of alternative energy sources.

The logic of this proposal is also at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades. It makes it appear as though the government is changing the goal posts for electricity consumers 'ad hoc', and thus sends a message of confusion concerning how best to contain energy pricing for everyday Australians.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for taking the time and effort to consider my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000

[REDACTED]

et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand,

and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

As a household considering whether to install a home battery, this proposed increase in fixed costs will rule out a battery for us as the payback time will be excessive.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000000

[REDACTED]

arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity – including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households – would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0

[REDACTED]

Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
0000000

[REDACTED]

arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery

owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted address]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
000000

[Redacted footer]

To the Australian Energy Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,



From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00000

ket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to

properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
0000000

[REDACTED]

arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000

[REDACTED]

t Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal. I am in this latter category as a retired single renter!

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000

[REDACTED]

t Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
.0000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery

owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 2026-02-08T11:42:37.0000000

[REDACTED] mission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00

Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to

properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000000

[REDACTED]

arket Commission,

Can you publish the analysis that led you to this decision? We are moving from a purely centralised system to a mix of central and decentralised system , that is obvious.

Probably there will be some unsettling issues on the way. This is one of them. What is the pricing structure? Will the suburban householder pay the same as a big business? Where do you assess network charges? Is it based on infrastructure age? Maintenance requirements? Distance from a sub station? How about you give the poor suckers out here some insights into what you intend, the range of consumers who you intend to fund it, presumably big business will pay big. How much work is involved and at what cost? And why this is your preferred option? Will there be a mechanism to cap rises? Align charges to revenue? CPI?

Just give us some analysis info, please! Other wise, the mob will start to think its a stitch up to protect commercial interests. Yes information can allay some concerns and encourage productive input. Over to you now.....

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Thank you for considering my concern.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
000000

[REDACTED]

arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households. Many households, including ours, have already invested and deserve recognition of this investment.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: [REDACTED] 0000
User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: [REDACTED] 00
User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households

could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature block]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

[Redacted recipient name] 0
Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even people who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is seriously at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted name]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: [Redacted] 00000
User: [Redacted]
To the [Redacted] ket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for

a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

[REDACTED] sion,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future. I wish to express my profound concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and punish people trying to do the right thing by the environment - and the future - by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal. What kind of incentive is that to be energy-smart.

Meanwhile, high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity. Again, what sort of equity is that?!

This recommendation is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

In short, Sustainability 101!!

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
2.0000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date:
User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] mission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down

wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 4.0000000
User: [REDACTED]
To the Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000

[REDACTED]

t Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

[REDACTED]

ommission,

Here is my submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future.

My major concern is Recommendation 5 which reads as if it has been crafted by the energy retailers themselves as it de-risks their business model and insulates them against declining demand as a result of household solar.

Furthermore it rewards high energy users and penalises those who have installed panels and batteries. This has to be against the thrust of government programs to encourage householder involvement in a cleaner, more distributed energy system.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00000

[REDACTED]

ket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00

[REDACTED]

Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000

[REDACTED]

et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery

owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
4.0000000

[REDACTED]

To the Australian Energy Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,



From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Submission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to

properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Kathryn Maxwell

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
.0000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

I have invested in solar, a battery and energy efficient appliances. Higher fixed charges will be a disincentive to further such investments.

I have also seen deteriorating rebates on energy fed back into the grid.

I feel a higher fixed cost, while protecting energy retailers, will diminish the benefits of solarisation and run counter to broader government policies on energy.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to craft a consistent pricing system that does not work against those who are seeking to do the right thing by the planet and making their own investment in a clean energy future.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
000000

[REDACTED] rket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Renationalise the grid so it's fair for everyone rather than CEOs who making huge bonuses

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

[REDACTED]

ion,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000

[REDACTED]

t Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even though I was a low energy user, I installed solar power in 2009 and recently upgraded my system to create an all electric household. I was considering adding a battery to my system but increases to the supply charge would mean that I would be paying off the costs of the recent upgrades, a battery and an ongoing costly supply charge. Even now, the supply charge and the reduced feed in tariff means little saving when my household daily use is on average [REDACTED] daily.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies stand to make money on existing

infrastructure. In older suburbs most of this was established under the public owned state electricity commission . Also, upgrades of street wires to the household are paid by the consumer.

Overall, higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, leading to slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs. Ultimately it ensures lower emissions and a healthier environment.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00

[REDACTED]

Commission,

Dear Sir or Madam

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by

reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
000000

[REDACTED]

Australian Energy Market Commission,

I am the owner of five east coast residences. So I speak for not only my family but for those four households of my tenants.

I have always endeavoured to have good, long term tenants and, consequently reward them by keeping mine and their costs at the lower end of market rates.

So I often scrutinise the electricity invoices, often making the point to tenants that the majority of their electricity bill is the fixed connection fee.

No matter whether it is the three residences with solar panels or the one without.

That cost factor is one of the major issues in my consideration as to whether to

install storage batteries on the two freestanding cottages.

Hence why I am now writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns

about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery

owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by

reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be

negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high

grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households

could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they

are using the most electricity.

I opine that in principal the electricity grid should be operated as a public

utility for the benefit of the consumers. The focus should Not be how to maximise profits for private corporations.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery

payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy

resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help

deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down

wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand,

and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them

with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households. Thanking you in anticipation of you giving favourable consideration to my submission.

nally,

[REDACTED]

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: [REDACTED] 0000
User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help

deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000000

[REDACTED]

arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000000

[REDACTED]

arket Commission,

I am about to purchase a battery to enhance my small solar system. [REDACTED]. The battery will reduce my bills after paying for itself in about 8 years. It will also reduce my households dependency on fossil fuels.

The recommendation 5 will make the payback period longer and less viable for me. The reduction of carbon dependency seems like an important factor me. I don't think you should make it more difficult for me to reduce carbon dependency.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

.0000000

Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 5.0000000
User: [REDACTED]
To the Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000

[REDACTED]

t Commission,

I have installed solar panels on my home and am looking at a home battery to reduce my electricity costs. I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5, which will significantly reduce the economic benefit of a battery to me and thousands of other Australians.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
.0000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

As a Lake Macquarie pensioners who have invested considerable personal resources to electrifying our home and installing solar panela and a battery we are writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express our concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering our submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted name]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: [Redacted] 00
User: [Redacted]
To th [Redacted] Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery

owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000000

[REDACTED]

arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

[Redacted] 000000
[Redacted] rket Commission,

Hundreds of thousands of people have invested a significant amount of their own money in solar panels and batteries. Those investments were based on current pricing models, particularly fixed network charges.

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would significantly negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right

thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, risking slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

Government's first priority should be people and consumers, not the profits of corporations. The AEMC as a government agency should also have the same focus.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
000000

[REDACTED] rket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000

[REDACTED]

t Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
0.0000000

[REDACTED] Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down

wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
0:40.0000000

[REDACTED]

gy Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households. Personally I would also consider going off the grid if this takes place despite the risk of being without a backup power system. If this is not allowed I would then consider raising awareness and going to a high court action to make households not being forced into mandatory connection to the grid.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
9.0000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery

owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted address]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
:24.0000000

[Redacted footer]

To the Australian Energy Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,



From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
000000

Market Commission,

This submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future is to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am troubled that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
26.0000000

[REDACTED]

y Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000000

[REDACTED]

arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help

deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000

[REDACTED]

et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00000

[REDACTED]

ket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income

households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000

[REDACTED]

et Commission,

I wish to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity. A galling prospect.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000

[REDACTED] et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
0000000

[REDACTED]arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

[REDACTED]

ission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down

wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00000

[REDACTED]

et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
2.0000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
.0000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery

owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

I don't currently have solar panels installed. We are actively monitoring our electricity usage and switch off appliances. Already now, the fixed charges are a large component of our bill. If that goes up, there will be less incentive to go solar. Don't punish low electricity users. Heavy users should pay!

Yours Sincerely,



From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00

Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to

properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
1.0000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: [REDACTED] 00000
User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

To reduce non renewable electricity usage, you have to increase the cost per Kw.
To encourage solar uptake you have to increase the feed in tariff.
It's a simple user-payer scheme.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 8.0000000
User: [REDACTED]
To the Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy

resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000

[Redacted]

t Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

If the network companies are allowed to increase revenue to pay off the network then shouldn't other people who have invested also get the same deal?

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
0.0000000

 Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

000

[REDACTED]

t Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed prices and transferring wealth to the energy companies is a regressive tax. This would be a betrayal of the electorate and Labor's claimed values.

This would be stupid waste of your electoral mandate, and be corrosive to any trust in Labor. The long term consequences will negatively impact all progressive agendas.

You will lose all the people who have invested in efficiency and solar, who would normally be your constituencies, and impact all the people already at a disadvantage. Where do you think future votes will come from, energy company executives?

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000

[REDACTED]

ket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for

a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
0000000

[REDACTED]arket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 9.0000000
User: [REDACTED]
To the Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them

with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000

[REDACTED]

et Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help

deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

[REDACTED]
Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Contact: [REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
1.0000000

[REDACTED] Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households

could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

[REDACTED]

ommission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

[REDACTED]

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for

a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

[REDACTED] ommission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00000

[REDACTED]

ket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them

with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00

[REDACTED]

Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help

deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I feel like a sitting duck. I am retired self funded widow. When I made my retirement plans to the rules in place, I expected to have a moderate comfortable life.

Since then the government and business have changed the rules so often I feel cheated. I rarely travel, I have reduced my spending but find the bills are greater than my income. My life is bleak.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

[REDACTED]

ion,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be

negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00000

[REDACTED]

ket Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

I am very concerned about plans to raise the fixed network charges in your future pricing structure. While I have understood why people with solar panels don't get paid as much per kwh as they pay, because the network needs to be remodeled and or extended to allow for the many people who feed into the grid, an increase in the fixed rates is socially very unfair, as it hits the poorest the worst. It is also economically and climate-technically non-sensical and destructive.

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake.

This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals,

Personal, defamatory and other confidential information has been omitted per our publication process.

support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]