

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

[REDACTED] ommission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

[REDACTED]

Submission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

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

The proposal is manifestly unfair, minor users will be charged the same as major users.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

00000

[Redacted]

ket Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted 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 strong concerns about Recommendation 5.

Increasing fixed network charges would create two significant problems that undermine both our climate goals and social equity.

1. Slowing the energy transition

Increasing fixed network charges would slow the transition to a lower emissions and more renewable electricity future. This is because it would negatively impact solar and battery owners, and energy-efficient households. These people would find the returns on their valuable efforts and investments diminished.

Additionally higher fixed network charges would weaken the incentives for people considering investment in home solar, batteries and energy efficiency measures.

2. Worsening social inequality

Increasing fixed network charges would disproportionately impact low income households, and those with modest electricity consumption, while rewarding high-income households with high grid consumption who stand to benefit the most from this proposal. This is a backward step, and penalises the very least able to absorb cost increases.

These outcomes are incompatible with a just transition to clean energy that supports vulnerable community members while driving decarbonisation.

I urge the AEMC to:

- Reject increases to fixed network charges
- Properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals for efficient consumption
- Support consumer energy resources that benefit the entire grid
- Deliver equitable outcomes that do not punish low-use or environmentally responsible households

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]

-----

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

0

[REDACTED] Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

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

Supporting increased fixed charges is not justified and an unreasonable cost burden on consumer.

This will impact heavily on the most vulnerable in our communities.

Power companies already benefit and taken advantage of green power generated by customers and now pay a pittance per kilowat reselling at a premium

[REDACTED] ?? Charges are at some of the highest levels and companies hold all the leverage to gouge the market.

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

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

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

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

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

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.

onsidering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

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

00

Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I was planning to install a battery system but the potential changes to fixed charges has changed my decision.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

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

Yet again, the people who face no real world consequences of their decisions are proposing a rule change that will greatly increase the electricity bills of low income households.

Multiple studies have shown that the higher a households income the more electricity they consume, even if they have solar and battery. Please take a minute to stop and think about what this proposed rule change means to people struggling to make ends meet. While I'm quite sure no one considering this rule change has had to make the choice between buying food, a visit to the doctor or paying an electricity bill in recent years, if ever, this is the reality for many people.

There will come a time when average people are going to say enough is enough and governments are going to act to reign in corporate protection rackets such as these. The nascent movement to re-nationalise energy infrastructure will be given impetus if proposals like this are allowed to proceed.

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.y ent

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]

-----

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000

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

My husband and I lived overseas for many years and have only been in our home for just over a year.

I have been thinking seriously of getting solar panels and a battery to not only reduce our power bill but to contribute to a cleaner more sustainable world. My husband's concern has been that as we are older Australians, we would not recoup our initial outlay. This new proposal seems to make that unavoidable.

We live in a country with an abundance of sunshine and wind. We could be leaders in promoting clean energy worldwide. Please help us take advantage of this.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

00

[REDACTED]

Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

00

Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
-----  
From: noreply@123formbuilder.com  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
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  
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  
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.

I have just invested over [REDACTED] in extra solar panels and a battery to reduce our demand on the grid and we export on average [REDACTED] into the grid daily and receive [REDACTED] per kW for our investment.

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

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

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

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

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

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and 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: [REDACTED] 7.0000000  
User: [REDACTED]  
To the [REDACTED] Market Commission,

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

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and all Australians who are trying to be efficient in their use of electricity.

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

Meanwhile, high-income households with high grid consumption would benefit the most from this proposal because they would be charged proportionally less for the electricity they actually consume.

Transmission and Distribution Network companies in Australia have built their poles and wire networks to support peak network demand. What Australia needs now is for this built infrastructure to operate as efficiently as possible by spreading consumption away from peak periods and this is best achieved by applying Time of Use Charging not by increasing the fixed network daily service charge.

Australians have been encouraged (successfully) to invest in Solar PV to offset their electricity consumption and to contribute distributed renewable generation to the grid to reduce the cost of electricity for all consumers.

More recently, Australians have been encouraged (again successfully) to invest in home and business-based batteries to time shift Solar PV energy to peak consumption periods in order to reduce the load on the grid, which in turn improves the capacity of the existing grid infrastructure and avoids further grid investment to support peak loads.

I am therefore concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and lessen the incentives for further investment in consumer energy resources, thereby shifting peak loads back to the grid.

Increasing fixed network charges is at odds with other government policies that

encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system, to cut emissions, bring down wholesale energy prices, and reduce the need for costly network upgrades.

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

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals to improve the efficiency of grid infrastructure, while supporting distributed consumer energy resources, and deliver fairer outcomes for all Australian households.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

-----

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

[Redacted]

Commission,

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

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

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

-----

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
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,

Ian Egan

[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  
31.0000000

[REDACTED]

y Market Commission,

Our family has an energy efficient home with appliances that are designed to use less electricity than most models, as well as using newer technologies. We have solar panels on the roof, a battery in the garage and a solar hot water system.

st d a total of [REDACTED] for the household of which:  
% ([REDACTED]) came from t [REDACTED] op solar/battery;  
% ([REDACTED]) came from the grid.

us [REDACTED] e daily grid provided power was just under [REDACTED] at a cost of approximately [REDACTED]. The daily supply charge (for the connection to the

[REDACTED]. So the cost of the connection to the grid is much higher

cost of the electricity we get from the connection. That doesn't make sense.

Whilst we understand that there is a need to maintain the poles and wires that

make up the grid, we are being told that the use of renewables is necessitating

a huge and very expensive upgrade to the grid to bring the power from the widely

distributed wind and solar farms all over the eastern states. However, as of

late 2025, Australia has over 28.3 GW (gigawatts) of installed rooftop solar

capacity, with over 4.2 million homes and businesses equipped with solar systems. That is a very large amount of power that doesn't need to come from the

large scale renewable energy farms.

The majority of the grid power in Australia is consumed by industry, business

and transport, with households accounting for only 24% of the total electricity

consumption. With the growth in rooftop solar and battery storage for households this percentage is likely to reduce. Therefore it may be deduced that the majority of the electricity from the distributed renewable energy farms will be used for industry and business. If this is the case then it seems only fair that an increase in the daily supply charge should be born predominantly by the industries and businesses that require most of the power sourced from the renewable energy farms, not the households who use only a small proportion of the electricity produced by the grid. Also a case can be made for households that produce a lot of their own electricity, and feed some of it back into the grid at very low prices, to pay a very small amount for their daily supply charge as they are not responsible for the need pay to upgrade the grid.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

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  
00.0000000

[REDACTED]

y Market Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

000

[REDACTED] t Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The proposals here for Recommendation 5 betray everything us "roof-toppers" have so far achieved. WHY is this even being considered?

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 a vast portion of households including those who use the low amounts electricity due to energy efficiency, house-hold size or small solar and battery system owners.

Specifically, I'm very concerned that the ability to shift electricity consumption to the middle of the day is grossly overstated for the vast number of households. The people most able to take advantage of free midday electricity are those that have load intensive appliances and the requisite flexibility to run them during the middle of the day, such as well-paid professionals able to work from home and/or owning EVs.

While there is potential for the increased use of timers to run standard

household appliances such as dishwashers and washing machines during the middle of the day, an analysis of energy consumption clearly shows that they represent a relatively minor portion of overall electricity usage. It is well-known that for many households, peak consumption occurs during the evening and is driven by a combination of home heating/cooling needs, family meal preparation (running the stove and oven) and hot water needs for baths/showers. The requisite energy needs are not discretionary and cannot be shifted to different time windows.

It should be evident from consumption data following the introduction of demand tariffs and time of use tariffs, that achievable changes to consumption patterns have already occurred, that is: people are likely to have responded by shifting as much load as possible to cheaper time periods, and are unlikely to significant shift demand further. As a result, the introduction of higher daily supply charges, would drive up overall electricity costs for many people with limited or no opportunity to adjust daily consumption patterns.

I'm also concerned that higher fixed charges would disproportionately penalise energy-efficient users by making up a disproportionate portion of electricity cost. This further cements price inequality evident in many existing plans where higher levels of consumption are rewarded by cheaper unit costs, favouring high energy users and providing a disincentive to reduce electricity uses. High-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal: these households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

Finally, I am concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods - investments people evaluated and committed to on the basis of previous pricing structures - and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake. This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades. Electricity pricing should support the increased roll-out of gridscale

renewables storage while encouraging households to save energy, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system and generation costs. Pricing should not punish households with higher unavoidable charges irrespective of efforts made to reduce consumption and contribute to renewable energy generation.

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

[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.

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

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

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

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

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

[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  
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.

I recently forked out [REDACTED] for solar on my house, and now I find out that the benefit of that is going to be negated by an unfair charge. I might as well have spent the money on something else more worthwhile.

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

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

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

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

resources, rising slower uptake.

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
57.0000000

[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.

I have solar panels on my home that generate more power than I use.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
9:16.000000

[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  
0000000

[REDACTED]

To the Australian Energy Market Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,





properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and 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]

Market Commission,

I am a battery owner and have spent over [REDACTED] on battery and panels, I am writing to make a submission to the [REDACTED] Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I have 12 solar panels and a battery, and could almost operate off grid. Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners like me, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,



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

00

Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

But mainly, I am very concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, resulting in a slower uptake, and eventually rendering any independant, owner-generated energy source completely useless. The eventual outcome will be that all consumers will totally rely on the grid-based power stations. This, of course, will be a BOON to nuclear energy and will be an election issue at the next Federal election.

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission. y wont be replacedral Election.

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

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

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

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal.

These households could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[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

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.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,





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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

000

[Redacted]

t Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

-----

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

0000

[Redacted]

et Commission,

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

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

I have had solar panels for a number of years, and the benefit of supplying energy back into the grid has been continuously declining. I have just ordered solar batteries. Now, instead of getting the benefit of being self sufficient, I will instead be penalised by increasing fixed network charges.

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

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

[Redacted signature]

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

00

Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

You're doing what some businesses do . I'm talking about False Advertising. The incentive to install Solar Panels was to take pressure off the grid and to lower my energy costs. I did without to pay for my panels and now you are asking me to pay again. This is not acceptable.

Thank you for considering my submission.  
Margaret O'Donnell

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 is NOT conducive to a Consumer-Driven future.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

[REDACTED]

arket Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

[REDACTED]

ission,

SUBMISSION TO PRICING REVIEW: ELECTRICITY PRICING FOR A CONSUMER-DRIVEN FUTURE

I am very concerned about Recommendation 5 which will drive producer-consumers away from a distributed network, which is the best way to deliver secure, reliable, cheap renewable energy in the future.

Increased fixed charges will disincentivize the move to rooftop solar and battery storage which is the major contribution to meeting the government's renewable energy goal. This is at odds with other government policies that encourage households to help deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

Increased fixed charges are also inequitable, rewarding high-income households and profligate energy users. Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity - including single-person households, apartment residents, retirees, and low-income households - would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

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

AEMO should support the government's attempt to increase renewable energy usage by aligning the energy supply infrastructure with that ambition. Market signals should not reward large inflexible energy supply power stations and poles and wires snaking across the land. Market signals should encourage load shedding, shifting energy consumption to match solar and other renewable supply, support community systems which match local demand and supply at the local level and other smart methods to reduce pressure on fossil fuel era large scale grid infrastructure.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches 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  
5.0000000

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.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Contact: [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  
09.0000000

[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: [REDACTED] 00  
User: [REDACTED]  
To the [REDACTED] Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

-----

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

000

[Redacted]

t Commission,

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

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: [REDACTED] 000000  
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

I am generally supportive of proposed changes in the Pricing Review, however I have concerns about Recommendation 5.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network 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  
00.0000000

[REDACTED]

y Market Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[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  
Date: [REDACTED] 000  
User: [REDACTED]  
To the [REDACTED] t Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

-----

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
4:46.000000

[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.

██████████ for considering my submission.

██████████  
Yours Sincerely,

██████████  
████████████████████  
-----  
From: noreply@123formbuilder.com  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
3.0000000

████████████████████ 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  
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

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

[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

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.

It is coming to the point very rapidly where electricity charges make it impossible for olde

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

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

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

Thank you for considering

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]

-----

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: :16.0000000  
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, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Perhaps the AEMC should be investigating the proliferation of companies profiting from billing consumers. This is surely the biggest cash cow and the cause of electricity price increases. We have three levels of profits from the

Australian electricity system, which also helps to explain the exorbitant cost to consumers.  
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,

Cam Crossley

Contact: cam@camcrossley.art

-----

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  
Date: :58.0000000  
User: [REDACTED]  
To the Energy Market Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

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  
:07.0000000

[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.

Personally I have been using solar PV and batteries to power my energy efficient homes, and "trying to do the right thing by reducing my electricity use" for 28 years!!

From Oct 2012 my current home has been "grid connected" via a hybrid Solar PV & BESS. Historically approximately 65% of its annual solar production has been exported to the grid yet my home has only imported approximately 5% of its total power used annually from the grid.

Having just spent many thousands of dollars replacing my entire hybrid solar & battery system, (due to my 13+ year old VRLA batteries being at "end of life" , the vast efficiency increases in modern PV & BESS , and the federal govt's CHBP) I am extremely disappointed to hear of the AEMC's proposal to increase fixed daily supply charges. DSCs are by far the biggest component of my monthly power "bills" as I continue to import much much less power from the grid than what my solar system exports to the grid.

In my opinion this recent AEMC proposal is extremely unfair towards all power consumers but also even more so to those of us who have been "trying to do the right thing by reducing our electricity use" through our own personal investments in solar technology supporting Australia's transition from an old, dirty, & inefficient centralised power grid to a much cleaner and inherently more efficient de-centralised power grid.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and 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 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  
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 [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. What's wrong with the "User Pays" principle ?

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

-----

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

I invested in solar panels and a solar battery five years ago, and I am very pleased with the results, with regard to both reliability and cost-saving. Therefore, I am concerned about the proposed increase in fixed network charges.

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

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

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

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households

could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

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

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

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

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and 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: 0.0000000  
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 signature]

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.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]

-----

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
49.0000000

[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 is a poor use of resources as any proposed increase in poles and wires infrastructure rollout is expensive and increasingly irrelevant, archaic network design from the early twentieth century that only favours the vested interests in the distribution businesses and high carbon footprint generators.

A smart use of infrastructure funds would be to redirect investment into even more solar panels and batteries, both large and small scale at the house and enterprise level. Also further encouragement of large scale wind farms to create over time a more robust and larger totally distributed power generating system as opposed to the current proposal of satisfying energy demand from large single generator locations using fossil fuel technology. Using old technology design that requires increasingly expanded distribution system that is fragile in the face of more powerful weather events due to climate change and then to direct this power over vast distances to consumers.

Generate the power and then store surplus where it is used using cheap renewable technologies .

A expanded distributed renewable based power generation system using millions of solar panels supplemented by wind with both large and small batteries distributed throughout cities, towns and country would deliver a cheaper, cleaner energy system - one that cuts emissions, brings down wholesale energy prices, and reduces the need for costly network upgrades.

The dirty generators and the distribution businesses will not like to hear these ideas as any proposal that encourages the expansion of community located renewable based power generation, supported with both battery and hydro storage

system, as any such a system if implemented breaks their business models.  
It is  
harder for them to 'clip the ticket'!

Yet a distributed renewable power generation with local storage system is almost  
a no-brainer, that reduces total cost by consuming the power near to  
where it is  
produced and increases system wide reliability. As major weather events  
or fires  
may damage a small part of the distributed generation and storage system  
but the  
majority of consumers remain unaffected. Unlike now where a large  
damaging storm  
or generator failure takes out large swathes of the existing system  
affecting  
many consumer often a long way for the storm or bushfires.

And to argue against a distributed network based on renewable generation  
and  
throwing increasing sums at an increasingly archaic single source power  
generation and distribution network designed in the early 20th century is  
to  
argue against progress. Spending more money on old technology solutions  
it is  
like standing on the beach and building a small sea wall trying to  
prevent the  
tide from come in your efforts will be expensive and may work for a  
limited time  
but eventually the tide will come in and swamp you and your work.

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and  
to  
properly assess alternative approaches that are cheaper and more  
reliable,  
support consumer energy resources.

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
19:12.0000000

[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

00

Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
-----  
From: noreply@123formbuilder.com  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 3.0000000  
User: [REDACTED]  
To the Market Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000

[REDACTED]

et Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
5:28.0000000

[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

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: 8.0000000  
User: [REDACTED]  
To the Market Commission,

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

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted 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,



-----  
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, rising slower uptake.

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

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

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

properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and 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 th

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and 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 people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use and adopting solar and wind technology. It may also provide a significant incentive for people to leave the grid all together, rolling out a whole new challenge for supply .

People who 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 why I disconnected from gas..as it

[REDACTED] to access [REDACTED]. The balance needs to be fair

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

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

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

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

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

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 signature]

[Redacted contact information]

-----

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

000000

[Redacted footer]

To the Australian Energy Market Commission,

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

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

The existing system of wholesale pricing on the NEM is based on supply and demand. Investing in solar and batteries reduces our reliance on the grid, but furthermore, we actually feed back into the grid. This feedin primarily provides electricity to our neighbours. So our use of the grid is actually minimal. Surely, the system should be based on usage, how much we utilise the grid and it's energy. By increasing via fixed network charges, this penalises those with Solar with or without batteries, and those on lower incomes which will struggle to afford the increase in fixed costs.

We are in a significant point in time as the network transitions to low carbon future, This needs to be equitable and fair, but also provide incentive and disincentive. Increasing costs on actual usage provides the most effective trigger for all users of energy.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake. We need to continue to encourage private and public investment in renewables.

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

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

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and 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  
5:27.0000000

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Energy Market Commission,  
Before I retired 16 years ago I put rooftop solar panels, heat pump and roof insulation to help with my power bills, as I knew I would have less income. Since then I have saved up, upgraded my solar panels and added a battery. It is good for me and for the planet.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

[REDACTED] ket Commission,

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

-----

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

[REDACTED] mission,

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

I have invested in my home by installing solar panels, a home battery, a hot water heat pump and ducted heated and cooling to reduce my family's reliance on fossil fuels. This proposal is a perverse cash grab to protect profits at the expense of hard working Australians.

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches 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,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

[REDACTED] sion,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
57.0000000

[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. Also due to all the solar and batteries that have been installed costs in the last quarter last year were reduced so why are we punishing people that have installed these systems

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and 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  
9.0000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]

-----

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: 02.0000000  
User: [REDACTED]  
To the [REDACTED] Market Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

with higher unavoidable charges.

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

For many years I have been aware of the futility of saving costs - and energy usage at expense of the planet. And now, indirectly, it seems we are going to be driven to more consumption!!! So, along with other consumers especially low and middle income users I am writing to make a submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future, and to express my concerns about Recommendation 5.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches 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]

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 signature]

[Redacted contact information]

-----

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  
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,



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

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and 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] 00000

[REDACTED] ket Commission,

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

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

This proposal punishes those who are making the contribution to achieve lower carbon emissions.

We produce more electricity than we consume and put twice as much into the grid as we use. Yet the daily rate charges are already very high and mean we end up paying a high price to put power into the grid.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ssion,

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

Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people who have reduced their electricity use.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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]

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

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 like myself, and low-income households whom are already struggling with cost of living pressures would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

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

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

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

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

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches 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: :58.0000000  
User: [REDACTED]  
To the [REDACTED] Energy Market Commission,

ELECTRICITY THROTTLING

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

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

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

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

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

Electricity pricing should encourage 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 electricity companies especially Essential Energy also block the amount of solar generated electricity that can enter the system by not upgrading their transformers. I am restricted to [REDACTED] input ( known as throttling) because of poor local infrastructure, This makes it extremely hard to cover the

daily rate no matter how much I invest in solar panels and batteries. It is also  
r as other solar producers nearby have limits of [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

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

[REDACTED]

ommission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

-----

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

00000

[Redacted]

ket Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

[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

[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

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  
6:20.0000000

[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,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

00000

[REDACTED]

ket Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

[REDACTED]

arket Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

resources, rising slower uptake.

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

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

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

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

00

[Redacted]

Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

0000

[REDACTED]

ket Commission,

This is my submission to the Pricing Review: 'Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future,'

I am concerned about Recommendation 5 which will lead to an increase in fixed network charges.

This will seriously affect consumers who are trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use. Those who use the least electricity - such as single-person households, and retirees - will have to pay more if Recommendation 5 is implemented.

Those who use the most electricity, many of them on high incomes, will benefit as the cost burden moves away from the amount of electricity consumed towards the increased fixed network charge

Electricity pricing should encourage consumers to save energy, shift demand and, if they can, to invest in solutions that lower system costs. They should not be punished with higher fixed charges.

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

D 00

U [REDACTED]

T [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,



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 0:18:37.0000000  
User: [REDACTED]  
To the Energy Market Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

-----

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

[Redacted]

Market Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted name]

-----

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.

I am a Brisbane resident who has installed solar panels and also moved from gas to electric appliances. I am now planning to add a battery.

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

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

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

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake. This is the last thing we need right now, as we must quickly transition to renewable energy.

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

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

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

After all, those of us who have made ourselves close to self sufficient are using the poles and wires less than others, so, on a user pays basis, we deserve to be rewarded for the investments that you have asked us to make. If we all choose to go off-grid as our only method of further reducing our costs, then you will have less customers to contribute reasonable fees and less of our surplus energy to help our country to 100% renewables.

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.

With the vast majority of Australians trying to make renewable energy their top priority, Recommendation 5 becomes completely antithetical. Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[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

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

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  
02.0000000

[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] 000  
User: [REDACTED]  
To the [REDACTED] t Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

-----

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

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

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: :35.0000000  
User: [REDACTED]  
To the Energy Market Commission,

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

We are retired public servants and we installed solar panels and a battery back in 2016. This helped cut our annual costs for electricity by a large amount and helped the planet at the same time.

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

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

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

are using the most electricity.

I am also concerned that higher fixed charges would extend solar and battery payback periods and weaken incentives for future investment in consumer energy resources, rising slower uptake. It will decimate the incentive for people to obtain 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.

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

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and 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 signature]

[Redacted address]

-----

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

00000

[Redacted address]

ket Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted contact information]

-----

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

[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. This is unfair for all energy customers.

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

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

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

Electricity pricing should encourage households to save energy, shift demand, and if they can, invest in solutions that lower system costs - not punish them with higher unavoidable charges. It should be a user pays system, where those who use the most have to pay more. Higher fixed charges burden low energy users the most and add to the cost of living for these people. This policy if implemented will discourage people from installing solar and batteries. The

cheapest supply of energy is solar power located where its needed on households and businesses roofs. No extra transmission lines required.

I would also like to urge the regulators to change the current rules in WA that is restrictin he export of solar power to [REDACTED] from homes with systems greater than [REDACTED]. There is a huge amount of [REDACTED] power going to waste because of this crazy rule. There are now many grid scale batteries in place that could be using this free energy to benefit the whole network.

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

[REDACTED]

ission,

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

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

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

Meanwhile, the poles and wires companies, and high-income households with high grid consumption stand to benefit the most from this proposal. These households

could save hundreds of dollars every year on their energy bill, even though they are using the most electricity.

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted address]

-----

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

[Redacted name] 0

Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted signature]

[Redacted name]

-----

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

000000

[Redacted address]

arket Commission,

Submission to the Pricing Review: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven

Future

I have concerns about Recommendation 5. Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact solar and battery owners, energy-efficient households, and people trying to do the right thing by reducing their electricity use.

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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, 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  
3.0000000

[REDACTED]

Market Commission,

Re: Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future

I am extremely concerned about Recommendation 5. Increasing fixed network charges would negatively impact me as a solar panels and battery owner, along with other energy-efficient households.

Even households without solar, batteries and energy-efficient homes would be negatively impacted. People who use the least electricity such as myself as a retiree, would be forced to pay more under this proposal.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
:35.0000000

[REDACTED]

gy Market Commission,

I am writing to express my concerns about Recommendation 5 in the AEMC review.

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

I urge the AEMC not to proceed with increasing fixed network charges and to properly assess alternative approaches that preserve strong price signals, support consumer energy resources, and 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: 26.0000000  
User: [REDACTED]  
To the [REDACTED] Market Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 37.0000000  
User: [REDACTED]  
To the Energy Market Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

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

This is a form letter that I can't improve on, all is correct in my opinion

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  
000000

[Redacted name]

arket Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

It is also unfair to buy energy from distributed providers by paying a feed-in tariff of only 10% of the price charged to sell it back to consumers - and even less fair if consumers are to be charged for the power they feed in to the grid, as has been mooted in some discussions.

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

-----

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

00

[Redacted]

Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

-----

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

0000

[REDACTED]

et Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

-----

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

000

[Redacted]

t Commission,

I, and [Redacted], install rooftop solar from the beginning of 2010. We are all connected to an Embedded Network and restricted from installing any further rooftop solar or upgrading in any manner such as batteries.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

Personal, defamatory and other confidential information has been omitted per our publication process.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]