

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
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
15.0000000

[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

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

.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
:14.0000000

[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

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

000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

Please accept my submission expressing my objection to increasing the fixed pricing of electricity as indicated in 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.

Please stand up for fair electricity pricing that rewards households, not punishes them, for being part of Australia's clean energy future.

Thank you for considering my submission.

For the only planet we have.

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

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
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]

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
28.0000000

[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

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 as a proportion of the total electricity bill of low and mid-consumption households 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. While I support the need for end-users to contribute to some of the cost of maintaining fixed network charges, I believe the current level of fixed network pricing or perhaps even a slightly lower level of charges for household users is appropriate.

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,



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

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.

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.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. It would be completely unjust that 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.

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.

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.

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].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

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.

This will add an expensive cost to my electricity bill and I am a single homeowner with solar panels and I am already paying much more now that the solar incentives have been reduced. I was contemplating adding a solar battery but now it seems I will be left too far out of pocket costs.

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

000

[Redacted address]

t Commission,

As a renewable energy salesman, the ability to spruik the benefits of outlaying

significant capitol on installing solar and now batteries is constantly being undermined by the ever moving goal posts.

The reason that the cost of power has significantly reduced during the day is because of the investment of mum and dads into rooftop solar. This is the first piece of the puzzle in transitioning to renewables and alleviating some of the load on fossil generated power. The storage of renewable energy is the second piece of the transition and there are many households currently investing in batteries to relieve their ever increasing power bills. Addition additional fixed costs, regardless of significant personal investment goes against both the benefit of such investment and the wider goal of transitioning to renewable energy.

Thus 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 subject line]

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
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

00

[Redacted]

Commission,

I was shocked when I read about the industry proposal to increase fixed charges. This completely goes against the necessity to encourage people to invest in energy saving technologies. We face climate change due largely to the profit making energy industries and we should be doing whatever we can to encourage

energy saving and wise use. Fixed charges that don't support private energy demand must be encouraged.

Hence, 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
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 block]

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

[Redacted address line]
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.

I own an electric vehicle with an 80kwh battery, also 11 kw of solar on my roof. An increase in the fixed charge world drive folk like me to go totally off grid, increasing the load on the less priviledged folk.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature block]

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
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

[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.

I have spent just under [REDACTED] upgrading my house to save on electricity, then you come along and consider upping fixed network charges. Let's be real the only ones who benefit are the big company's not us who have invested in your dream of cheaper energy. Time you started doing the right thing for the ones sucked into your proposals. Defiantly not agreeing with this submission.

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

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.

I have just negotiated a supply charge of [REDACTED] when Engie had

[REDACTED] o
[REDACTED] .

I have paid for solar plus batteries and contribute cheap power to the grid.
Make the government pay for poles and wires through increased taxes on mining companies and the wealthy.

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
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. I have already disconnected from the gas network because of huge connection costs relative to usage costs, it's impossible to save money.

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, which are clearly profitable, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households could save on their energy bills even though

they are using the most electricity, there would be little incentive to use less.

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

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
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]

[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: 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

[REDACTED]

ommission

I wish to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future. I am especially outraged at the suggestion (recommendation 5) that fixed energy prices should increase.

Increasing fixed charges has the opposite effect of what we need everyone to do, that reduce their consumption of energy from fossil fuel sources. We need everyone to be producing and storing their own energy through batteries and solar.

This has the biggest impact on those who use energy the least, whether they have installed solar or not. Often this is the poorest people, who do everything they can to reduce their energy costs. At the same time those who use the most energy, usually high income households, will benefit the most.

This seems contrary to all other government policies.

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.

I encourage you to consider different system, so that people are encouraged to reduce their energy usage, and those that can least afford to pay are not hurt the most.

Thank you for considering my submission.

[REDACTED]

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

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.

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]

Extremely bad decision
Mindset woeful
Can't believe this

Why oh why is our country heading down this path!!!! We have worked so hard to achieve solar renewables in our home. WTF are you doing to our country...

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.

My wife and I have been increasing our solar battery array and bought a battery so that our retirement years would be affordable. Before we both retired we invested in a cheaper cleaner way of producing and using the energy that powers

 seem

on destroying this common sense approach to helping ourselves in retirement by making this more expensive and less clean than in the recent past. We want, no we need cleaner more affordable power in this country and you seem intent on making this harder not just for my wife and I but for everyone else. You should be doing everything you can to encourage this and not continue on this renewables destroying path.

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.

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

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 signature block]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 1.0000000
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
Date: 5.0000000
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, expressing 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, 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. How can this inequity be ethical?

Also concerning is 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 certainly 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 strongly 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,



Contact: judrees@hotmail.com

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.

I am planning to upgrade my solar panels and add a battery. An increase to the network costs would make the payback time longer and harder for me to justify the cost of the upgrade.

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

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 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
3.0000000

[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]
[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date:

User: [REDACTED]

Prop [REDACTED] OT in Consumers' Interest

This is a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future.

I especially want to express my concerns about Recommendation 5. This is NOT aligned with the title of your review which claims to target a Consumer-Driven Future.

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, the only ones to benefit from this proposed increase in daily charges would be the Distribution companies that own the poles and wires. This is NOT YOUR BRIEF. Your task is to provide a better environment for the CONSUMER.

Even consumers 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 unconscionable proposal.

In addition to the poles and wires companies, high-income households with high grid consumption also 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 quite simply an indefensible imbalance toward those who can best afford to pay, and against those who can least afford such an increase.

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

Crucially, your proposal is at odds with other government policies which encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system. Increasing the daily charge also flies in the face of government policies that aim to cut emissions, bring down wholesale energy prices, and reduce the need for costly network upgrades.

Electricity pricing should encourage consumers to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs – not punish them by increasing the unavoidable daily charges.

For all the reasons above, I urge the AEMC NOT to proceed with increasing fixed network charges. Instead, your brief should guide you to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for consumers.

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 signature]

[Redacted contact information]

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

[Redacted subject line]

ssion,

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]

[Redacted]

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

000000

[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]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: [REDACTED] 000

User: [REDACTED]

To the [REDACTED] t Commission,

I am writing to submit my formal feedback regarding the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, specifically to address the fundamental flaws in Recommendation 5.

As a retired household living on a government pension, this is not a theoretical debate for us -- it is a matter of direct financial pressure. My household was an early adopter of renewable technology, investing in a [REDACTED] solar system back in 2012. We made that choice at a time when the technology was still maturing, believing we were making a long-term contribution to a cleaner grid while securing our own financial future.

Increasing fixed network charges now feels like a calculated "bait and switch." This policy effectively punishes those of us who have spent the last 14 years supporting the energy transition. By shifting costs toward unavoidable fixed fees, the AEMC is devaluing our long-term investment and removing the one tool we have to manage our cost of living: controlling our usage. On a fixed income, budget stability is paramount; removing the price signal that rewards efficiency is a regressive step that hits pensioners and low-consumption households the hardest.

Furthermore, this proposal creates a perverse incentive by rewarding high-consumption households. Under this model, high-income users with the largest grid demand could actually see their bills fall, while those using the least -- the very people the system should be protecting -- are forced to pick up the tab. This isn't just an inequitable outcome; it's a form of strategic oversteering that is completely at odds with every other government signal encouraging us to cut emissions and lower wholesale energy prices.

Electricity pricing should be designed to reward solutions that lower system

costs, not to guarantee revenue for poles-and-wires companies at the expense of efficiency. I urge the AEMC to scrap the plan to increase fixed charges and instead develop a model that preserves strong price signals and delivers actually fair outcomes for all Australian households, particularly those on fixed incomes who have already invested significantly in the grid's future.

Thank you for your consideration of this submission ahead of the February 13 deadline.

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]

Market Commission,

My submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future - Recommendation 5

I believe increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners and energy-efficient households who have been trying to take the pressure of the electricity supply by their actions. These are people who have been trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use from the grid.

Households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes because they are not in the position to be able to afford these changes, would be negatively impacted by this proposal. People who use the least electricity would be forced

to pay more if network charges were increased. Pensioners, renter, single-person households, apartment residents and low-income households would be financially affected.

The only groups to benefit from higher fixed charges would be the poles and wires companies and high-income households who can afford high grid consumption.

I am also concerned that this would discourage households to take up solar and batteries which is helping deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system, cuttings emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades. This is because higher fixed charges would increase solar and battery payback periods.

Higher unavoidable charges, as are proposed, will not encourage households to invest in solutions that save energy and shift demand and in doing so, take pressure off the supply system.

I strongly urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing the fixed network charges 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
6.0000000

[Redacted name]

Market Commission,

Here is my submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a

Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my annoyance 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. Why are energy companies being rewarded for their laggardly behaviour? They should be encouraged not to put up power prices for poles and wires or other infrastructure because we the public are doing the heavy lifting producing so much electricity during the sunny day hours. They should be building batteries to capture some of our power generation to sell to those who do not have solar. AEMC is damaging the good and solid work governments and ordinary people have done to cut CO2 emissions and to lower consumers' energy costs.

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. This is outrageous and wrong headed. It is facilitating putting profits before people when it should be people before profits. Sure the companies need to make profits, but how much profit? and at what cost to tax payers?

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. Already those of us who have good feed in tariffs have to wait to put in batteries and possibly miss out on government incentives because in Qld Energex will cut feed in tariffs if we install batteries!!!

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. There are many days in summer when renewables are providing more electricity than fossil fuel sources. This should be celebrated! Encouraged more and more.

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. Please do not punish us who have spent thousands on our infrastructure at our homes (we have to maintain this so what about our ongoing maintenance cost?) I'm sure AEMC hasn't bothered to factor in us and our contribution to reducing fossil fuel emissions. Please give us consideration.

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.

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
8.0000000

[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 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.

The Gentailers have been doing this for years. When the electricity price is reduced at the annual review, they just put up the daily charges and thereby maintain their revenue at the same level. Thereby sabotaging the grid transition to renewables. I understand that the companies and Government entities that own the poles and wires charge a fixed fee giving the gentailers the option to charge whatever they like. The mark up over the cost of the poles and wires could be of the order of [REDACTED]. The gentailers charge up to [REDACTED]. Your job and responsibility to the Australian community is to stop the gouging by the gentailers. No wonder inflation is on the rise and adversely affecting mortgage rates.

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 serious concerns about Recommendation 5. How can the power companies greed be upheld by you - they will try anything, all the time, to procure more and more money for themselves - STOP THIS GOUGING

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

00

[Redacted name]

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
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 greener consumer energy resources, resulting in 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.

I understand that privatized electricity companies exist to increase profits for shareholders, but, as a longer term national initiative for cleaner energy, 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
9.0000000

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
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

[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]

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 affect all network customers. I can think back to the days when these additional fees just didn't exist. As a customer it feels exploitative, that we have to pay connection fees even if we use little or no product. Electricity is an essential service and with the electrification of more and more of the demand side part of the equation this is becoming even more so. Yet, as I understand it, customer and business investments in batteries and solar is spreading network loads, flattening the

peak supply and peak demand periods, which over time means less investment in distribution services.

With regulations enabling distribution service providers (DSP) to simply pass all their costs onto consumers, represents a monopolisation of the system as we the customers cannot choose our DSPs, only our retailers. It seems their monopoly status over this part of the network, combined with their degree of separation from the customer, make them impervious to customer needs and choice. This is not fair. We should not be locked into what ever the DSPs demand.

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, which will also slow the decarbonisation of the grid - essential to our kids futures.

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

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

20.0000000

[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

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
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.

What is the point of trying to help reduce our emissions, to generate electricity to take pressure of the ageing system.

Should I start burning wood again !

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
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.

I am retired, live in a single person household and have solar panels. Under this proposal of increasing fixed network charges I would be paying more for my electricity, despite trying to reduce my electricity costs.

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
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

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.

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].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.

To say the least, I was aghast when I read Recommendation 5. This Recommendation will impact severely those least able to afford the proposed change. It is clearly a cost of living issue for so many. People who use the least amount of electricity would be forced to pay comparatively more under this proposal.

Yet again, after previous years of energy networks 'gold plating' the grid, we find that they need to be bailed out again because they have preferred to deliver profits to their shareholders rather than continue to invest in the networks that they own.

Sadly, a grid once built and owned by the taxpayer, since privatisation these semi-monopolistic corporations are seeking more power to charge ordinary consumers. Surely, this is a clear example of market failure!

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.

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 also believe that such an increase will lead to the wealthier households considering or deciding to go off grid.

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]
[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

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.

The daily supply charge already exceeds our electricity usage and, even if we get a battery and go off grid but wish to contribute our excess solar to the community, we will have pay to do so - at a proposed increased cost. In these days of climate changing "natural" disasters, this makes no sense and shows a blatant disregard for the future generations.

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. - and I am proud to be one of these people.

We have invested significantly in solar and batteries to minimise our impact on the environment, and the grid - recognizing that battery banks such as ours can provide benefits to the grid by being used to assist with load leveling and overall grid stability.

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 - an outcome that does not pass the pub test no matter how you spin it.

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
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.

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 must 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
7.0000000

[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

[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]

[Redacted contact information]

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

00000

[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,



[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: [REDACTED] 00

User: [REDACTED]

To the 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.

This proposal if implemented will push me and others off grid

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]

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
7.0000000

[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 my energy bills as a solar and battery owner, energy-efficient householder and less well off people than me trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use by necessity.

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

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]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: 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

000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future.

Increasing fixed network charges would be mighty unfair to us solar and battery owners, who have spent a huge amount of money paying for 22 panels and a battery.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would discourage more people from buying solar panels and batteries, thus reducing the benefits of more solar-generated power in reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

The pricing of electricity should be set to encourage people to do everything they can to reduce global warming.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

00

Commission,

Time to seriously support all initiatives that lower carbon emissions above all else .

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 from [REDACTED], father of two sons who will do anything he can to prevent their futures being jeopardised by myopic policy.

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 like myself, trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use to avoid contributing to the worst consequences of ignoring the impending climate crisis

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. Both my young sons, currently renting in Wollongong would be severely affected by 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. Shouldn't we be encouraging people to reduce their carbon footprint rather than punish those who are behaving proactively.

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]

[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.

Electricity prices are a major contributor to the high cost of living and has a multiplier effect as major electricity consumers pass on the increased cost while small consumers have no choice but bear the brunt

We have a very inefficient electricity marketing system where the wholesale cost of electricity fluctuates widely . The multitude of retailers with high

overheads and high advertising cost and need for ever increasing profits drive prices ever upward . Currently we manage to turn low cost renewable energy high cost retail prices. This needs to be reversed

I thought the fixed cost portion of our electricity bill was to pay for the cost of the distribution network but this cost varies between retailers so they must be able to mark up the fixed costs.

I think we need a total rethink of how the energy market works and how it can be more efficiently operated . When our electricity system was privatized we were promised that it would operate more efficiently and reduce prices . This has not been the case .

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that make our fit for purpose and deliver affordable energy which is essential for our future prosperity

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
Date: 000000
User: [REDACTED]
To the Market Commission,

As a pensioner, I make a big effort to save on power. I only have one light burning at a time, as I move from room to room; I have no TV (I read) and my only concession to excess is to have a heated mat on at night and in cooler weather for my small dog.

So, 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
0000000

arket Commission,

I installed solar panels, battery and EV charger at my last home in Darlington Point. That was costly but it meant that our electricity bills were down. Then in 2025 we sold that place and moved to Callala Bay where we had solar panels, battery and EV charger installed too. So that is twice we have expended money to make our electricity more renewable. and to help save the planet. Now you are recommending a new change.

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]

[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.

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. It would be a greater percentage increase the less energy you use! This is not what is needed.

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:
User: [Redacted]
To th [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 Faithfully,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[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.

This is fundamentally wrong when we should all be fighting climate change & therefore should be incentivised to use less electricity.

Those of us who have invested in rooftop solar & batteries have been propping up the grid during the latest heatwave. We should be rewarded for this not penalised.

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. Charging more for the actual good supplied I.e. the electricity consumed is a fairer and more equitable approach. Maybe repurchasing the pole and wires so it just needs maintaining and not profitable would also be a better solution. 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 making 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
.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 signature]

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted signature]

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

00

[Redacted signature]

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 signature]

[Redacted address]

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

[Redacted name]

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

[Redacted footer]

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
2.0000000



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

0000

[REDACTED]

et Commission,

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

Electricity Pricing ,, and to xpress my concern at your proposal to impose fixed daily charges to cover the costs of poles etc. I believe this to be unfair.

I a. A 73 year old disabled woman. And I live al,one. I struggled to make my my home all electric and. energy efficient. I can't afford a battery. To have additional fixed daily charges imposed would cause me real hardship.

People like me are doing what we can to minimise our dependence on fossil fuels, so why are you intent on Penalising me?

or considering my submission.

[REDACTED]

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

:45.0000000

[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 signature]

[Redacted contact information]

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
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

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

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.

Better still, a higher portion of the cost of poles and wires needs to be recouped from industrial and commercial energy users, who consume far more than households.

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
46.0000000

[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] 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

[REDACTED]

ission,

I am now considerig how I can go off grid completely and not accept ypur fixed line charges. The power should be charged at cost of production and a small element for fixed line supply. This properly incentives people to conserve power and become power efficient. You are doing the reverse which actually penalises fuel efficient people and rewards high consumption vs fixed line charge.

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. More power efficient.

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.

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.

Furthermore, in the face of Origin making a 58.7% increase in net profit last financial year on the back of lower input costs (mainly from costs from lower rooftop solar) and from increasing tariff rates (approved by AEMC), this constitutes price gouging in anyone's language.

A 58.7% increase in profit. It was in their annual report.

Your organisation thinks that this is fair. And the flow on effect is substantial. Because you have allowed this exorbitant profit to occur on the back of electricity prices, inflation has risen. Interest rates have risen. Ineed your organisation is nearly solely responsible for the economic pain and suffering that millions of Australians are now suffering. If one didn't know better, one would think you were not independent. Who thinks a nearly 60% profit increase in one year is fair?

Thank you for taking the time to read my submission (if anyone actually did).



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, people that have done the right thing by reducing their fossil fuel powered 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 pay lip service to encouraging households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices and IMPORTANTLY, REDUCES the need for costly network upgrades.

An article from mid 2025 revealed that the DNSPs in the NEM were making \$17bn in economic profit and another \$15bn in SUPER ECONOMIC PROFIT. How is that justifiable? Why do they now need even more?

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 charges, charges that are unavoidable. that smacks of rent seeking behaviour by natural monopolies and it's wrong.

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 the DNSPs believe that their returns are inadequate for the risk that they believe that they're taking, then I'd suggest that they restore their enterprises to Government control where lower borrowing costs will allow instant reductions in prices at the same profit.

Government controlled DNSPs could be better directed to serve the needs of the public, rather than being driven by the biggest possible bottom line for their shareholders.

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]

[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: [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.

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

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
7.0000000

[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
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 am a single person household who is very careful with my energy use and who has just invested significantly in solar and batteries and this change would increase my energy bills that I have worked hard to reduce.

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]

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. Why are we being forced to pay for distribution companies previous profit grabs, (by letting the poles & wires degrade)

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
8.0000000

[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

00

[REDACTED]

Commission,

Recommendation 5 of the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future is not acceptable to me. This is my submission.

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 00000

[Redacted address]

ket Commission,

I am writing to formally oppose Recommendation 5 of the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future. Increasing fixed network charges is a regressive move that undermines both consumer fairness and Australia's energy transition goals.

Key Objections:

Penalizing Efficiency: This proposal directly punishes households that have invested in solar, batteries, and energy efficiency. By increasing unavoidable

costs, you are stripping away the financial incentive for consumers to "do the right thing" and reduce their grid reliance.

Regressive Social Impact: This shift disproportionately burdens those who use the least electricity—including retirees, low-income earners, and apartment dwellers. It is unacceptable that vulnerable, low-usage households should subsidize the grid costs of high-consumption, high-income households.

Stalling the Transition: Higher fixed charges artificially extend payback periods for consumer energy resources (CER). This will inevitably slow the uptake of the very technologies required to lower wholesale prices and reduce the need for expensive network upgrades.

Policy Contradiction: This recommendation is fundamentally at odds with broader government initiatives aimed at decarbonizing the grid. You cannot claim to support a "consumer-driven future" while simultaneously implementing pricing structures that disincentivize consumer investment.

Conclusion:
Electricity pricing must remain a tool for encouraging demand flexibility and efficiency, not a mechanism for guaranteed revenue for network companies at the expense of the public.

I urge the AEMC to reject the increase in fixed network charges and instead prioritize alternative models that reward system-positive behavior and ensure equitable outcomes for all Australians.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]

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

[Redacted address] 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

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 invested thousands of dollars to help fight the effects of climate change, by

g solar to my roof. But I only receive [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]. We are already being ripped off by the electricity prov

just because we care about the environment. I freeze during the cold Queanbeyan

winters because I cannot afford to pay for more electricity. I have to keep my

costs to a minimum, being on the pension only. Now you want to punish us even

further by increasing the daily charge. Don't increase the Daily Charges! They

have already gone up so much in the last couple of years. I will be subsidising

the heavy and wealthy users, just because I try to save power usage. That is not

fair!

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 extremely disillusioned about one of your recommendations and 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 feels that that the harder we try to do something about climate pollution, the more the government figures out a way of benefiting the fossil fuel interests. 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.

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.

In the draft report, recommendation 5 states "Generally, network costs are recovered on a volumetric basis, which means the costs of infrastructure are not shared fairly among electricity consumers".

I assume from this that the fixed daily cost does not cover the full cost of transmission. It is hard for me as an end consumer to know this and it is not clear from what I have read if this is the case.

These fixed costs are already a major component of our electricity bill and the idea that they will rise further is concerning. We are on a SWER line and don't see much in the way of maintenance out here.

We have done what we can to reduce our consumption, including adding solar panels to our farm, changing our appliances, adding insulation and installing double glazing in the kitchen and lounge room. Recently we have increased the size of the system. There is a threefold rationale to this decision. While one is related to the cost of electricity, the other is to reduce demand on the grid overall and the third is to have energy security in the event of blackouts. It is with that in mind that we have committed to add a battery to our system. That decision was made on the basis of current electricity and supply charges. We

have already committed funds for some of this infrastructure and it is not economical for us to cancel the project at this stage.

We have adjusted our energy usage and patterns of usage in response to the changes we have had to deal with, including changing usage tariffs, connection fees and solar FITs. It seems we are likely to be penalised by being a low usage consumer and a possible supplier by adding a battery, while high energy consumers will likely benefit under the proposed changes. We have already spent a significant amount of money to try and reduce our energy consumption. It seems unreasonable to me that we would now be hit with increased charges while those with high energy usage would be beneficiaries.

I would urge you to rethink this as it appears to me to send the opposite sort of signal to consumers that I thought you were trying to send with moves to bring charges in line with demand.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
40.0000000

[REDACTED]

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: [REDACTED] 0000
User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] et Commission,

After paying for 2 solar energy systems, the first in 2011, when rebates for power to the grid were favourable, and the second last year, when they were not, I'm appalled that the government is proposing even higher charges on people who have put in the financial effort toward sustainable energy.

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.

Increasing fixed network charges will 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, resulting in 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]
[REDACTED]

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

0000

[REDACTED] Market Commission,
I have Solar and recently installed a battery.
I do not believe increasing my fixed unavoidable costs is fair and I am actually considering disconnecting from the grid.

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
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 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.

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: 48.0000000
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
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

[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 owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use (that's us).

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 like us, and other 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.

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]

[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

00

[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.

I would also you to think about the way our trust & faith have been betrayed by the way we have been coned in to in stalling solar systems & hot water systems .

having all of the pricing changed !! T

[REDACTED] ering 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

0000

[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] 0000
User: [REDACTED]
To the [REDACTED] Market Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

Fixed network charges are an unavoidable component of the system and need to be adjusted to address future conditions. Household solar systems are now an important part of the system and I feel that their further expansion will improve the overall energy system for everyone.

However, increased fixed network charges will inhibit further investment by households. Additionally, users with relatively high grid consumption will benefit while those with less usage are likely to have increased power bills. Those with the least consumption include many on low incomes. The proposed changes are inequitable on both counts.

While the proposed increases may be necessary, they must also be structured so as to minimise restraint on further investment in household solar systems and also to avoid increased power bills for low usage customers. This could be achieved with increases graded relative to grid power consumption.

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 urge the AEMC to carefully assess alternative approaches that 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 signature]

[Redacted address]

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

00

[Redacted address]

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.

For the many reasons raised in other submissions, I see no justice in increasing fixed network charges other than to ensure that the business is viable. This would negatively impact energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use. It would be contrary to our economic practices to artificially subsidise a failing business and may lead to communities developing local power networks and abandoning the large networks.

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

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] 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

[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 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
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]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
56.0000000

[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
Date: 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 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

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, 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.

I am an Age Pensioner in a single person household. I have solar roof panels but

cannot afford a home battery even with the current subsidies. I carefully manage my daily energy use to minimise my costs. The largest part of my monthly power bill is just having a connection to the grid. No amount of careful planning and usage on my part changes that, yet you want to make it harder for people like me to simply exist.

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

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]

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 contact information]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: [Redacted] 00000
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.

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

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 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

[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,

It seems that the federal government gives with one hand one for the AECM takes away with the other.

I feel like it is entrapment as taking up the offer will now lead to higher prices and this is simply not fair. Good practice and policies with householders subsidising largely foreign owned large companies. Please represent Australian residents first.

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 wish to add my voice to the objections you are receiving to 'recommendation 5' of the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future.

The critical imperatives are:- 1) reliability, 2) decarbonisation, and 3) affordability.

Reliability of supply for everybody is enhanced by incentivising people to invest more in solar generation and battery storage; by removing that incentive, recommendation 5 would adversely affect reliability of the grid. In addition, recommendation 5 would incentivise people who are already more than self-sufficient to simply go off-grid - which would work against grid-reliability, as well as leaving the fixed grid costs to be borne by fewer people (and those being the people who can least afford it).

Decarbonisation is also obviously not served by recommendation 5 as it would lead less investment in solar generation and storage, It would also work against decarbonisation because with usage-based charges being lower (both in absolute terms and as a proportion of people's bills) it'd reduce the incentive for people to minimise their usage, both in their choices of appliance, home renovations, and simple things like turning off appliances when they don't need them - that would lead to more usage, including not only dirty coal, but also dirty gas.

Affordability also would obviously not be served by recommendation 5 as it'd keep the grid reliant on costly coal and on very costly gas.

Recommendation 5 appears to have been written by the usual suspects in the industry. They're trying to get the AEMC to do their dirty work for them. Instead, please use the market levers you have in your hands to encourage people to help clean up the grid and the market.

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
5.0000000

[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

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]