

Cover email text: I am strongly opposed to these changes, both from personal financial impact and the resulting change in user behaviour and the impact that has on climate targets and emissions in my lifetime. Written in response to reading this article <https://reneweconomy.com.au/solar-and-battery-households-will-be-biggest-losers-from-network-tariff-changes-advocates-say/>

Individual Submission to the AEMC

Re: The Pricing Review – Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Driven Future

Date: 12 February 2026

To the Australian Energy Market Commission,

As a young person trying to build a stable and sustainable future, I'm grateful that over the past decade the falling cost per kWh of electricity has aligned with efforts to reduce emissions and fight climate change. Affordable renewable energy has meant I haven't had to choose between doing what's right for the planet and managing my cost of living. However, the proposed shift toward significantly higher fixed network charges threatens to break this alignment, creating yet another situation where I must split my attention - and finances - between climate action and economic survival. Recent analyses warn that these tariff changes could impose substantial new burdens on low-consumption households and those who have invested in rooftop solar and battery storage. [\[koalabel.com\]](#), [\[au.headtopics.com\]](#)

The move to increase fixed charges would particularly disadvantage households like mine that have taken proactive steps to reduce grid reliance and emissions. Independent modelling shows that solar-and-battery households may face bill increases of \$400-\$700 per year, undermining the value of the very technologies governments are encouraging us to adopt. Meanwhile, low-income households - who typically consume less energy - could see increases of \$100-\$200 annually, making the proposal especially regressive. These outcomes directly undermine the AEMC's own goals of supporting consumer preferences and enabling a fair, CER-enabled energy system. [\[au.headtopics.com\]](#), [\[pv-magazin...tralia.com\]](#)
[\[au.headtopics.com\]](#) [\[aemc.gov.au\]](#)

This shift also contradicts broader national policy directions aimed at accelerating consumer energy resource adoption. Clean-energy advocacy groups note that raising fixed charges would discourage households from installing solar panels or batteries, despite existing federal and state initiatives intended to support uptake and lower long-term system costs. Such mixed signals make it harder for young people like me to plan responsibly: we are told to invest in clean energy for the sake of our future, yet proposed pricing reforms risk penalising us for doing exactly that. [\[pv-magazin...tralia.com\]](#)

I urge the AEMC to reconsider any move towards higher fixed network charges and instead adopt pricing structures that support efficiency, fairness, and CER uptake. Usage-based or capacity-reflective tariffs preserve consumer agency, reward investment in clean technology, and better align with the long-term goals of a flexible, decarbonised grid. Above all, pricing reform must not force households - especially younger generations already facing significant cost-of-living pressures - to choose between affordability and climate action.

Thank you for considering this submission.

Regards,



12th February 2026