

Where individuals and organisations provided their comments in the body of an email (as opposed to in an attached document), we have combined those emails to enable uploading the submissions to our website. These emails have been reviewed, and any personal, confidential or defamatory information has been redacted.

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T23:12:20.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: None

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Please just leave the tariffs alone alot of people have bought into solar battery deals and increasing the daily service charge will massively increase the return on investment time most likely out of the warranty period of the battery and inverter.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28158>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T22:11:40.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Na

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed increase in fixed electricity costs. Our family has recently invested [REDACTED] in installing a solar and battery system to reduce our energy consumption and manage rising electricity expenses responsibly. This was a significant financial commitment made with the intention of lowering our ongoing power costs and contributing to a more sustainable energy future. Introducing higher fixed charges would substantially reduce the financial benefit of our investment and negatively impact our household budget. Fixed cost increases disproportionately affect families like ours who have taken proactive steps to reduce grid reliance. We respectfully request that this matter be reconsidered, as the proposed changes would place additional financial pressure on our family despite our efforts to be energy efficient and self-sufficient. Thank you for your time and consideration.

[REDACTED]

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28157>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T22:01:59.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Ex ADF

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: "I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays,

locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.”

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28156>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T21:41:57.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]  
First Name: [REDACTED]  
Last Name: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]  
Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Hello,  
The idea of increasing the subscription fee and reducing energy fees is a terrible idea because:

- 1 - It will encourage even more energy use and green house gas emission
- 2- It will financially punish those who have reduced their energy usage by behaviour change, solar panel installation and battery installation.
- 3 - It will severely disadvantage vulnerable customers who are already struggling with the cost of power.

This is the problem with having a privatised energy supply industry where

company shareholders are considered more important than customers and the environment.

Instead stop subsidising the fossil fuel industry. Tax fossil fuel exports appropriately. Consider changing electricity companies to not for profit organisations or turning it them back into a government run utility. Capitalism always screws everyone over, except the rich.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28155>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T20:50:06.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Independent

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: The Energy market should be incentivising households and businesses to be using less power.

Lower Energy consumption for a given unit of population/ business output helps meets Australia's goals of emissions reductions and productivity.

Shifting charges from Per unit to fixed costs correctly disincentivises lower consumption and actively punishes those households and small businesses whom already use minimal electricity.

For low usage households the daily supply fee can already exceed consumption charges and this proposal will only further punish these users.

Time of use or maximum demand charges (as measured during peak periods) are

better methods to better reflect actual network costs whilst not undoing the benefits users have recovered by decreasing or shifting usage.

In a publicly controlled energy market pricing should always seek to incentivise best customer practices and certainly should not be engineered to increase costs for those whom are already doing the right thing.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28154>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T18:58:03.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Household

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposal to increase fixed network charges. Households like mine have spent thousands on solar and batteries based on long-standing government policy encouraging reduced grid use. These reforms would now penalise us with higher unavoidable charges despite using the grid less. This is unfair, regressive, and undermines investment in clean energy.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28153>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T18:27:34.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Independent

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: "I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.”

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28152>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T18:17:01.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.

- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to

avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

Your proposal is likely to be as popular as a fart in a crowded elevator. Can you please stop.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED]

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28151>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T16:46:37.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Resident

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

Raising fixed charges unfairly penalises low-use households and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households reduce grid demand and support Australia's clean-energy transition; they should not be worse off for doing the right thing.

Higher fixed charges weaken incentives to save energy, install solar, add batteries or improve efficiency. This risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that strengthens the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Shifting more costs into fixed fees disproportionately impacts pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families. It also increases the long-term risk that those who can afford solar and storage will consider leaving the grid, shrinking the customer base and driving prices up for everyone else.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and an essential service. Pricing reforms should build trust and support participation, not undermine it.

I urge the AEMC to maintain fair, usage-based pricing and protect incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy. Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28150>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T16:13:13.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: resident

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not

discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28149>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T16:05:17.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: "I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Penalising the generators of green energy which reduces demand on infrastructure which is a positive for the country, makes no sense.

Increasing costs in the face of the steeply rising cost of living makes no sense.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity,

efficiency and long-term grid stability.”

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28148>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T15:05:03.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Personal

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I was concerned to read that the AEMC is considering changes to the pricing system which involve increasing the fixed daily connection price.

I was also troubled by the retailer centric focus of the voluminous but fluffy documentation on your website.

From a system perspective, I could not find any discussion or modelling on the impact of pricing changes on the speed and cost of the energy transition.

From an end customer perspective there are a number of obvious objections to higher connection costs:

Equity: a higher fixed cost disproportionately affects those on lower incomes & smaller households.

Households with solar/battery:  
higher fixed costs and lower tariffs are a potential disincentive to minimise grid use.

Households considering solar/battery:  
Will higher fixed costs reduce the ROI?  
Again, where is the analysis?

I dont think this proposal is anywhere near release.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28147>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T14:34:32.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: First,Australia is on the way to clean energy, which relies highly the solar investment of every family.The new plan will push the payback period for a large proportion of households, which will finally reduce future uptake of these systemsby by individuals, making it more difficult to achieve emission reductions goals.

Second,the fairness means the more you use, the more you pay. That is also the basic rule of the society. If the law is far from the fairness, the society will be in disorder. If the power bill rule is far from the fairness, the market will be in disorder too.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28146>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T14:24:21.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: private

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Any Increase in supply charges would be detrimental to the good will and faith many residents have committed to assist in reducing emissions and Increasing supply of renewables. My own situation whereby solar has been installed and usage substantially reduced is not something that should be discouraged. As a single property with 2 meters and one supply point this already sees myself contributing more. Why should residents be penalised further?

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28145>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T14:23:24.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private citizen

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

This is a poorly thought out proposal for the reasons listed below.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower

prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28144>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T14:03:15.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: N/A

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: At my home, due to the high usage and high cost of electricity back



Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

It penalizes low energy users and provides lesser incentives to save energy.  
The system should provide pricing as much as possible based on consumption  
and encourage efforts to minimize energy usage.

As an additional danger it could drive more customers to go off-grid and the  
government sponsored batteries are no longer available to provide a benefit  
to the whole community.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28142>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T12:41:10.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: na

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I should not be penalised for investing in renewable energy and funding my own solar and battery system for my home. I strongly oppose this proposed legislation.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28141>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T12:31:13.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private consumer

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.  
Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that  
use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and  
batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made  
significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy  
transition. They should not be worse off because of it.  
Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That  
weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or  
upgrade  
older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time,  
this  
risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the  
grid,  
especially during daytime peaks.  
Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure  
that  
shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects  
pensioners,  
renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.  
There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to  
rise,  
households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will  
increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the  
customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even  
higher  
for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system  
and  
undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.  
Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good.  
Many  
Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower  
prices

or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how  
privatised  
electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms  
should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.  
At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face  
delays,  
locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever.  
Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's  
electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not  
discourage it.  
I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong  
incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.  
Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of  
equity,  
efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28140>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T12:30:11.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web  
site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven  
future

Organisation: No organisation

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am disturbed to learn that the AEMC is proposing an increase  
in  
daily supply charges to consumers of [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]. This is a disastrous  
proposal because:  
1. It sends a price signal to consumers to NOT avoid energy usage in peak  
usage times  
2. It undermines the Federal Government's Cheaper Home Battery scheme.  
3. It disadvantages poorer customers

I urge the AEMC to drop this highly controversial and highly unpopular  
proposal before the weight of public opinion will force federal  
government

intervention!

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28139>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T11:29:17.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private household electricity generator and consumer

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.
- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.
- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport. The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges

for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which

is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord

relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a

laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out

long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a

residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network

tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what

are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the

AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to

effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained

incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such

that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

Can you please stop.

I am a grandmother and have spent my career in public health working with the most marginalized in our community.

I want the future to be better for everyone.

[REDACTED]

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28138>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T11:19:28.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am opposing to Recommendation 5 as I have invested significant amount of money in being energy independent as possible with solar panels and battery storage technology. Increasing fixed daily electricity network charges goes against the principal of reducing our carbon footprint as a country.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28137>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T11:09:17.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private citizen

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: The proposed move to significantly higher fixed electricity charges should not proceed because it undermines investment in consumer energy resources (CER) like rooftop solar and batteries, dulls price signals that drive efficient decarbonisation, and creates unacceptable distributional and equity impacts for households who have invested in good faith in the energy transition.

## 1. Nullifying solar and battery value contradicts the review's objectives

The draft report says the review's purpose is to deliver a smarter and fairer electricity pricing framework that meets consumers' needs at lowest cost, including by supporting efficient integration of CER such as solar PV, batteries and EVs. Shifting a much larger share of network and retail costs into fixed daily charges directly undermines this by making bill savings from rooftop solar and batteries materially smaller, regardless of how efficiently households use or generate electricity.

Under current volumetric tariffs, customers with rooftop solar and batteries

contribute less to network costs than customers with the same consumption who only use grid power, even though both depend on the network. The draft then proposes to transition towards network tariffs with a larger fixed charge component, with fixed charges recovering most of a network's revenue requirement. For households who have invested thousands of dollars in CER in reliance on volumetric pricing and payback periods, this would retrospectively strip away a major part of the value proposition and materially extend payback times.

The report itself acknowledges that transitioning to higher fixed charges may create winners and losers and that some customers will pay more than they used to. In practice, a steep increase in fixed charges means:

- households that have already invested in solar and batteries will see much of their expected savings wiped out, even if they shift load and export at optimal times
- potential new investors will see weaker business cases, reducing the uptake of CER that the review elsewhere seeks to encourage.

This is at odds with the report's own framing that technology will play a critical role in helping all consumers gain more value from the energy system. If policy changes remove the financial upside of investing in CER, consumers will reasonably question whether future reforms can be trusted.

## ## 2. High fixed charges weaken efficient signals and raise system costs

The draft emphasises that tariffs should reflect underlying costs and send signals that reward customers for behaviour that reduces costs and shares them more equitably. It also recognises that more efficient, dynamic tariffs can help manage congestion and avoid costly network investment by rewarding behaviour that benefits the system.

Greatly increasing fixed charges moves in the opposite direction:

- A large, unavoidable fixed charge is insensitive to when and how energy is used, so it cannot reward consumption or export that helps avoid network upgrades or takes advantage of periods of surplus renewable generation.
- If the fixed component becomes dominant, the variable component - and thus the behavioural signal - becomes too weak to drive the CER-driven flexibility and demand response that the review wants to unlock.

The draft envisages arrangements where dynamic charges are zero most of the time and the fixed charge recovers most revenue. In that world, a household's careful load shifting, investment in batteries, and daytime EV charging will have only marginal impact on its bill, even though those behaviours can significantly reduce system-wide wholesale and network

costs. The draft also shows that individual batteries and flexible demand can deliver substantial wholesale and network savings; if customers can capture only a small fraction of that through lower variable charges because fixed charges dominate, the system loses a key, low-cost tool for managing the transition.

In short, the proposal risks locking in higher long-term system costs by blunting the incentives for CER uptake and flexible demand – the very tools that can lower peak demand, defer network augmentation, and integrate renewables at least cost.

### ## 3. Distributional and equity impacts are poorly justified

The draft recognises that a move to predominantly fixed charges would negatively impact some customers in the short term and that some may be experiencing vulnerability and be least able to adapt. It also concedes that detailed customer impact analysis is still to come and that transitional measures have not yet been fully designed.

In this context, moving ahead with a strong shift to higher fixed charges is

premature and risky, particularly given:

- Renters, apartment dwellers and low-income households often cannot install rooftop solar or batteries, and therefore cannot offset higher fixed charges with self-generation or storage.
- Households that have invested in CER under the current rules will see their savings eroded; many of these investments were financed on the basis of projected bill savings and payback horizons which the proposed changes would materially alter.
- Part of the gap between the CER haves and have-nots arises because some households currently avoid network charges without a corresponding reduction in network costs, but simply lifting fixed charges does not address the structural barriers (tenure, capital constraints, building suitability) that prevent many households from accessing CER.

Instead, it will raise unavoidable bills for everyone while weakening incentives to expand CER access through innovative business models. The draft

asserts that tariff reform is also a move to more equitable tariffs, but it

has not demonstrated, with empirical customer-level analysis, that a fixed-heavy design would help vulnerable consumers more than targeted measures such as:

- means-tested concessions and rebates
- social tariffs or protections for low-income and hardship customers
- mandated access to basic, low-complexity, low-risk tariffs that retain meaningful volumetric signals.

Without that evidence, the equity claim is unsubstantiated, and the risk of disproportionate harm to vulnerable households and to recent CER adopters is high.

#### ## 4. Trust, stability and the "rules of the game"

The review emphasises that technology will be central in helping consumers gain value and that reforms should enable new business models bundling solar, batteries and EVs. To unlock private capital into CER at the scale required, households must trust that the rules will not be retroactively tilted against them.

The draft explicitly envisages that fixed charges may vary across customer types and that networks can design fixed charges differently for different groups. Combined with a policy preference for fixed-heavy tariffs, this creates a real perception risk that:

- households who have already invested in CER will be targeted with higher fixed components, on the basis that they are "able to pay" or "already ahead"
- future reforms could continually chase and erode the savings of early adopters.

Such perceptions matter. Stakeholders have urged the AEMC to be bold while carefully managing equity so customers are not left behind. If reforms are perceived as penalising households that responded to past policy signals to invest in CER and electrification, they will undermine trust not only in this package, but in future decarbonisation initiatives.

A pricing framework that is stable, predictable and aligned with long-term CER payback periods is essential. A sharp increase in fixed charges that effectively grandfathered away solar and battery savings is inconsistent with that stability and risks chilling future investment.

#### ## 5. A better path: efficient, dynamic and fair

The draft already contains the building blocks for a better approach that supports efficient cost recovery without undermining CER:

- More efficient, dynamic network tariffs that signal both long-run infrastructure needs and short-run congestion, including rewards for helpful behaviour and charges for harmful behaviour.
- Recognition that energy service providers are best placed to package complex network signals into simple, consumer-friendly products and

services.

- Measures to enhance competition, address the retail loyalty tax and improve comparison tools, so consumers on market offers consistently access good value without constant churn.

A more balanced approach would:

- cap the proportion of network revenue that can be recovered through fixed charges, to preserve meaningful volumetric and dynamic signals for CER and demand response
- require that any increase in fixed charges be contingent on completed customer impact analysis showing no disproportionate impact on vulnerable households and recent CER investors, with appropriate protections agreed in advance
- design dynamic tariffs where rewards for congestion-relief and flexible demand are large and visible enough to make CER investments more attractive, not less.

This would use pricing to reward consumers for activities that genuinely lower system costs and share them more fairly, without bluntly removing the financial benefits that households legitimately expect when they invest in solar, batteries and electrification.

## ## 6. Requested changes to the draft recommendations

In light of the above, I request that the Commission:

- Explicitly rule out any tariff reforms that would materially erode the expected savings from existing household investments in rooftop solar and batteries over their economic life, except where households provide explicit informed consent to move to such tariffs.
- Amend the network pricing recommendations so that fixed charges remain a minority share of total network revenue, with the primary focus on efficient, dynamic price signals and targeted support for vulnerable consumers.
- Make any move towards higher fixed charges contingent on completed customer-level impact modelling, published in full, with clear options for mitigating distributional harm and protecting vulnerable and CER-investing households.
- Reaffirm that the long-term direction of pricing reform is to accelerate, not dilute, the value streams available to households that invest in CER, flexible demand and electrification, consistent with broader net-zero objectives.

These changes would better align the pricing review with its stated aims of

delivering a smarter, fairer, lowest-cost electricity system that empowers consumers, supports the rapid uptake of CER, and maintains public trust in the energy transition.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28136>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T10:59:17.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Australian Citizen

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid,

especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28135>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T10:49:28.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private citizen

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments:

I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.
- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.
- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy

efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tennant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

Your proposal does not support us. Can you please stop.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28134>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T10:38:42.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am writing in response to the proposed changes to electricity pricing. I am in strong opposition to this as it will disproportionately affect lower incomes in a negative way.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28133>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T10:18:57.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: N/A

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would urge the AEMC to cancel its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to becoming largely fixed.

It undermines efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise the grid by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers who adopt energy efficiency measures incl solar and batteries.

It will hurt lower income households who tend to consume less energy than high income households.

It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification.

[REDACTED]

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28132>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T10:16:12.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Personal

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.”

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28131>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T10:08:03.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: N/A

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am concerned about the proposed changes to electricity network tariffs that increase the fixed daily charge paid by households. Raising fixed charges unfairly impacts low-use households, including those already under cost-of-living pressure. When more of the bill is unavoidable, people who actively limit their energy use lose the ability to control their costs. This particularly affects smaller households, retirees, and low-income families who already use less electricity. I am also concerned that these changes penalise households that have invested in rooftop solar and battery storage. Many people have spent significant amounts to install batteries that reduce peak demand and support the grid during high-use periods. Increasing fixed tariffs devalues that investment

and removes the incentive for households to use and store energy in ways that benefit the wider electricity system. These changes send the wrong signal at a time when households are being encouraged to invest in energy efficiency, solar, batteries, and demand management. Fixed charges do not reflect how or when electricity is used and do not reward behaviour that helps reduce strain on the network. I do not support tariff changes that shift costs away from usage-based pricing and onto unavoidable fixed fees. Any network pricing reform should protect low-use households, recognise the contribution of solar and battery owners, and avoid worsening cost-of-living pressures.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28130>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T09:58:15.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Home owner

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am concerned about the proposed changes to electricity network tariffs that increase the fixed daily charge paid by households.

Raising fixed charges unfairly impacts low-use households, including those already under cost-of-living pressure. When more of the bill is unavoidable, people who actively limit their energy use lose the ability to control their costs. This particularly affects smaller households, retirees, and low-income families who already use less electricity.

I am also concerned that these changes penalise households that have invested in rooftop solar and battery storage. Many people have spent significant amounts to install batteries that reduce peak demand and support the grid during high-use periods. Increasing fixed tariffs devalues that investment and removes the incentive for households to use and store energy in ways that benefit the wider electricity system. These changes send the wrong signal at a time when households are being encouraged to invest in energy efficiency, solar, batteries, and demand management. Fixed charges do not reflect how or when electricity is used and do not reward behaviour that helps reduce strain on the network. I do not support tariff changes that shift costs away from usage-based pricing and onto unavoidable fixed fees. Any network pricing reform should protect low-use households, recognise the contribution of solar and battery owners, and avoid worsening cost-of-living pressures.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28129>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T09:57:22.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Solar and battery households hate the idea of higher fixed tariffs:

I was shocked to learn that Consumers face five-fold hike in network  
I strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges

away from being tied to power demand to instead become larg

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.

- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

Your proposal is likely to be as popular as a fart in a crowded elevator. Can you please stop.

ly,


URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28128>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T09:37:22.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: -

First Name: 

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: -

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28127>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T07:24:46.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.

- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on

renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise. Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills.



From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-15T00:14:41.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am writing to formally lodge my opposition to the AEMC's proposal to drastically increase fixed daily network charges. As a household consumer, I believe this shift is fundamentally unfair, economically backwards, and actively undermines the transition to renewable energy.

1. This is a "Robin Hood in Reverse" Policy  
The proposal to quadruple (or even quintuple) fixed daily charges is a direct hit to low-income households. Data from Energy Consumers Australia clearly shows that low-income earners use significantly less power than high-income earners. By shifting costs into a fixed fee, you are ensuring that a pensioner in a small unit pays the same network fee as a mansion-owner with a heated pool and ducted air-con. This isn't "efficiency"—it's a wealth transfer from those who can least afford it to those who use the most resources.

2. You are Penalizing Good Behavior  
For years, we have been told to be "energy conscious." Many of us have invested our own hard-earned savings into solar panels and batteries to reduce our reliance on the grid and lower our bills. The "Double Cross": We were forced onto smart meters and "cost-reflective" time-of-use tariffs under the guise of efficiency. Now that we've adapted, the AEMC wants to change the rules again because those same "efficient" choices are reducing the revenue of network monopolies.  
Killing the Incentive: If my bill stays the same regardless of whether I save energy or generate my own, there is no longer a financial reason to invest in solar or batteries. This will stall Australia's rooftop revolution just when we need it most to meet emissions targets.

3. Protecting Monopolies Over People  
This proposal feels like a bailout for electricity distribution networks. Because household peak demand has flattened, these companies are seeing their

guaranteed revenue drop. It is not the job of the Australian consumer to guarantee the profits of network shareholders by paying a massive "subscription fee" for a service we are working hard to use less of.

Conclusion

The AEMC's guiding principle is meant to be the Long-Term Interests of Consumers (LTIC). This proposal fails that test. It punishes the poor, rewards the heavy wasters of energy, and destroys the business case for home renewables.

I urge the Commission to abandon the shift toward high fixed charges and instead maintain a system where those who use the network the most—and place the most strain on it—pay their fair share.

[REDACTED]

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28124>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T23:33:30.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity network charges under EPR0097.

Shifting more of my bill into fixed charges means I pay the same regardless of how much electricity I use. That removes the incentive to conserve energy, improve efficiency, or invest in rooftop solar and batteries. Households that have made these investments have reduced demand on the grid and supported Australia's clean energy transition. We should not be penalised for

lowering our consumption.

Higher fixed charges disproportionately affect low use households, including pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers, and energy conscious families. These customers have limited ability to reduce fixed costs and will bear a heavier relative burden.

If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford to may look to reduce their reliance on the grid altogether. That risks increasing costs for everyone else and undermining fairness in an essential service.

Electricity pricing should reward responsible usage and support distributed clean energy, not weaken it. I urge the AEMC to reject this proposal and maintain fair, usage based pricing that protects consumers and supports long term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28123>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T23:25:14.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Solo

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Ridiculous proposal that will be ruin the market for everyone

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28122>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T23:22:42.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: None

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Fixed charges will penalise the users who are causing the least risk to the network instead increasing the peak costs would encourage more people to shift their load to reduce the peaks.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28121>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T22:41:59.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Creating reasons not to invest in solar batteries at this critical time is just criminal.

I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.
- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.
- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a

laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

Its also a vote loser for any Government.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28120>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T22:19:11.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: As a residential consumer following government policy to reduce environmental impacts and improve sustainability, we invested in renewable energy out of pocket. This proposal is another example of policy maker to punish ordinary household when they chose to trust government and policies. Strongly reject such proposal which would only see the benefits go to pole and grid businesses rather ordinary household and voters. Do add another example of political lie in Australian history.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28119>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T20:57:10.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am totally against the proposal to change the way the charge for poles and wires from usage-based to a fixed charge. This will impact more on low income households than the wealthy and discourage investment in solar and batteries.

The poles and wires charges are already too high.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28118>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T20:26:50.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments:

I strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.
- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.
- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and

transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such

that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

Your proposal is likely to be as popular as a fart in a crowded elevator. Can you please stop.

Yours sincerely,

Someone with a vested interest in making the world a better place.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28117>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T18:43:20.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Me

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: [REDACTED]

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28115>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T18:32:15.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Personal

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: This proposal undermines investment decisions made in good faith by me in energy infrastructure at my home. What this does is penalise me for spending my own capital on generation and storage which, ultimately, reduces demand on the grid and provides stability at times of peak demand through my exports.

Government should consider their role here and, if genuinely additional revenue is needed to meet some demand here, how else this might be met rather than from those who have already contributed "above and beyond".

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28114>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T18:31:30.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private household

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I'll keep this simple as many others have probably explained why this is a bad idea. If you change the pricing model to increase the fixed costs at all, it will become cheaper for our household to disconnect from the grid. There will be many households in a similar situation, so the system will then lose all the energy we feed in as well as the current fixed costs we pay.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28113>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T18:22:12.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Home

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I do not agree that raisunf connection charges is the best action.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28112>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T18:11:27.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: This proposed idea will stop the transition to renewables in its tracks as the return on investment will not be justified

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28111>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-14T18:11:16.000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am writing to formally lodge my opposition to the proposed increase in fixed price fees for residential energy customers. As a homeowner

who has invested significantly in a solar and battery storage system, I believe these changes are inequitable and undermine the transition to renewable energy.

1. Penalizing Private Investment

I have invested substantial personal capital into a solar and battery system with the explicit goal of reducing my reliance on the grid and managing my long-term cost of living. By increasing the fixed-fee component of the bill, the utility is effectively "decoupling" the cost from actual energy usage. This diminishes the return on investment (ROI) for my system and punishes me for being self-sufficient.

## 2. Disincentivizing Energy Efficiency

Fixed charges are a "regressive" pricing mechanism. When a larger portion of a bill is fixed:

The financial incentive to conserve energy is reduced.

The incentive to install renewable technology is weakened for future adopters.

Low-usage households (often those trying to save money) are hit hardest.

## 3. Impact on Quality of Life and Future Security

My decision to invest in home energy technology was a move toward long-term

financial stability. High fixed fees act as a "sunshine tax" or a "battery

tax," making it impossible to reach a \$0 (or near-zero) bill regardless of

how much energy I contribute back to the grid or how little I draw from it.

This significantly impacts my financial planning and my ability to maintain

my quality of life in an era of rising costs.

## 4. Recognition of Grid Benefits

Residential battery systems like mine provide stability to the grid by reducing peak demand. Rather than being charged higher fixed fees, prosumers

who have invested in these technologies should be recognized as partners in a

modern energy network.

## Conclusion

I urge the AEMC to reject the increase in fixed charges. Energy pricing should remain focused on usage-based variables to ensure that those who invest in sustainable technology are not unfairly penalized for helping to

modernise our energy infrastructure.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28110>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-14T17:51:46.0000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: Review of the Integrated System Plan framework

Organisation: Home owner

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: To whom it may concern,

I was shocked to learn from your article - Consumers face five-fold hike in network charges under regulator plan - that the energy rule maker is going to jack up the network fixed charge such that there's nothing I can do to minimise this cost, even if I was to improve my energy efficiency or adopt solar and a battery.

Given submissions to the Australian Energy Market Commission are closing on the February 13, do you happen to have a template submission I could borrow from to get something done quickly?

From: [REDACTED]

To: Renew Economy reader

Normally I try and steer clear of writing submissions. I decided a while ago that my time was best employed communicating with large numbers of people rather than a narrow group of people who read submissions and who have usually already made their minds up.

But if I was to write a submission it would say:

I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.

- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

Your proposal is likely to be as popular as a fart in a crowded elevator. Can you please stop.

Yours sincerely,

[REDACTED] already invested heavily in solar and batteries [REDACTED]

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28109>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T17:41:29.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Home

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose this proposed draft change that would increase my fixed daily electricity network charges. If passed, this could raise bills for my

household by an estimated [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] per year, regardless of how efficiently I use energy.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28108>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T17:21:07.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: NA

First Name: Anonymous

Last Name: Anonymous

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: NA

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity including low income households many of which are already minimising electricity usage due to cost of living pressures. My fixed charges are much higher than my usage charges and this proposed rule change further penalises me.

The proposed rule change also penalises people who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's net zero transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid,

especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households like myself will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families. It disproportionately impacts me as a single householder, living in an apartment (with no ability to instal solar/battery) and who already has fixed charges higher than usage charges!

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the important concept of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy. For a 'consumer-focused future', please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28107>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T17:10:49.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: None

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Flat costs (a high proportion of fixed electricity charges) ALWAYS disadvantage the poorer people. It also encourages waste as there would be no incentive to not use power, utterly ridiculous in a climate change emergency.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28106>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-14T16:41:07.0000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: None -individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Increasing the fixed daily supply charge will negatively impact the individuals and organisations that have invested in, or are considering investing in technology to reduce their electricity usage. Reducing electricity usage or adapting to utilizing rooftop solar panel produce energy is an important move towards net zero and protecting our planet for our children. I urge you to reconsider this move. Perhaps the daily supply for gas should be increased instead. Any infrastructure invested into this has a much shorter pay back time so should be chartered at a higher rate.

Reducing gas usage would be a huge step forward for WA and net zero.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28105>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T16:02:10.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: NA

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.”

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28104>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-14T15:49:43.0000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Nil

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am concerned about the proposed changes to electricity network tariffs that increase the fixed daily charge paid by households. Raising fixed charges unfairly impacts low-use households, including those already under cost-of-living pressure. When more of the bill is unavoidable, people who actively limit their energy use lose the ability to control their costs. This particularly affects smaller households, retirees, and low-income families who already use less electricity. I am also concerned that these changes penalise households that have invested in rooftop solar and battery storage. Many people have spent significant amounts to install batteries that reduce peak demand and support the grid during high-use periods. Increasing fixed tariffs devalues that investment and removes the incentive for households to use and store energy in ways that benefit the wider electricity system. These changes send the wrong signal at a time when households are being encouraged to invest in energy efficiency, solar, batteries, and demand management. Fixed charges do not reflect how or when electricity is used and do not reward behaviour that helps reduce strain on the network. I do not support tariff changes that shift costs away from usage-based pricing and onto unavoidable fixed fees. Any network pricing reform should protect low-use households, recognise the contribution of solar and battery owners, and avoid worsening cost-of-living pressures.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28103>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T15:39:12.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Hi strongly oppose the proposed changes to increase fix-rate pricing. Pricing of electricity should be based on consumption and demand.

Households that have privately invested in reducing their dependence on the grid should not be unduly burdened for their low consumption of grid electricity.

Households with solar and batteries are greatly assisting the grid by removing the oversupply of power during high sunlight periods (middle of the day) and reducing consumption during peak periods.

They are doing so at their own personal cost, noting the low Feed in tariffs during peak solar periods and high costs to consume during peak energy consumption (18:00 - 20:00).

At a considerable personal cost household have greatly improved affordability of electricity to all households through greater self consumption. These households should now to be forced disproportional cover the cost of energy use for high energy consumers or business, and should not be relied on to ensure profit maximization by energy suppliers.

Many alternatives are available to cost recover. Higher demand pricing, increase chargers to business that profit from energy use or reduction in inefficient and backwards subsidies such as removal of the Capital Gains Tax discounts and negative gearing.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28101>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T15:29:43.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Consumer

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: A plan that penalizes people investing in making greener energy for them and the grid isn't a solid plan.  
Where I understand where the logic comes from, this needs to factor in solar / battery people who are making Australian energy better.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28100>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T15:29:18.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven

future

Organisation: N/A

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am concerned that the proposal for an increased in the fixed rate charge will have a regressive effect on lower income households who are lower energy users whilst also acting as a deterrent to the decarbonisation efforts of other policies.

Many thanks for your consideration.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28099>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-14T15:09:10.0000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: I represent myself

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.

- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to



Comments: Tax carbon, use the funds raised to help deliver non-carbon systems and pricing that rewards consumers who do the right thing, not punish them.

We need to bite this bullet hard, or you simply keeping annoying and antagonising people who are already doing their best to aid the energy transition. Oh, and stop subsidising diesel, and put those savings into the pot too.

Yes, you will need the federal and state/territory governments to be onside.

Good luck.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28097>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-14T14:48:22.000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: N/A

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade

older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

Please note: my views are my own and not representative of my employer.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28096>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T14:39:00.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Residential user.

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I believe shifting the pricing structure onto everyday families is going to detrimentally affect their pockets and overall network stability. Homes won't install batteries and peak demands will inevitably fail the system. Australians have had enough of price gouging and politics running so called "independent reviewers/commissions". This needs to stop! Every day a Man commits suicide due to financial stressors and overall costs of living. I blame you for this tragedy.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28095>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T14:38:10.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: N/a - private citizen

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose increasing fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Key

reasons:

Undermines cost-reflective pricing

Higher fixed charges disconnect bills from actual electricity use, reducing incentives to conserve energy and shift demand.

Weakens clean energy investment signals

Increasing unavoidable costs discourages households from installing rooftop solar, adding batteries, electrifying appliances and improving efficiency—working against decarbonisation goals.

Penalises households supporting the grid

Solar and battery owners have made private investments that reduce peak demand and defer network upgrades. Pricing should reward this behaviour, not penalise it.

Disproportionately impacts low-use households

Pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-efficient families will

pay more despite using less electricity.

Further disadvantages renters and apartments

These households already face barriers to accessing solar; higher fixed costs

reduce their ability to control bills.

Creates long-term grid defection risk

Rising fixed charges increase incentives for wealthier households to disconnect as solar and battery costs fall, shrinking the customer base and pushing costs onto those who cannot leave.

Risks a two-tier electricity system

Higher unavoidable costs undermine electricity as an essential service and

reduce trust in the system.

Consumer trust must be strengthened

The Australian Energy Market Commission should prioritise fair, transparent

pricing that supports participation in the clean energy transition, consistent with affordability concerns raised by the Australian

Competition

and Consumer Commission.

Please reject increases to fixed charges and maintain strong usage-based pricing.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28094>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T14:07:33.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: We have spent a considerable amount of money on solar and improvements to my home for energy efficiency would see that investment significantly devalued by the pricing review. I formally submit my objection.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28093>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T13:46:58.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Increasing network charges and decreasing other fees will result in loss of trust from people who have bought solar/batteries, and those who are still considering it.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28092>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T13:37:13.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: N/a

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: "I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this

risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia’s electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.”

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28091>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T13:16:50.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

This proposal reeks of the classic bait and switch routine - get the consumer to fund the majority of their own infrastructure (solar panels and batteries) thus reducing their reliance on electricity grid and then charge them more with a fixed daily charge.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, self funded retirees, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and

undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28090>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T13:08:07.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: private citizen

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I strongly oppose the AEMC's proposal to shift network pricing toward predominantly fixed charges. Fixed charges reduce my ability to

control my bill and weaken incentives for efficient energy use and investment rooftop solar and home batteries, which allow for more autonomy while retaining a system that works for all. I strongly urge the AEMC not to progress the proposal for retrograde weighting of fixed network charges rather the current system that allows more flexibility with its weighting towards usage charges.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28089>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T12:06:22.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.
- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.
- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks.

Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of

dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

Your proposal is likely to be as popular as a fart in a crowded elevator. Can you please stop.

Yours sincerely,  
Someone with a vested interest in making the world a better place.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28088>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T12:05:53.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Personal

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade

older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28087>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T11:57:17.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Home owner

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher

for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28086>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T11:56:04.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Self

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: A plan to significantly increase network costs is ridiculous.  
This is recently the opposite of what we should be doing.

Right now we are a society should be encouraging batteries into homes and beyond.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28085>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-14T11:26:20.0000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: NONE

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I strongly urge AEMC to abandon this proposal to increase network charges.

It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28084>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T11:25:41.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual Consumer

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments:

I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.
- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.
- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy

efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tennant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

Your proposal is likely to be as popular as a fart in a crowded elevator. Can you please stop.

Yours sincerely,

Someone with a vested interest in making the world a better place.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28083>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T11:16:05.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Solar Owner

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28082>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T10:24:58.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Na

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I strongly object to the planned changes to energy pricing structures and advocate for continuing with the current situation where network charges are low and people pay for the power they use. This system does not force high charges to people who use less energy.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28081>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-14T10:05:05.0000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: One side Govt is advocating for clean green energy and on the other side planning to penalize the households by additional charges.

Not accepted the proposal.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28080>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T09:54:10.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private citizens

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Having just installed a rooftop solar system with a 24 kw batteries and have done this to cut our cost for imminent retirement and to increase the supply charge is to put it bluntly appalling and just another case of the poor paying the bulk of bills while the wealthy live in comfort, so much for having heating and aircon on, as they say GET A BLANKET or OPEN THE WINDOW

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28079>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T09:44:11.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28078>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T09:23:06.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: N/A

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: The proposed approach to increase fixed tariffs has some very significant potential issues. While I understand the need to fund managing and upgrading the energy grid, this proposed change will likely significantly impact three groups:  
Low income consumers, who have minimal energy usages at present as, to be frank, they can't afford to use more. Increasing the fixed tariffs will likely result in them no longer being able to afford to have power connected, which in extreme situations (dead of winter/mid summer) result in their death.

The other likely impacted group is households who are focussing on investing significantly on making their houses energy efficient, upgrading insulation, sealing gaps, installing double glazing, reducing energy wastage, etc. This is often at significant cost, but is in-line with the push for a greener

future. As this group is a lower consumer of energy from the grid, increased fixed tariffs will penalise this group. It will also disincentivise further people looking to start this journey.

Lastly, this proposed change will impact those who have made the significant investment in a greener future, by installing PV solar and batteries to reduce their drain on legacy power sources and to (in many cases) supply energy back to the grid at times of high demand.

Shouldn't we be encouraging groups of people that are supporting the government (and the world)'s goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, while also supporting the most vulnerable people in our society? On the surface, this proposal seems to target both groups, which does not seem to be progress, or an improvement to me.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28077>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T09:13:52.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less

energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.

- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what

are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

Your proposal is likely to be as popular as a fart in a crowded elevator. Can you please stop.

s sincerely,

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28076>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T09:04:00.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: x

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become

largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.

- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28075>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T08:43:14.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Dear AEMC Commissioners,  
I am writing to strongly object to the draft recommendation (Recommendation

5) to significantly increase the fixed charge component of network tariffs as

a way to recover residual network costs.

While I understand the intent—to address perceived inequities where households with consumer energy resources (CER) like solar and batteries can

reduce their variable charges—I believe this approach would have serious unintended consequences that undermine the very goals of a “consumer-driven

future” and Australia’s energy transition.

1. It would deter investment in renewables and energy efficiency  
Higher fixed fees would make the payback period for rooftop solar, home batteries, and efficiency upgrades (e.g., insulation, efficient appliances)

even longer and more uncertain. These investments already require 7-12 years to break even for many households. Adding hundreds of dollars in unavoidable annual fixed charges—potentially \$127-\$217 more per year for low-usage and low-income households, according to Solar Citizens’ analysis—would tip the scales against adoption.

This directly contradicts the review’s aim to support CER uptake. Instead of rewarding households for reducing grid demand and emissions, it would penalise them.

2. Constant policy changes are eroding consumer confidence

Over the past decade, repeated reductions in feed-in tariffs, shifts in rebate schemes, and now this proposed tariff overhaul have created a climate

of instability. Households need predictable fee structures to make long-term

financial decisions. When rules keep changing, people delay or abandon investments in solar, storage, and efficiency—leaving the grid to carry more load during peaks and increasing reliance on higher-emission generation.

This outcome would raise overall system costs and carbon emissions, the opposite of what the Integrated System Plan and net-zero targets seek to achieve.

3. It risks creating new inequities

The draft report acknowledges the need for careful transitions and further

customer impact analysis. However, the current proposal appears to favour high-usage households (who could see savings of \$791-\$1,401 annually) while

burdening efficient, lower-usage ones—including many solar adopters and renters. True equity should reward behaviour that benefits the whole system,

not penalise it.

Recommendations

I urge the AEMC to:

- Retain a stronger link between network charges and actual usage/export behaviour, with protections for vulnerable and low-usage households.

- Prioritise dynamic/time-of-use tariffs that genuinely reward CER (e.g.,

zero or negative charges during low-congestion periods) rather than defaulting to higher fixed fees.

- Conduct and publish detailed, independent modelling on the distributional impacts of fixed-charge increases, including effects on CER

adoption rates and grid stability.

- Work with distributors and retailers to offer transitional “efficiency

bonuses" or opt-in fixed tariffs only for those who choose them.  
Australia's energy transition relies on millions of households investing in solar, batteries, and efficiency. Undermining that momentum with higher fixed costs would be a costly mistake.  
Thank you for considering this submission. I am happy to provide further details or participate in any follow-up consultations.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28074>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T08:32:11.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]  
First Name: [REDACTED]  
Last Name: [REDACTED]  
Email: [REDACTED]  
Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Do Not raise electricity daily connection charges, raising them will impact on new much needed solar installation and cause more financial stress on low income users

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28073>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T08:21:45.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Slowing down Climate Change (CC) has to be the main focus of any policy change.

An increase in the fixed charge works against domestic solar and batteries.

The increasing wild weather from CC also contributes to the cost of maintaining poles and wires.

I strongly oppose an increase in the fixed charge for supplying power.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28072>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T08:02:27.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I object to the increasing cost for the fixed portion of electricity charged, particularly those that will hit those with solar and/or batteries the most. I was under the impression that installing solar and batteries at a significant cost (i had to cash in on some life insurance to manage it), was HELPING the electricity situation , and was encouraged by the govt to do so too with the rebate. The feed-in tariffs are already next to nothing, and the electricity companies are giving incentives to sell (our stored) electricity back to them during the night, but it's so small it's sometimes not worth the trouble. If they are going to stipulate the prices they charge us, we should stipulate the price we sell our electricity to them, according to inflation and demand, and the cost of our hardware. Bring back [REDACTED] ! I get [REDACTED] now. It's been bait and switch.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28071>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T08:02:07.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Self

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Submitted by: [REDACTED]

Subject: Objection to Pr [REDACTED] Charging Framework

□

1. Introduction

I write to formally object to the proposed changes to network charges. While

I recognise the need for sustainable network funding and equitable cost recovery, the proposed structure disproportionately impacts households that have invested in rooftop solar, battery storage, and energy efficiency measures.

These investments were made in good faith to support grid stability, reduce peak demand, lower emissions, and contribute to Australia's energy transition. The proposed charges undermine these objectives.

□

## 2. Disproportionate Impact on Solar and Battery Households

Households with distributed energy resources (DER), including rooftop solar and batteries, already:

- Reduce peak demand on the grid
- Lower overall network stress
- Provide localised generation
- Export surplus energy during daytime periods
- Invest private capital into infrastructure that supports system resilience

Under the proposed network charges:

- Fixed or capacity-based charges reduce the financial benefit of reducing grid reliance.
- Households who have reduced consumption through efficiency or self-generation still face higher unavoidable charges.
- The incentive to install batteries (which support evening peak management) is weakened.

This effectively penalises proactive consumers who have reduced their net grid impact.

□

## 3. Policy Inconsistency with National Energy Objectives

The proposal appears inconsistent with broader objectives supported by:

- The Australian Energy Market Commission
- The Australian Energy Regulator
- State and Federal renewable energy policies

Australia's energy transition relies on increased uptake of distributed solar, batteries, demand response, and electrification. Network charging structures should:

- Reward peak reduction
- Encourage local storage
- Promote grid-supportive behaviour
- Reflect actual cost causation

Instead, the proposed structure shifts costs toward households who have reduced system burden.

□

#### 4. Failure to Reflect Cost Causation

Cost-reflective pricing should align charges with actual network usage and peak contribution.

Solar and battery households typically:

- Import less energy during system peaks
- Contribute to daytime supply
- Can export during constrained periods
- Participate in virtual power plant programs

If charges are largely fixed or based on connection rather than usage or peak impact, they fail to reflect true cost drivers.

□

#### 5. Equity and Social Impact Concerns

The proposal also raises equity concerns:

- Early adopters of solar and batteries often funded installation without subsidies currently available.
- Energy-efficient households who have invested in insulation, efficient appliances, and behavioural changes are penalised by higher unavoidable fixed charges.
- The reform reduces consumer agency and undermines trust in regulatory stability.

Consumers who took initiative to reduce emissions and system strain should not be retroactively disadvantaged.

□

#### 6. Economic and System-Level Risks

If implemented, the proposed structure may:

- Slow rooftop solar and battery uptake
- Reduce participation in demand response
- Encourage grid defection in the long term
- Increase political and community resistance to future reforms

A charging model that discourages distributed energy investment will increase future network costs rather than reduce them.

□

## 7. Recommended Alternative Approach

I respectfully recommend AEMO consider:

1. Stronger peak-demand-based pricing rather than higher fixed charges
2. Incentives for battery discharge during evening peak
3. Export pricing that reflects locational value
4. Transitional protections for existing solar and battery households
5. Clear modelling demonstrating that DER households impose higher costs

□

## 8. Conclusion


I urge AEMO to reconsider the proposed network charge structure. It risks penalising households who have actively supported Australia's energy transition and grid resilience.

Network reform should:

- Align with decarbonisation goals
- Reward efficient energy behaviour
- Reflect cost causation principles
- Encourage distributed energy participation

The proposed changes do not meet these principles in their current form.

I request that AEMO withdraw or substantially revise the proposal following broader consultation and transparent cost modelling.

ubmitted,  


URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28070>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T07:53:03.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Citizen

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Regarding supply charge increase. Australia has [REDACTED] new home batteries, most of them connected to the grid exporting in evenings during peak times. An increase to supply charge will result in many going off grid, reducing grid stability and negating the positive outcomes intended by the cheaper home batteries program and vpp incentives.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28069>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T07:32:40.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Increasing connection costs is not a good outcome. People with solar and batteries and low electricity users will be negatively impacted. This is not a fair system. People with solar and batteries shouldn't be disadvantaged they play an important role. Please don't increase connection or base costs, it should be user pays, where high electricity users pay more.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28068>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T07:21:16.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: We oppose this change. With increasing cost we Australians are already struggling.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28067>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T07:09:09.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I  
Type your search query and hit enter:  
Type Here  
All Rights Reserved  
Renew Economy  
Type your search query and hit enter:  
Type Here

Commentary  
Solar and battery households hate the idea of higher fixed tariffs:  
There's  
still time to register your opposition  
Tristan Edis  
12 February 2026 8:59 PM  
Solar and battery households hate the idea of higher fixed tariffs:  
There's  
still time to register your opposition

From: Renew Economy Reader

To: [REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

I was shocked to learn from your article - Consumers face five-fold hike in network charges under regulator plan - that the energy rule maker is going to jack up the network fixed charge such that there's nothing I can do to minimise this cost, even if I was to improve my energy efficiency or adopt solar and a battery.

Given submissions to the Australian Energy Market Commission are closing on the February 13, do you happen to have a template submission I could borrow from to get something done quickly?

From: [REDACTED]

To: Renew Economy reader

Normally I try and steer clear of writing submissions. I decided a while ago that my time was best employed communicating with large numbers of people rather than a narrow group of people who read submissions and who have usually already made their minds up.

But if I was to write a submission it would say:

I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network

charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.

- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges

for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This

makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send

completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification

in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear

and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which

is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord

relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a

laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out

long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network

tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve

understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

Your proposal is likely to be as popular as a fart in a crowded elevator. Can you please stop.

Yours sincerely,

Someone with a vested interest in making the world a better place.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28066>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T07:07:11.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private citizen and solar panel owner

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Rooftop solar must play a vital role in responding to the climate emergency. Energy retailers have already reduced the feed-in tariff three times in the short period that we have had panels on our roof. They now want to increase fixed charges. The privatization of the electricity grid had the objective of passing the risk in changes in technology from the public (government) to private enterprise. In reality, it became a case of private your profits, and socialize your losses. The Australian economy cannot afford the economic and human cost of natural disasters relating to climate change. We must decarbonize. The profits of a few overseas-owned utilities cannot be put ahead of the wider national interest.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28065>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T06:11:24.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Nil

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.

- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight

before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

Your proposal is likely to be as popular as a fart in a crowded elevator. Can you please stop.

Yours sincerely,

Someone with a vested interest in making the world a better place.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28064>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T06:11:15.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28063>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T04:40:21.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: None

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Hi, what is "fair" about encouraging user for years, with state and federal governments incentivising consumers to spend tens of thousands on solar panels and batteries, to now shift the goal posts re electrify funding? We spent this money in good faith, and have effectively pre paid years of electricity expenses upfront, for you to now want to change the system because power companies can't make enormous profits?

How about the federal government cuts its budget and they fund the cost of managing the grid? I bet the ridiculous travel allowances could cover the costs!

When consumers rapidly increased their streaming services, internet providers have had to pick up the cost of the extra usage of the uncapped services. Why is this any different?

Why didn't electricity providers start selling solar panels and batteries years ago? They have EVERY users power consumption data and can easily calculate how the consumer could benefit from these products and yet they did

nothing? There are literally thousands of solar and battery companies that were created from the demand from consumers. The energy companies could have simply done the same. But instead they were lazy and relied on massive energy increases to fund their stupidity, and now you want to bail them out and reward incompetent people?

This makes absolutely no sense, and will significantly reduce consumer's electrifying their homes. Rather than get rid of my gas appliances for energy efficient appliances, I'm better off financially just destroying the planet, which is what this will do, as solar becomes pointless.

When my solar panels need to be replaced, there will be no benefit to replace them. Over the long term the environment will suffer and the power companies will continue to make big profits and you will have been instrumental in this.

I do also wonder why one of the labour ministers, in the energy or climate sector I believe, recently mentioned he did not have solar or batteries at home - did he know you were going to screw us over and that we were wasting our money?

I feel like a fool falling for government's promotion of net zero and climate change initiatives, only for them to turn around and have you change the rules.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28062>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T02:39:08.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: n/a

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: n/a

Comments: You're supposed to be encouraging people to use their own power, not punishing them by making them pay off the balance of their batteries/solar, and then making that harder to do by moving more of the electricity payments to fixed fees. So now we've paid for the solar AND more for the grid. Stop giving companies permission to prioritise profit for their shareholders over affordability for the populace

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28061>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-14T02:29:06.0000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: N/A

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I think the proposed increase to the daily tariff is disgusting. If the proposed increases are applied to all households the high income households will effectively receive a reduction in their annual energy bill while the middle and low income households will be further exploited and the disparity in quality of lifestyle will be further widened.

The proposed increase in daily tariff reeks of corrupt self-serving interests

and should be thrown out. It does nothing to encourage or incentivise households to flatten the curve of their daily energy demands.

Australia has the enormous potential to reach net zero by developing green energy projects such as large scale batteries and pumped hydro instead of burning coal or gas at power stations, and where should the funds from these green energy projects come from? The households who aren't investing in home solar+battery systems, the households who don't put extra layers on in winter and rarely use the AC in summer, the households driving EV's which they've charged off the grid over night. Don't widen the wealth gap even further, make it fair, lower the daily tariff and raise the cost per kWh so the people who use the grid more heavily pay a larger percentage of it's maintenance costs.

The idea that only high income families have solar and/or batteries is simply not true, as the cost of entry to these systems has continued to fall to the point where the payback period is 6-8 years. Households and families who invest in our energy future should be rewarded not penalised for their environmentally friendly ideals.

I hope you can understand why raising the daily tariffs would be fundamentally bad for the majority and would only help those who frankly have already got more than their fair share.



URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28060>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T01:47:56.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices

or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28058>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T01:17:24.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: N/A

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I can not see good reasoning regarding the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Shifting a greater share of costs into the fixed portion of bills will place added pressure on households that work hard to keep their electricity use low, including those who have invested in rooftop solar and battery systems to manage their demand. A pricing structure that reflects actual usage helps ensure fairness and supports responsible energy choices.

I encourage the AEMC to carefully consider the importance of maintaining balanced, usage-based pricing that continues to reward efficiency and household investment in clean energy.

Please reconsider changes that would increase fixed charges in ways that could weaken equity, reduce incentives for demand management, and affect the long-term resilience of the grid.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28057>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T01:08:09.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Self

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments:

If network charges become fixed instead of being a function of usage, there will be no incentive to reduce consumption

Those who use less energy end up subsidising heavy users - a totally inequitable outcome

It will penalise lower income households more, isn't that why taxes are not

fixed?!

It will reduce the incentives for adoption of high efficiency appliances, solar and batteries, and thus substantially slow down decarbonisation efforts and increase emissions

It totally sends the wrong signals and will undo the positive changes brought about by the vehicle emissions and home batteries policies

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28056>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T00:48:16.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Myself

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: No to charging

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28055>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T00:47:33.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Na

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose this proposed draft change that would increase my fixed daily electricity network charges. If passed, this could raise bills for my household by an estimated [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] per year, regardless of how efficiently I use energy.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28054>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T00:17:08.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: A concern citizen

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.

- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges

for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This

makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send

completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification

in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear

and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which

is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord

relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a

laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out

long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network

tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what

are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

I strongly urge you to reconsider your proposal.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28053>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-14T00:16:03.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Home

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: The AEMC's reliance on increasing fixed service charges is a short-sighted strategy that underestimates the Australian consumer. By aggressively hiking fixed costs to recoup revenue, you are eroding the ROI for those who have personally financed the transition to renewables. Furthermore, this move creates a perverse incentive: rather than encouraging

users to support the grid through time-shifting, it forces them to consider total grid defection. If the goal is grid stability, the AEMC must stop penalising the very customers whose private investments are essential to the transition.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28052>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T23:57:09.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: "I strongly oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid,

especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.”

It's simply unfair.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28049>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T23:56:54.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: None

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.
- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.
- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy

efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tennant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.



URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28048>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T23:56:24.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will

increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28046>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T23:47:23.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I strongly oppose the AEMC's proposal to shift network pricing toward predominantly fixed charges. Fixed, unavoidable charges reduce bill control, undermine equity and weaken incentives for efficient energy use and investment in distributed energy resources.

Fixed charges discriminate against households that have invested in solar panels, including my own. We have spent thousands of dollars on solar panels and batteries in order to both reduce our carbon footprint and our electricity bills. By virtue of the low (in some cases near-zero) prices received for power sent into the grid, our household and other households with solar panels are already subsidising lower-cost electricity during the day for electricity users more generally. This subsidy will increase when the federal government implements its plan to require electricity distributors to provide three hours of free electricity during the day.

I strongly request that the AEMC retains the existing system of variable network charges. Introducing predominantly fixed network charges would undermine the ability of consumers to reduce their energy bills by lowering their electricity consumption and would also act against the move towards clean energy.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28044>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T23:47:13.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private citizen

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

Type your search query and hit enter:

Type Here

All Rights Reserved

Renew Economy

Type your search query and hit enter:

Type Here

Commentary

Solar and battery households hate the idea of higher fixed tariffs:

There's

still time to register your opposition

Tristan Edis

12 February 2026 8:59 PM

Solar and battery households hate the idea of higher fixed tariffs:

There's

still time to register your opposition

From: Renew Economy Reader

To: [REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

I was shocked to learn from your article - Consumers face five-fold hike in network charges under regulator plan - that the energy rule maker is going to jack up the network fixed charge such that there's nothing I can do to minimise this cost, even if I was to improve my energy efficiency or adopt solar and a battery.

Given submissions to the Australian Energy Market Commission are closing on the February 13, do you happen to have a template submission I could borrow from to get something done quickly?

From: [REDACTED]

To: Renew Economy reader

Normally I try and steer clear of writing submissions. I decided a while ago that my time was best employed communicating with large numbers of people rather than a narrow group of people who read submissions and who have usually already made their minds up.

But if I was to write a submission it would say:

I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.

- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

Type your search query and hit enter:  
Type Here

All Rights Reserved  
Renew Economy  
Type your search query and hit enter:  
Type Here

Commentary  
Solar and battery households hate the idea of higher fixed tariffs:  
There's  
still time to register your opposition  
Tristan Edis  
12 February 2026 8:59 PM  
Solar and battery households hate the idea of higher fixed tariffs:  
There's  
still time to register your opposition

From: Renew Economy Reader

To: [REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED],

I was shocked to learn from your article - Consumers face five-fold hike in network charges under regulator plan - that the energy rule maker is going to jack up the network fixed charge such that there's nothing I can do to minimise this cost, even if I was to improve my energy efficiency or adopt solar and a battery.

Given submissions to the Australian Energy Market Commission are closing on the February 13, do you happen to have a template submission I could borrow from to get something done quickly?

From: [REDACTED]

To: Renew Economy reader

Normally I try and steer clear of writing submissions. I decided a while ago that my time was best employed communicating with large numbers of people rather than a narrow group of people who read submissions and who have usually already made their minds up.

But if I was to write a submission it would say:

I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.

- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to

avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

Your proposal is likely to be as popular as a fart in a crowded elevator. Can you please stop.

Yours sincerely,

Someone with a vested interest in making the world a better place.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28043>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T23:15:17.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private citizen

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity,

efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28042>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T23:12:08.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Consumer

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalize households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners,

renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service. Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatization has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatized electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it. At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it. I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy. Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28041>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T22:56:29.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private Citizen

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.

- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges

for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This

makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send

completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification

in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear

and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which

is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord

relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a

laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out

long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

██████████

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28040>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T22:45:08.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Personal Submission

First Name: ██████████

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose this proposed draft change that would increase my fixed daily electricity network charges. If passed, this could raise bills for my household by an estimated [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] per year, regardless of how efficiently I use energy.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28039>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T22:45:08.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Self

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: To the Australian Energy Market Commission, I am writing to formally express my strong opposition to the proposal to shift network charges from consumption-based pricing to a structure heavily reliant on fixed charges. I urge the AEMC to abandon this proposal. It is economically inefficient, regressive, and contradicts the National Electricity Objective (NEO) for the following reasons:  
It is regressive and harms vulnerable consumers: Increasing fixed charges disproportionately impacts lower-income households, who generally have lower energy consumption than high-income households. This shift effectively subsidizes high users at the expense of the vulnerable.

It undermines the National Electricity Objective (NEO): The AEMC is obliged to support the long-term interests of consumers, including the decarbonization of the energy system. High fixed charges drastically reduce the financial incentive for consumers to invest in energy efficiency, solar PV, and battery storage. This stalls the consumer-led transition required to lower total system costs.

It endangers grid security and increases costs: As households electrify heating and transport (EVs), the grid faces significant new load requirements. We require strong, continuous price signals to encourage off-peak usage. Fixed pricing removes the incentive to manage demand, leading to higher peak loads. This will necessitate substantial, costly, and avoidable investment in new generation and network capacity—costs ultimately borne by all consumers.

It ignores the split-incentive barrier for renters: The proposal fails to address the lack of access to solar and efficiency upgrades for renters. The suggestion that retailers will bridge this gap via subscription models is unrealistic; it displays a fundamental misunderstanding of the credit risks associated with installing long-lived assets for tenants with short-term leases.

The approach to dynamic tariffs is fundamentally flawed: Implementing dynamic pricing only when a network is near capacity is a reactionary strategy that will fail.

Behavioral Lag: Household energy habits and equipment turnover take years to change. Consumers need long-term, consistent price signals now to drive the adoption of efficient technology and habits, not a "shock" tariff introduced at a crisis point.

Perverse Incentives: This approach incentivizes Network Service Providers (NSPs) to delay demand management until expensive capital upgrades are unavoidable, potentially to inflate their Regulatory Asset Base (RAB). This proposal sends the wrong market signals at a critical juncture in Australia's energy transition. It risks locking in higher costs, stalling decarbonization, and penalizing efficiency. I respectfully request that the AEMC rejects this pricing revision in full.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28038>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T22:35:31.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: General consumer

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Consumers shouldn't be charged high for simple connections, and to be fair, charged by how much power they use.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28037>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T22:31:10.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: NA

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: [REDACTED] - this is a strong submission already. It's clear, rational, [REDACTED] focused on equity and system stability. If you're lodging it formally to the Australian Energy Market Commission regarding EPR0097, I'd

suggest tightening it slightly and sharpening the economic argument so it reads less like commentary and more like policy critique.

Below is a refined version you can submit directly 📌

---

Submission Opposing Increased Fixed Electricity Charges (EPR0097)

I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity network charges under EPR0097.

Shifting a greater proportion of network costs into fixed daily charges unfairly penalises households that have reduced their electricity consumption or invested in rooftop solar, batteries, and energy efficiency. These households have made significant private investments that reduce peak demand, lower emissions, and support grid stability. Pricing reforms should not diminish the value of those contributions.

Higher fixed charges weaken the price signal that encourages efficient energy use. When a larger share of a bill is unavoidable regardless of consumption, the incentive to conserve energy, install rooftop solar, add batteries, electrify appliances, or upgrade older systems is reduced. This risks slowing the growth of distributed energy resources at a time when they are critical to Australia's clean energy transition.

The impact is regressive. Small households, pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers, and energy-conscious families typically consume less electricity. Increasing fixed charges shifts costs toward these lower-use customers while reducing costs for high-consumption households. This undermines equity and contradicts the principle that users should pay in proportion to usage.

There is also a structural risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households with the financial capacity to do so may increasingly consider partial or full grid defection through solar, battery storage, and backup systems. This would shrink the pool of customers contributing to shared network costs, placing upward pressure on prices for those unable to disconnect. Such an outcome would create a two-tier system and erode the concept of electricity as an essential public service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and critical infrastructure. Pricing reforms must maintain public confidence, encourage efficient behaviour, and support long-term system stability. At a time when large-scale generation and transmission projects face delays, distributed rooftop solar

plays a central and growing role in Australia's electricity supply.  
Tariff  
structures should reinforce, not undermine, participation in this  
resource.

I urge the Commission to preserve strong usage-based pricing signals and  
reject reforms that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity,  
efficiency, and long-term grid resilience.

---

If you want to strengthen it further, you could add one concrete example,  
such as:

> "For a household consuming [REDACTED] per day, a [REDACTED] increase in  
fixed  
charges adds [REDACTED] per year regardless of behaviour."

Regards,  
Luke

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28036>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T22:25:39.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web  
site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven  
future

Organisation: Retired 12 years

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Batteries and panels.

Electric bills [REDACTED] for 2 years now.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28035>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T22:25:25.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that actively save electricity, invest in energy efficiency and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be required to pay more per unit for electricity consumed.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28034>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T22:16:11.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Submission to The Pricing Review - Electricity Pricing for a Consumer-Led Future

I wish to object to the flagged proposal to increase fixed electricity charges for households.

For more than 20 years my family lived off-grid. During that time we learned to manage a household on minimal power while maintaining a comfortable and dignified lifestyle. We became highly efficient in how and when we used electricity, invested carefully in appropriate technology, and avoided unnecessary consumption.

Now living in a small rural town, we have continued that approach.

Soon after moving into town we installed rooftop solar. We removed a wood heater and replaced it with an efficient reverse-cycle heat pump. We replaced our hot water system with a heat pump programmed to heat when our solar generation peaks. We designed a small extension to increase winter solar gain and reduce heating demand.

In short, we have taken practical, deliberate steps to minimise our electricity use and reduce emissions. We export most of our solar generation to the grid. While feed-in tariffs are now modest, we are pleased that our surplus renewable energy supports the broader community.

We are retired full pensioners with only a small superannuation income. Every dollar matters. We carefully manage our household budget, including electricity. If fixed charges increase, we cannot reduce them through efficiency or behavioural change. We would simply have to cut spending elsewhere.

Raising fixed charges shifts more of the cost burden onto households

regardless of how little electricity they use. It removes the incentive to conserve energy and disproportionately impacts low-income households, renters, small homes and older Australians who already use relatively little electricity. By contrast, wealthier households with larger homes, higher consumption and greater capacity to absorb costs are less affected by higher fixed charges—particularly if those increases are paired with lower usage rates, as has been suggested. That structure risks encouraging greater overall consumption.

A consumer-led future should reward efficiency, demand management and responsible investment—not penalise it.

If the challenge is managing excess solar generation in the middle of the day, the solution is not higher fixed charges. The effort should instead focus on:

Expanding and incentivising storage—both household and community batteries—to capture excess daytime generation.

Encouraging daytime consumption through time-of-use pricing that genuinely rewards shifting load to solar hours.

Supporting electrification measures, such as heat pumps and smart appliances, that reduce overall system demand and emissions.

Ensuring tariff structures continue to provide clear signals to reduce peak demand and overall consumption.

Households like ours have acted in good faith. We have invested our limited savings to reduce reliance on fossil fuels and to ease pressure on the grid. Pricing reform should build on that behaviour, not undermine it.

Electricity pricing for a consumer-led future must be fair, progressive and aligned with national energy and climate goals. Increasing fixed charges moves in the opposite direction. It weakens price signals, discourages conservation, and places a heavier burden on those least able to pay.

I urge the Review to reject increases to fixed charges and instead design tariffs that reward efficiency, support storage and demand shifting, and ensure the benefits of the energy transition are shared equitably across the community.



-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T22:04:20.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: .

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments:

I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.
- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.
- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges

for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28029>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T21:45:46.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: user

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will

increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28028>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T21:45:29.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Nil

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would like to register my opposition to the fixed tariff/daily grid connectivity charge that is being proposed. This is for the following reasons:

1. It disincentivises electrification of households, and disincentivises people from a greener future. Why invest in solar and battery if the grid is going to charge me irrespective of my efforts to decarbonise?
2. It will hurt renters and those without access to solar more.
3. It's bad PR. Energy companies are already reviled as being money hungry.

This will further entrench that view. Surely you have enough profits by now.

When does the greed end.

4. It will hurt vulnerable families, who use less electricity anyway than high income earners.

Please reconsider and allow Australia to continue to decarbonise their homes, and support the grid with their solar panels and batteries without charging them extra for it. We are all on the same boat, there is no Planet B. Help it make financial sense for Australia to move towards a greener future.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28027>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T21:45:08.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Homeowner

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy. Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28026>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T21:44:57.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: This is misguided ill conceived retrograde thinking, that will only stand in the way of progress and harm those that are trying to do right by the planet and the future.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28025>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T21:44:56.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: This is misguided ill conceived retrograde thinking, that will only stand in the way of progress and harm those that are trying to do right by the planet and the future.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28024>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-13T21:34:48.0000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose recommendation 5! Energy policy should support households who invest in clean, efficient solutions – not penalise them with higher fixed charges.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28023>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T21:34:46.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am concerned about your Recommendation 5, Para 64, which does not seem to be based on the truth, particularly the last sentence: "For example, customers with rooftop solar and a battery contribute less to network costs than customers with the same electricity consumption who only use grid power, despite both groups of customers depending on the network". This is clearly not the case. My electricity bill is in 2 parts, being the fixed charge per day, and the electricity consumed. This is IDENTICAL to my neighbour on the same company and tariff. One of us has solar and a battery, the other does not. We both pay an IDENTICAL amount for the privilege of being connected, this payment being for whatever is needed to allow being connected. The second part of the tariff - the energy payment part - is very different. So I now wonder if this Recommendation 5 is yet another way of saying "If you do not use the electricity we can supply we are going to charge you anyway". I think you need to understand basic fairness regarding the supply of electricity. Using less for any reason - including being frugal - should not mean a bigger bill just because of being connected.

If a bus service goes along your street (a service being provided) you should not be charged daily bus fares if you do not use the bus. You may well be charged rates (or rent) that ends up maintaining the road, but not the bus fare.

Something is very wrong with Recommendation 5.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28022>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T21:34:18.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: How do these ridiculous proposals help reduce carbon emissions. These will effectively jack up everyone's costs, except for already high energy users who don't care how much energy they consume because they obviously can afford it. This will drive up costs for everyone which effectively giving the green light to waste energy. You are mandated to help reduce carbon emissions and thus approach will do the opposite while hitting the vulnerable where it hurts.

Greedy behavior that benefits the rich and networks owners and furthers destructive environmental impacts exacerbated problems the affect the less wealthy more severely.

How do you lot sleep at night, seriously?

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28021>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T21:24:03.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: NA

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I strongly oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households like mine that have invested in rooftop solar and batteries in order to be "greener". It is also an incentive to consider totally off grid.

My - and other households like mine - have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. We should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise,

households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28020>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T21:08:08.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: None

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose this as it will be a disincentive for solar panels and batteries and will push prices up for those of us that have already tried to do the right think and invest in a green future

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28018>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T21:04:25.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Personal

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28017>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T20:55:15.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: n/a

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

Type your search query and hit enter:

Type Here

All Rights Reserved

Renew Economy

Type your search query and hit enter:

Type Here

Commentary

Solar and battery households hate the idea of higher fixed tariffs:

There's

o register your opposition

[REDACTED] olds hate the idea of higher fixed tariffs:

There's

still time to register your opposition

From: Renew Economy Reader

To: [REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

I was shocked to learn from your article - Consumers face five-fold hike in network charges under regulator plan - that the energy rule maker is going to jack up the network fixed charge such that there's nothing I can do to minimise this cost, even if I was to improve my energy efficiency or adopt solar and a battery.

Given submissions to the Australian Energy Market Commission are closing on the February 13, do you happen to have a template submission I could borrow

from to get something done quickly?

From: [REDACTED]

To: Renew Economy reader

Normally I try and steer clear of writing submissions. I decided a while ago that my time was best employed communicating with large numbers of people rather than a narrow group of people who read submissions and who have usually already made their minds up.

But if I was to write a submission it would say:

I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.
- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.
- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial

benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tennant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

Your proposal is likely to be as popular as a fart in a crowded elevator. Can you please stop.

Yours sincerely,

Someone with a vested interest in making the world a better place.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28015>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T20:44:51.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Fixed daily electricity network charges that increase city prices by [REDACTED] a year is crazy. [REDACTED] trying to do to this country?  
This will push many people into extreme financial hardship.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28014>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T20:43:10.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: N/A

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Hi,

I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

Raising the fixed part of electricity bills is unfair to households that  
use  
less power and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries.  
These  
households have reduced their reliance on the grid and paid out of their  
own  
pockets to support clean energy. They should not be penalised for doing  
the  
right thing.

Higher fixed charges also weaken the incentive to save energy. If people  
see  
less benefit from using less electricity, they are less likely to install  
solar, upgrade old systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency.  
This  
risks slowing the growth of clean energy that helps reduce pressure on  
the  
grid, especially during peak times.

Low-use households will be hit hardest. Shifting more costs into fixed  
charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment  
residents,  
and energy-conscious families.

There is also a long-term risk. If fixed charges keep rising, wealthier  
households may choose to leave the grid by installing solar, batteries  
and  
backup systems. This would leave fewer people paying for shared network  
costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to  
disconnect.  
That would create a two-tier system and undermine electricity as an  
essential  
service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a vital public service.  
Many  
Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered better  
outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about the impact of  
privatised  
electricity on consumers. Pricing reforms should build trust, not reduce  
it.

Rooftop solar is now a major part of Australia's energy system and more  
important than ever. Pricing should encourage households to participate  
in  
clean energy, not discourage them.

I urge the AEMC to reject changes that increase fixed charges and to protect fair, usage-based pricing that supports equity, efficiency, and long-term grid stability.

Thank you for your attention to this matter!

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28013>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T20:24:28.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Home owner

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would like to submit that I think the large electricity suppliers are already milking the system by paying 1c feed in credits to those that are exporting to the grid. I know sometimes there is a glut but this doesn't happen all the time. I feel that the large companies are already making huge profits and as a battery and solar owner I made the descion on government priorities of saving the planet due to climate change. I disagree with charging excess daily fees as this will hit not only those of us that have invested in solar but also low income households also under threat of out of control prices

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28012>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T20:23:17.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Myself

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.  
Increasing fixed charges unfairly penalises low-use households and those  
who  
have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These customers have  
reduced  
demand on the grid and supported Australia's clean energy transition at  
their own expense. They should not be disadvantaged for doing so.  
Higher fixed charges weaken incentives to save energy, upgrade solar  
systems,  
install batteries and improve efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing  
distributed energy growth that strengthens the grid.  
The burden will fall hardest on pensioners, renters, apartment residents  
and  
energy-conscious households. Rising fixed charges also increase the risk  
that  
wealthier households disconnect from the grid, leaving fewer customers to  
fund shared network costs and driving prices even higher for those who  
remain.  
Electricity networks are natural monopolies and an essential service. The  
Australian Competition and Consumer Commission has previously raised  
concerns  
about consumer outcomes in privatised electricity markets. Pricing reform  
should rebuild trust, not undermine it.  
I urge the Australian Energy Market Commission to retain fair, usage-  
based  
pricing and reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of  
equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28011>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T20:15:09.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Interested community member with home solar and BESS

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.

It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send

completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tennant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] e outcome and you are proposing to set up a system that financially rewards the almost exact opposite

outcome.

ly,

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28010>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T20:14:04.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: AEMC

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: To whom it may concern,

I sincerely hope that I have misunderstood and that there will not be a massive increase in our electricity's daily supply charge.

If I have not misunderstood and you are planning on going forward with this, then low income earners and disadvantaged groups will be made to suffer.

My daily charge is around [REDACTED] so around [REDACTED] a year. I can only minimise my power usage so much [REDACTED] if that daily figure were to double there would be no way that I could cut my use down to cover the extra daily charge, much less another increase in power prices. In the last couple of years my supply cost has gone up by around [REDACTED] percent.

If you actually care about people who have low incomes and have problems with bills how can you justify increasing the daily charge.

Please look into it yourselves. Don't believe what people tell you. Do your own research, ask the public, go to a welfare office and talk to people about electricity and then make up your own mind about what is the right thing to do.

If this gets passed it will just show how much Australia has sunken about being a decent country once proud to do the right thing for its people.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28009>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T20:07:11.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: AEMC

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar

and batteries.

- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using

equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

Your proposal is likely to be as popular as a fart in a crowded elevator. Can you please stop.

Yours sincerely,

Someone with a vested interest in making the world a better place.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28008>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T20:03:41.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: None

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am oppose to these reforms

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28007>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T19:53:08.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: None

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Hi,  
As a homeowner who has invested in solar panels to reduce my power bills, I am against this change.

[REDACTED]

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28006>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T19:45:05.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I strongly urge the AEMC to reject the proposed shift from demand-based network charges to predominantly fixed charges. This proposal should be abandoned because it will:

- Harm lower-income households. These households typically consume less energy than higher-income households and will be disproportionately affected by fixed charges that don't reflect actual usage.
- Undermine decarbonization efforts. The proposal contradicts the energy market objective by removing financial incentives for energy efficiency, solar adoption, and battery storage—all critical tools for cost-effective decarbonization.
- Risk unnecessary infrastructure investment. Decarbonizing our energy system requires expanded renewable generation and widespread electrification of heating and transport. The intersection of solar-heavy renewable supply with electric heating creates winter supply challenges that make energy efficiency and load timing critical. Fixed charges eliminate incentives for efficient electrification and off-peak electric vehicle charging, potentially forcing costly and avoidable investments in generation and network capacity.

Ignore the rental market reality. The proposal does nothing to address the split-incentive problem preventing renters from accessing electrification and solar benefits. The suggestion that retailers will deploy these technologies to renters through subscription models demonstrates a fundamental misunderstanding of the credit risks inherent in providing long-term fixed equipment to transient residents.

Misunderstand network investment behavior. Your proposal to introduce dynamic tariffs only when networks approach capacity limits shows a naive view of how networks respond to regulatory incentives. Networks have little motivation to avoid upgrades when they can profit from expanding their asset base under the AER's generous weighted average cost of capital allowances. They will likely delay dynamic tariffs until upgrades are inevitable. When dynamic tariffs are finally introduced, households will have insufficient time to replace long-lived equipment or adjust entrenched behaviors. The sudden, geographically isolated nature of these tariff changes will catch many households—particularly vulnerable ones—off guard, resulting in bill shock that contradicts your stated concern for these consumers

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28005>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T19:43:22.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: NA

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.
- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.
- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28004>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T19:42:56.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: energy policy should support households who invest in clean, efficient solutions – not penalise them with higher fixed charges.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28003>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T19:33:37.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Self

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: As someone who has recently had solar panels and a small battery installed for our family home I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.

- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28002>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T19:32:57.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Personal consumer

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I wish to lodge an objection to raising the daily fixed charge. We should pay for electricity used only. We are not profit making machines.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28001>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T19:23:33.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Na

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: "I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will

increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.”

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/28000>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T19:12:30.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: NA

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I 100% oppose this recommendation.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27997>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T19:11:58.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.
- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.
- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges

for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

Your proposal is likely to be as popular as a fart in a crowded elevator.  
Can  
you please stop

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27996>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T19:03:16.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Australian citizen

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am writing to oppose rule 5 of the proposed changes which intend to pass higher fixed electricity daily costs to solar customers.

This goes against the spirit of government on one hand subsidizing solar panels and batteries and on the other hand to reduce this benefit and waste hundreds of billions of investment done by the owners of these systems.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27995>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T18:52:21.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Concerned person

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less

energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which

the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar

and batteries.

- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks.

Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges

for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost.

This

makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send

completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification

in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear

and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which

is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord

relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will

roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what

are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the

AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to

effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours.

Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained

incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such

that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

Yours sincerely,



a vested interest in making the world a better place.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27993>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-13T18:51:07.0000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Why should I a single parent on a below average wage be forced to pay the same amount for my electricity, no matter how much I use, as a wealthy individual for which the same sized bill will be inconsequential. How is that fair. How does that teach people to be conservative and respectful of the environment? When there is no excuse for gluttony and now reward for being respectful of our limited resources and our environment?

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27992>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-13T18:43:39.0000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Home user

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I strongly object to the planned changes to energy pricing structures and advocate for continuing with the current situation where network charges are low and people pay for the power they use. This system does not force high charges to people who use less energy.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27991>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T18:43:10.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose recommendation 5. I spent a lot of money installing solar panels and the advantages of this have been significantly eroded in the short period since installation 2 years ago. Tariffs have risen dramatically and solar exports have declined significantly. This measure will worsen the situation

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27990>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T18:42:46.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I do NOT agree with recommendation 5. So many people have gone to great expense to put in solar panels and batteries to help them with the cost of living and to improve the environment, you are now looking to penalize these people with recommendation 5. This needs to be reviewed and reversed.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27989>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-13T18:42:30.0000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: NA

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: 0402892418

Comments:

"I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27988>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-13T18:42:12.0000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the change as it will make solar less viable.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27987>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-13T18:32:39.0000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Citizen supporting those in rental property

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I advise the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed. This is punitive to the less wealthy, and feeds the excessive demands of the

retail power industry.

The proposal is open the abuse and bad impacts on consumers in the same way

that smart meters' installation have been used to change use/charges and disadvantage the less informed consumers.

This "higher fixed charges proposal" should be abandoned for the following reasons:

a) It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less

energy than high income householders.

b) It will hurt and discourage people who responsibly reduce power use, and

instal solar PV and batteries, thereby it will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (one purpose of the energy market which AEMC is obliged to address). The proposal would reduce the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well

as solar and batteries.

c) It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly

investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks.

Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

d) Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake

charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs. The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) may intersect with growing reliance on electricity for heat, so storage and careful power use timing are critical, for example, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Bluntly, your

idealistic view of energy retailers aiding renters is impractical and contrary to their intentions.

e) Introducing highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network

area is close to its capacity limits does not reflect the realities of consumer and retailer behaviour. Investing in their own assets, with effective subsidy, is more profitable.

From your own (apparently industrial and politically selfish) perspective,

your proposal will produce electoral backlash and loss of credibility in your

support

- for the common-wealth of this country,

- for the people,

- for the honest tax-payers.

People will rightly question whom are you serving ????

ely,

[REDACTED]

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T18:13:10.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Homeowner

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27984>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-13T18:11:40.0000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Home owner. Solar system and solar battery owner

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I do not agree with Recommendation 5. I believe energy policy should support households who invest in clean, efficient solutions – not penalise them with higher fixed charges.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27980>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T18:12:48.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Personal

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Pricing signals and lack of grid reliability have encouraged me to invest heavily in solar and battery. I am a net exporter of power and use no power from 6 am to midnight. [REDACTED] of the time I would need no supply from the grid. We're the fixed price rise significantly I would simply .ove off grid. Happy to pay the current [REDACTED] per year supply charge but low users should not be forced to subsidise high users who put more strain on the grid and force infrastructure upgrades

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27982>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T18:11:41.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Opposition to Recommendation 5  
Altering the Supply Charge will have a negative effect to the uptake of renewable energy generation and threatens to increase energy bills of all customers, including those without the resources to invest in solar/wind. If there is less increase in renewables, the cost of generation will continue to rise and inflation becomes an increased issue.  
Thanks for your time.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27981>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T18:03:04.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Residential consumer

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Hello,  
Regarding increases in fixed charges.

I have solar and battery and expect to move to Amber in the future.

This arrangement will minimize my import from the grid and will curtail export when the grid has too much electricity.

Given the above I am a case where my grid impact is minimized.

I don't see how it is possible that I will be unfairly benefiting from the shared grid at the expense of others.

For those solar and battery owners who have automatic curtailment (i.e. Amber) when export prices go negative cannot be stressing the grid.

What I believe we will collectively do is reduce the profits of the generators (i.e. less evening peak price profit).

Why not directly charge all consumers a grid share rate per kWh for both imports and exports? This would be more transparent for truly shared infrastructure and be fair. The generators and retailers supply charges are in addition and kept separate from true shared grid costs.

Give a residential battery per kWh may be an order of magnitude more expensive per kWh than what a generator with grid batteries may be paying - is the focus in Recommendation 6 - actually giving power suppliers to the grid an unfair advantage over those of us who have installed solar and battery to do our bit.

If in the future I felt that the proposed changes had resulted in unreasonable subsidies (indirectly via increased fixed charges) to already profitable generators - I believe with a bit more outlay I will be able to go off grid in an urban environment. That would be in a small scale a loss of "community". The reader could regard this paragraph as a bit of pique. But I can clearly see through relational database 5 minute analysis of my imports and exports over two years how this can be done. What I am suggesting is that as residential solar/battery and V2H EVs improve it will become clear to many more people that this is viable for them.

Australia doesn't have the best record of regulators and governments managing in consumer interests (i.e. Australia East coast gas market). I hope this industry lobby power is not enhanced by these recommended changes. Time will tell.

Hopefully this is read, thank you for reading this far.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27977>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T18:02:21.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Residential

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Dear Pricing Review Team,

I sincerely urge you to reconsider and NOT raise Electricity prices . I'm a mother and sole bread winner to the family... our electricity bills went up from [REDACTED] per quarter 4 years ago to now [REDACTED] average per quarter (as I need [REDACTED] un central Aircon). So I borrowed [REDACTED] y to install solar panels to reduce cost but it was still high... so I recently borrow more money to invest in a battery to bring down Electricity consumption at Night... with mortgage rates going up and more electricity bills... I will not be able to Afford. I really do not understand technology but had to learn just enough knowledge to save money. - Now I'm told there is a consideration (proposal to hike the rates for connection to Grid)... If this is true it will hurt us more. We cannot afford not to use Aircon at night especially Canberra winters and we cannot fully rely on exorbitant Electricity bills.

Please I humbly request you to not increase the rates.

Thank you kindly,

██████████  
URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27976>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T18:02:13.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Consumer

First Name: ██████████

Last Name: ██████

Email: ████████████████████

Phone Number: ████████████████

Comments: I oppose Recommendation 5 as it penalizes those who have invested in clean and efficient energy solutions and will increase costs significantly due to proposed higher fixed charges. This is unacceptable in a financial crisis and is at odds with the 'fairness' spin being touted.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27975>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:52:50.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays,

locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27973>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:52:33.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Household user

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this

risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.”

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27972>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:51:39.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Electricity consumer

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments:

"I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms

should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.”

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27971>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:51:39.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Home

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Strongly Oppose Recommendation 5

We are barely meeting our ends with mortgage rates going up, electricity rates going up... now after being pushed into investing in solar we as a family struggled to borrow and install solar now to be penalised again for having solar is just plain wrong.

Perhaps look at investment in Nuclear power or re-open coal power plants..

instead of looking at hurting everyday families with kids who needs to put food on the table.

Sincerely appreciate if there is consideration given to those families who have installed solar panels just to avoid excess bills.

S,

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27970>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:42:09.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That

weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27968>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:42:08.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Personal

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Terrible idea to move to a higher fixed rate scheme. As someone who has invested significantly in my home for energy saving appliances and solar, this will penalise us for actively trying to help the grid.

Part of sunk cost fallacy, is if we've already spent money to reduce reliance on the grid, the cost is not that much more to completely disconnect off the grid.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27967>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:41:19.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private citizen

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: A proposed new rule change will shift more of my bill into fixed charges.

That means i would pay more just for being connected, even if I use less power. I have responded to government incentives and insulated my house, I

have responded to gov incentives and spent thousands on solar and a battery.

The change to increased fixed charges means as a low user I will pay more.

Low-use households will be hit hardest.

The proposed change will begin the death spiral for the electricity grid with

those that can afford to, going off grid and paying nothing for the poles and

wires going past their homes whilst low income and/or low use groups pay more

to prop the grid up.

Distributor companies such as Ausnet services make Billions in profits:

For

the full year 2024,

AusNet Pty Ltd reported a net profit after tax (NPAT) of \$143.6 million,.

Its

about time they put some of those profits back into the grid rather than into

shareholders pockets.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27966>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-13T17:31:58.000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: personal

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27964>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:31:53.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private citizen

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That

weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27963>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:31:18.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Home owner

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am opposed to the proposed changes to the fee structure that would increase the fixed network cost component of electricity bills.

This creates a perverse incentive to consume more grid electricity and discourages households investing in energy efficiency and renewable power.

In my own case I have recently spent over [REDACTED] on solar, batteries, reverse-cycle A/C and a heat-pump hot water [REDACTED] m. This is a wasted investment if there is now to be a substantially fixed price for connecting to the grid.

Regarding renters, a more effective route would be to require landlords to install solar for their tenants. Re large energy users that own their homes, they should get on and install solar.

[REDACTED]

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27962>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:31:17.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Solar and battery owner

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices

or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27961>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:31:16.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Household

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am against this proposed change. ie increasing the fixed/daily supply charge. It does nothing to encourage people to conserve power, penalising low consumers and high alike. The people who will suffer the

most are those on low incomes who often try to use very little power to save money. They won't be able to offset this increase other than using even less power. There must be a fairer way of covering power supply costs.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27960>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:23:05.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Consumer

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: It is not fair that you are penalising households like mine who have in good faith, invested tens of thousands of hard earned income to invest in rooftop solar and a household battery only for the government to then unfairly change the rules and penalise us. Please rethink!

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27958>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:22:11.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: homeowner

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: As an electricity consumer in NSW, I am quite alarmed at the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

It seems like a slap in the face to consumers that have diligently saved to have solar and/or batteries installed on their home, only to have the economics pulled out from under them.

Increasing the fixed portion of electricity bills will unfairly penalise households that have taken steps to use less electricity through energy efficiency measures, solar and home battery installations and upgrading appliances. It will act as a disincentive to conserving energy since most of the cost will be paid regardless of consumption.

This change will push customers that can afford to go off-grid to disconnect completely, placing further pressure on remaining customers to support the grid.

The solar and home battery revolution has strengthened the grid by reducing demand and creating a robust distributed generation network, and the hundreds of thousands of households that have done so should not be penalised.

I urge the AEMC to maintain fair consumption-based pricing which encourages equity and efficiency.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27957>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:12:34.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: We are opposing the rule change as it punishes everyone who has worked towards reducing daily energy consumption. Investing in solar, house insulation and generally lower energy consuming appliances has been a climate and financial positive for the majority of households. The proposed increases in daily charges diminish those efforts and reducing energy consumption becomes less incentivising.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27956>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:12:14.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Absolutely ridiculous proposal to raise the grid access price. This would significantly hurt homes with PV and battery installations, which are those who are massively reducing the load on the electricity grid by locally generating a large proportion of their own power.

It is also unfavorable to lower energy users who will pay much higher grid prices.

I strongly urge the council to reconsider this arcane, and frankly ridiculous proposal.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27954>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:12:13.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Home user of solar and battery

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: To the Commissioners,

I write to formally oppose Recommendation 5 in Project EPR0097: The pricing review - Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future by the Australian Energy Market Commission.

The proposed increase in fixed daily electricity network charges would disproportionately impact households that have invested in rooftop solar and

battery systems. These customers have made significant private investments to reduce grid demand, lower peak usage, and contribute to emissions reduction. Increasing unavoidable fixed charges undermines those efforts by reducing the financial benefits of efficient energy use and self-generation.

Higher fixed charges weaken price signals. They diminish incentives for households to:

Reduce peak demand

Invest in distributed energy resources

Shift consumption to off-peak periods

Improve overall energy efficiency

This proposal risks discouraging further investment in clean energy technologies at a time when distributed energy resources are essential to system resilience and affordability. It effectively penalises proactive consumers while reducing the transparency and fairness of cost recovery mechanisms.

Energy pricing reform should encourage participation, innovation, and efficiency – not shift more costs into unavoidable fixed components that blunt consumer choice and behavioural signals.

I respectfully urge the Commission to reconsider Recommendation 5 and instead pursue pricing structures that:

Maintain strong cost-reflective signals

Support distributed energy investment

Promote fairness and long-term system efficiency

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

rds,  


URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27953>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:10:05.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less

energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which

the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar

and batteries.

- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks.

Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges

for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost.

This

makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send

completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification

in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear

and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which

is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord

relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will

roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

Y,  
[REDACTED] rmission of [REDACTED] )

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27951>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:07:08.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven

future

Organisation: Private household

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: We believe energy policy should support households such as ourselves who have deliberately invested in clean energy and not penalise them with higher fixed charges. This is a backwards step for the future and we oppose recommendation 5.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27949>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-13T17:02:33.0000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Home

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am opposing Recommendation 5, as I've only just invested in solar and use my electricity as sustainably as I can.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27947>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:02:28.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: N/A

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am a rooftop solar owner and I strongly oppose Recommendation 5 in the EPR0097 draft report. Increasing fixed network charges would unfairly penalise households like mine that have invested in rooftop solar and batteries to reduce grid usage, improve energy efficiency, and lower overall costs. This change would add hundreds of dollars to annual bills regardless of how little electricity we draw from the grid, undermining the incentives for clean energy adoption and energy efficiency. Electricity pricing should reward—not punish—consumers who contribute to a lower-cost, more sustainable grid through solar and smart usage. I urge the AEMC to reject or significantly revise Recommendation 5 to protect solar households and support Australia's energy transition goals. Thank you for considering my views."

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27946>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:02:23.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: private citizen

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Hi Team,

I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will specifically and directly hurt lower income households at a time when cost of living is already an issue. Yea, you can give pensioner rebates, but what about the working poor who have limited control over when they use electricity?
- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.
- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.
- It is cruel to have encouraged early movers to invest in renewable energy (some of them have even replaced panels with more efficient ones). Now you are intending to punish the very people that kick started the renewable revolution.
- it will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tennant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a

laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.



URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27944>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:02:12.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: A higher fixed network tariff would impact low use customers the most.

As a renter, having a level of control over our electricity bill by adjusting usage is empowering and allows us to alter our habits to reduce our costs when necessary. I don't agree with the theory that this would be a better outcome for renters.

This change would also reduce the impact of sustainability measures on electricity costs, removing some of the incentive to reduce consumption and emissions. While this may be a popular idea among electricity suppliers, it's counterproductive to the goals of the energy transition. It would be much fairer to simply increase usage costs.

If the goal is to make the energy transition more equitable the better solution would be to improve access for renters via research and funding into portable solar panels and batteries, solar share schemes etc. and/or to provide discounts or rebates to households running essential medical equipment, low income households and/or renters.

Heavy use businesses will barely feel this change, while struggling households will be worse off. That doesn't feel equitable to me.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27942>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:01:54.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Home Owner with Solar + Battery

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose Recommendation 5 because increasing fixed daily network charges reduces the incentive for households to invest in rooftop solar, batteries, and energy efficiency. Fixed charges disconnect costs from actual network usage and disproportionately impact households that have taken steps to reduce grid demand. I encourage the Commission to consider pricing structures that better reflect usage and support distributed energy participation.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27940>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:01:18.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I have had solar panels for 5 years & now a battery for the past 5 months & since the battery was installed I have not used any grid power, why

I do not object to a service fee, the proposed changes go beyond what's fair.  
Also if all homes with solar turned their system off, the grid would collapse, which proves the solar power is being used, if you use it you pay for it.  
As well as the above before the power system was privatised we the consumer had already paid for the poles & wires, now we have to pay for them again & the way the system has been arranged, this payment goes on forever, we now never pay for the poles & wires, only to use them.  
We the public have been ripped off once by privatisation, we do not want to be ripped off again.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27939>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:01:16.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose this proposed draft change that would increase my fixed daily charge. If implemented, this could raise bills for my household by an estimated [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] per year, regardless of how efficiently I use energy.  
This is not fair for those who use the energy efficiently

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27938>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:01:14.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.  
As a household that has invested in rooftop solar and actively works to manage electricity usage, I am concerned that increasing fixed daily charges unfairly reduces the benefit of those efforts. Higher fixed costs weaken the connection between consumption and price, meaning households that use less energy or invest in clean technologies are penalised relative to higher-consumption users. Usage-reflective pricing is important. When a growing share of a bill becomes unavoidable regardless of behaviour, the incentive to conserve energy, improve efficiency, or invest in distributed energy resources such as solar and batteries is diminished. This risks discouraging exactly the kinds of consumer actions that support the grid and Australia's energy transition. Rising fixed charges also raise equity concerns. Low-use households – including smaller families, apartment residents, and pensioners – would bear proportionally higher costs despite placing less demand on the network. There are broader long-term implications. Continued growth in fixed charges may push some consumers to reduce grid reliance or disconnect entirely, leaving fewer customers to recover shared network costs and increasing affordability pressures on those who remain. Electricity is an essential service. Pricing reforms should strengthen fairness, transparency, and consumer trust, while maintaining strong incentives for households to manage demand and invest in clean energy. For these reasons, I urge the AEMC to reject changes that increase fixed

charges at the expense of equitable and usage-based pricing.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27937>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T17:01:11.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: self

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose this proposed draft change that would increase my fixed daily electricity network charges. If passed, this could raise bills for my household by an estimated [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] per year, regardless of how efficiently I use energy.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27936>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:58:11.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.
- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.
- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will

roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

Your proposal is likely to be unpopular Can you please stop.

Yours sincerely,

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27934>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:52:37.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private Citizen

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I strongly oppose recommendation 5 which would allow an increase of fixed daily network charges. As a citizen who has invested in clean energy to contain energy costs this move would increase the cost of energy regardless of how efficiently we use energy. Along with the miniscule feed in tariff would force consumers to disconnect from the grid.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27933>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:52:28.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Ridiculous tone-deaf proposal.

When we've all invested in solar panels + batteries, wtf is this proposal?

Corruption and greed come to mind.

I oppose this proposed draft change that would increase my fixed daily electricity network charge of pa [REDACTED], this could raise bills for my household by an estimated [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] per year, regardless of how efficiently I use energy.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27932>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:52:17.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose this proposed draft change that would increase my fixed daily electricity network charges. If passed, this could raise bills for my household by an estimated [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] per year, regardless of how efficiently I use energy.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27931>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:52:15.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments:

We believe energy policy should support households who invest in clean, efficient solutions – not penalise them with higher fixed charges.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27930>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-13T16:52:12.0000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private personal and consumer of electricity

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: The attached article by [REDACTED] from Solar Quotes provides detail info on why I am not in favour of any changes to Fixed Charges. The submission of [REDACTED] in this article describes my feelings and views in detail.

<https://www.solarquotes.com.au/blog/aemc-wants-to-raise-bills/>

Last year I searched for the number of retailers in Victoria and found 34 active electricity retailers and when I did the same search today I found they are now 39. In my view the AEMC have create a monster that is out of control and just more and more retailers will be approved and we as consumers have to pay for this. They have to make money and see now that with Solar they printing machine is failing and the only way they can keep the money rolling in is to get fixed charges increased. They AEMC must remember that not only have they to ensure that the market is stable but they also have to protect the consumer. We as consumers are paying for the AEMC to do an effective job. The number of retailers must tell the AEMC that they created a printing machine for the retailers and they are cashing in. Even the ACCC is saying that the market is broken. If we take this point to the extreme and say there is 5 million retailers in Victoria with say 5 million households or users of the power where does the money comes from to cover all the overheads, CEO's etc cost? We as the public is the ones that copped it.

Maybe it is time that we get a royal commission for this sector to sort it out. In my humble opinion if the new market realities cannot support this current model the solution is not to burden the consumer but to rethink the whole situation. Is it not clear for the AEMC that if power prices are dropping so that is is virtually free then why do the price to the consumers goes up?

At we all know before privatisation the Commonwealth as single entity run this market. I think our main objective should be to look at the price of energy before renewables came in and disregarding inflation and normalise the prices to the same level and then let the consumer pay for his service at what the price of powers now. Disregard all of these retailers that is rich from this model that the AEMC have created.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27929>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:52:08.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am against of changing or increasing the electricity network charges. Whats the point of having our own rooftop investment when we have to pay for the electricity companies regardless.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27927>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:51:36.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Defence

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments:

I oppose Submission 5 of ERP0097, which proposes to increase fixed network charges for households that have invested in rooftop solar and battery systems. This measure unfairly penalises Australians who have taken personal initiative to invest in clean, efficient energy solutions that directly contribute to national emissions reduction targets. Rather than discouraging household investment, energy policy should reward those supporting grid stability and sustainability through distributed generation and storage. Many solar and battery users already contribute to grid resilience by reducing peak demand and enabling localised energy sharing. Increasing fixed charges undermines this progress and sends a regressive signal that discourages innovation and private investment in renewable energy. A fairer approach would be to reform pricing structures to encourage demand management, storage optimisation, and grid-friendly behaviours – not to impose blanket charges that punish households for doing the right thing. Energy policy should build trust with consumers and accelerate, not deter, Australia's clean energy transition.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27925>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:51:27.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: opposing Recommendation 5

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27924>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:51:11.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners,

renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27923>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:41:43.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: n/a

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose Recommendation 5 of the AEMC's pricing review. Increasing fixed charges would penalise households who invest in clean, efficient technologies such as rooftop solar, batteries, and electrification.

These consumers reduce strain on the grid, lower emissions, and help Australia transition to a more resilient energy system.

Energy policy should reward efficient behaviour and empower households to manage their bills – not lock them into higher unavoidable charges. A fair

pricing framework must preserve strong incentives for demand flexibility, energy efficiency, and consumer-led investment in clean technology.

I urge the AEMC to reject Recommendation 5 and pursue pricing reforms that support, rather than discourage, consumer-driven decarbonisation.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27920>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-13T16:41:09.000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.

This would be a political Bomb

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27918>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-13T16:39:16.000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: As a solar customer, i've made significant investment in reducing

energy bills. A price rise after the investment feels like a blatant rip-off / bait and switch. This will cause others to reconsider taking up solar, which is a terrible outcome!

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27917>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:32:11.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Self

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I think this proposal will penalise people who have invested in domestic solar installations and batteries by unfairly tidying them for increased base-load tariff increases by increasing their fixed costs.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27915>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:32:05.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Home owner

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose recommendation 5 as an owner of a home who has worked hard to pay for a solar system supported by a battery.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27914>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-13T16:31:14.0000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Nil

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: The suggestions to charge people more who use less electricity speaks volumes that this move is designed to make profits for corporations, not take care of the individual. This will drive a wrecking ball through already stressed household budgets. You should be ashamed

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27913>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:31:08.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: As a consumer making ends meet, I oppose Recommendation 5.

Cost of living is through the roof. We have young children and one with disability.

Please consider.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27912>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:31:06.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Home owner

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: This draft change is unfair to those who have made an investment into solar which is the best thing for the environment. The government should be rewarding those who make this choice and not subjecting them to increased costs making Solar less viable. We should not be punished for making the best choice we can for the environment.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27910>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:30:56.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: [REDACTED] mmen ion 5 could raise bills for solar households by an estimated [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] per year, regardless of how efficiently you use energy. We [REDACTED] e in [REDACTED] ed in 66kw of rooftop solar to take control of our electricity costs, this proposal moves in the opposite direction. As such we DO NOT support this recommendation.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27909>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:30:49.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Submission - EPR0097

I strongly oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges.

Australia's electricity system is changing rapidly. As highlighted in recent analysis <https://reneweconomy.com.au/networks-are-losing-volume-to-rooftop-pv-and-home-batteries-and-we-now-have-a-tariff-problem>. Network energy volumes are falling because households are installing rooftop solar and home batteries. Customers are reducing the amount of energy they draw from the grid. This is not a failure of the system – it is consumers responding rationally to price signals and investing their own capital in clean energy.

Raising fixed charges is the wrong response.

Shifting more costs into unavoidable daily charges weakens the price signals that are driving efficient behaviour. It reduces the financial reward for:

- Installing rooftop solar
- Adding battery storage
- Improving energy efficiency
- Reducing peak demand

Blunting marginal price signals discourages the very behaviour that helps manage peak loads, reduce wholesale price volatility, and defer network investment. Indeed it could be argued fixed costs should be reduced from current levels and marginal costs increased instead.

Higher fixed charges are also inequitable. They disproportionately impact low-use households – including pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers, and energy-conscious families – who have limited ability to invest in distributed energy and who can only actively reduce consumption to manage bills. A larger fixed component makes their efforts less meaningful.

There is also a long-term structural risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households that can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly reduce their grid reliance. This shrinks the customer base funding shared network infrastructure (adverse selection). This risks creating a two-tier system, with higher costs concentrated on those least able to avoid them, or indeed prompting a death spiral as more and more users go off grid. Neither is in the interests of the system.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies providing an essential service. Pricing reform should reinforce efficient, usage-based signals and support distributed energy participation – not undermine it.

I urge the AEMC to decisively reject increases to fixed charges – which would do nothing to reduce emissions nor incentivise electrification – both of which are key to the energy system of the future.

AEMC should instead prioritise tariff structures that:

- Maintain strong marginal incentives for efficiency and demand flexibility
- Encourage distributed energy investment and emission reduction
- Protect low-use and vulnerable households
- Support long-term grid sustainability.

Increasing fixed charges would move Australia in the wrong direction at a critical point in the energy transition. If anything fixed costs should be reduced and marginal costs increased.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27908>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:30:48.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Dear Sir or Madam,

I strongly object to the AEMC's proposal to shift network charges away from demand-based pricing towards largely fixed charges. I urge the Commission to abandon this proposal for the following reasons.

\* **\*\*Equity impacts:\*\*** Fixed charges will disproportionately harm lower-income households, who on average consume less electricity than higher-income households and therefore benefit least from usage-based pricing.

\* **\*\*Undermining decarbonisation:\*\*** The proposal would materially weaken incentives for energy efficiency, rooftop solar and battery uptake. This directly undermines cost-effective decarbonisation and is inconsistent with the National Electricity Objective, which requires consideration of emissions reduction outcomes.

\* **\*\*Higher system costs:\*\*** By dulling price signals that encourage efficient consumption and load shifting, the proposal risks driving unnecessary and costly investment in generation and network capacity. As electrification of heating and transport accelerates, efficient technology choices and sensible timing of electricity use will be critical to managing peak demand and containing costs.

\* **\*\*Poor signals for electrification:\*\*** Reduced incentives for off-peak consumption will discourage efficient electrification, particularly for electric vehicle charging. Without clear and durable price signals, EV charging is likely to exacerbate evening peaks, leading to significantly higher network costs.

\* **\*\*Renters remain excluded:\*\*** The proposal does nothing to address the split-incentive problem facing renters. Suggestions that retailers will deploy electrification, efficiency or solar through subscription models demonstrate a poor appreciation of the credit and tenure risks associated with installing long-lived assets in rental properties.

\* **\*\*Flawed approach to dynamic tariffs:\*\*** Deferring the introduction of dynamic network tariffs until areas are near capacity reflects a naïve understanding of household behaviour and network incentives. Such tariffs would likely be introduced too late for households to adapt their equipment and usage patterns, resulting in bill shocks—particularly for vulnerable consumers.

In summary, the proposal weakens price signals, increases long-term system

costs, and undermines both equity and decarbonisation objectives. For these reasons, it should be abandoned.

Yours sincerely

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27907>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:22:16.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: "I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid,

especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.”

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27905>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:22:15.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] large for network connection could disadvantage those, like myself, who have endeavoured to reduce energy costs by purchasing an electric vehicle, installing solar panels and (next month) ai solar battery. These come at considerable expense, their purchase encouraged with rebates from federal and state governments wanting to reduce greenhouse gases. In the space of six years, I have seen my feed-in tariffs dwindle from around [REDACTED] cents to [REDACTED] cents. While I recognise the urgent need to upgrade the national grid, and understand my civic responsibility to contribute to this task, I ask if those with low incomes, low power usage and solar systems are being treated inequitably. I do not wish to be paying power higher bills than I might were I not to have ventured, for reasons both economic and environmental, down the renewable energy path.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27904>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:22:06.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Personal

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

This is likely to force my solar panels and battery off grid, which at the moment is feeding power at peak and most vulnerable times. Afternoon and into the evening and soaking up excess solar during the day.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27903>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:21:50.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: private citizen

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I have just heard about the proposal to increase the fixed price of electricity access and minimise the variable cost. This is madness. Taken to its logical limit, we will have zero variable cost and 100% fixed costs which will provide no incentives to have solar or to find efficiencies in the system. Also, as with any other expense, consumption is highly correlated with income. People with higher incomes have pools to heat and larger houses. This would be a means of subsidising their costs to the detriment of people less well off and/or who have invested in batteries, solar panels, and other efficiency measures.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27902>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:21:12.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private individual,

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Dear Sir/Madam,  
I wish to state my objection to the area of the proposal to increase supply charges for low consumption users and as these are generally the those who can least afford price increase, and, object even more strongly to the proposal to increase costs those who have roof top solar & batteries. The proposal is a disincentive for further investment in renewable energy by individuals, and is counter productive for those who have invested after considerable encouragement from government over the years.

If governments previous were more pro active in embracing renewables earlier, larger and more efficient renewable projects would have been underway and cost benefits could have been directed to the transmission area at government level.  
Please do not penalise those who can least afford it, and those who have acted individually, encouraged by government, to invest in clean energy and lower their costs.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this submission.

[REDACTED] Y,

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27901>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:11:48.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised

electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia’s electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.”

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27897>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:11:03.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: n/a

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.

- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the

AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

I find it staggering that the government is robbing Peter to pay Paul: offering financial incentives to encourage households to purchase solar and a battery, and then the AEMC wants to significantly increase fixed tariffs that effectively take away that benefit (not to mention the considerable investment by the householder to pay the majority of the solar/battery cost).

I also work for a council in the community sustainability team, educating and encouraging our local LGA residents to install solar and battery to help stabilise the grid and reduce their energy bills. An increase in fixed tariffs will no doubt affect some decision making when they reflect on the ROI.

I urge you to reconsider a better way forward.

erely,

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27893>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:02:11.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven

future

Organisation: Self

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: This is not fare deal for consumers. Electric companies already minted hell lot of money by getting solar energy for 1 cent and selling for 40 or odd cents. They should fund the upgrade cost to the system. Low unit consumer will be suffering as well this will demotivate people going solar with negative benefits.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27891>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au

Date: 2026-02-13T16:02:04.0000000

User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would like to strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

The situation of rapidly increasing electricity bills experienced over the past decade was in no small part due to the build out of distribution networks to accommodate actual and expected demand growth. A large part of this was caused by increased demand from air conditioning combined with the ever-increasing size of dwellings and Australian housing's abysmal household energy efficiency.

Any increase to fixed charges that is independent of a household's demand level is manifestly unfair. It will force poorer households without air conditioning or single-occupant or residents of smaller dwellings who least contributed to the over inflated distribution network asset base to subsidise those who are most responsible for the network buildout of the past.

Higher fixed charges will also mute any price signal to improve household energy efficiency. Energy efficiency investments are widely understood to have a large net benefit to society and Australia is lagging badly in efficiency. Installing additional roadblocks would not be in the country's best interest.

As a general comment, Australia's regulators are clearly failing consumers. The regulated transmission and distribution businesses have consistently extracted super-normal profits from consumers. Something is clearly wrong when the lowest risk part of the energy supply chain, the TNSPs and DNSPs, are making higher expected and actual returns than the much more risk exposed generators.

Rather than seeking to protect the networks' golden goose, the AEMC should be seeking to ensure pricing encourages the behaviors that provide a benefit to society and discouraging those that increase costs over the long term.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27890>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T16:01:37.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Solar and battery owner

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Addendum - Long-Term Structural Consequences

If tariff reform continues to shift cost recovery toward higher fixed charges while reducing the value of distributed generation and storage, it may unintentionally accelerate structural separation between proactive households and the grid.

Households that have already invested in solar and battery systems may increasingly evaluate options such as further storage expansion, load defection, or partial grid independence to preserve the economic rationale of their investments. While full grid defection may not currently be economically optimal for most customers, weakening the value proposition of grid participation risks creating precisely that long-term outcome.

A regulatory framework that diminishes the benefit of supporting the grid could gradually encourage customers to minimise engagement with it.

This would not strengthen the electricity system. Instead, it risks reducing shared network utilisation, increasing cost concentration among remaining users, and undermining the cooperative foundation required for an efficient energy transition.

For these reasons, I strongly urge the Commission to ensure that tariff reform maintains alignment between private investment incentives and system-wide objectives.

Sincerely,  
[REDACTED]

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27887>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T15:57:16.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I object to any AEMC-proposed rule change that will allow for decoupling of network connection charges from power demand.

Any such proposal should be abandoned for various reasons including:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

- by decreasing financial incentives for consumers to adopt distributed solar production and batteries, as well as energy efficiency measures, it will undermine efforts to eliminate fossil fuel use in Australia. [Just as every cigarette does you harm, every additional tonne of fossil fuel burned will ensure continued deterioration and degradation of the climate we bequeath to future generations].

- It risks requirement for additional unnecessary and costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks.

- . Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship.

The implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models suggests a surprising and

disappointing misunderstanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

It may be widely recognised that electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load, not a lot of people know that it also offers the potential for energy storage whenever vehicles are parked up and connected to the grid. That is, when not being driven vehicles can function as energy repositories that can meet local demand without the need for investment in additional transmissions.

The proposed rule change will send a completely wrong price signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner.

The time may yet come for increased fixed network charges, but so long as there is any coal or gas-fired generation connected to the grid, that time has not yet come.

[REDACTED]

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27886>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T15:55:12.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.

- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve

understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27885>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T15:51:12.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Nil

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Hi,

Please dont change the incentives to adopt green energy and reduce reliance on the network by increasing the network fees instead of usage fees. The changing of incentives will kill people's faith becoming an adopter.

Thank you.

[REDACTED]

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27883>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T15:41:56.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.

- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

- The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

- Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained

incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27881>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T15:41:14.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: N / A

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.
- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.
- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly

investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

Please urgently abandon this crazy proposal.

Yours sincerely,

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27878>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T15:41:10.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: "I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid,

especially during daytime.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia’s electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.”

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27877>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T15:32:07.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I would strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less

energy than high income householders.

- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which

the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial

incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.

- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges

for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This

makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send

completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification

in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear

and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which

is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tenant-Landlord

relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a

laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out

long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a

residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network

tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what

are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the

AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to

effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours.

Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained

incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of

dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households you profess to care about.

Your proposal is likely to be as popular as a fart in a crowded elevator. Can

you please stop.  
Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27876>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T15:31:17.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: N/A

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Low income consumers will be noticeably worse off under the AEMC proposal, facing an increase in their annual power bill. Households that have taken action to reduce their energy costs and emissions would see those efforts devalued, as a far greater share of their electricity bill would no longer respond to how or when they use electricity. Adopting this recommendation would punish most energy users by raising fixed charges. What this analysis illustrates is that the low income consumers will be noticeably worse off under the AEMC proposal, facing an increase in their annual power bill. As an industry we must not stifle consumer ambition by transferring misplaced risk allocation to those making the investments themselves. Thank

you

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27875>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T15:31:00.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Consumer

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: To raise prices on low income earners in a cost of living crisis is completely wrong bordering on evil, because these changes do not allow you even reduce your usage to help cover costs. This is an essential service and should be treated as such. These companies make profit of a home owners solar panels yet still want to charge extra for the service. I would call this double dipping and should be refused

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27873>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T15:30:59.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: None

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27872>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T15:16:11.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I already pay my electricity supplier, almost 9 times what they pay me for the solar energy I feed back into their grid.

If their current daily supply fee charged is also increased this will strongly motivate me to go completely off grid.

They already get something for next to no cost, and now want to charge a premium for something I do not need.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27867>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T15:11:17.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Shifting to fixed costs (like water charges are) doesn't incentivise lower use, or efficiency. All it does is hurt people who a) can't afford as is and b) have invested their own money to reduce costs into the future.

Some of reasons cited, like households which cannot reduce their consumptions, is also false. If you can afford a house with a 15kW ducted system, surely you can afford the bills. And if a customer finds themselves in financial hardship, other support measures should be looked at. The wrong

approach is to bake that into the pricing.

Fairness across the board, and especially for lower incomes needs to be looked at. And with the increase in EV adoption, higher loads will only increase. It is in the best interest of society for households to be smarter with electricity (and even reducing their grid demand) but perhaps not for the profits of generators.

Lastly, if the price of fixed costs goes up, it is likely people will look to go off grid, especially with how a 30-50kW battery can fully support a household. This reduces the net revenue of the whole grid, especially in rural areas. The move to increase fixed costs is short sided - perhaps an escalation of charges based on use is a better way (e.g. first 10kW = x, next 10kw = x\*1.1, etc.).

The demand charge is a perfect example of lack of forethought in QLD - let's charge the consumer for a whole month when they only had one peak period's worth of high consumption.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27866>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T15:11:11.000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Home Solar user

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27864>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T15:11:10.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I strongly urge the AEMC to abandon its proposal to shift network charges away from being tied to power demand to instead become largely fixed.

This should be abandoned for the following reasons:

- It will hurt lower income households who on average tend to consume less energy than high income householders.
- It will undermine efforts to cost-effectively decarbonise our energy system (which is contrary to one aspect of the energy market objective which the AEMC is obliged to address) by substantially reducing the financial incentive for consumers to adopt energy efficiency measures as well as solar and batteries.
- It creates the risk of requiring substantial extra, unnecessary, costly investment in new supply capacity in both generation and networks. Decarbonisation of the energy system will require increased reliance on renewable energy and electrification of household heating loads and transport.

The increased reliance on renewable energy (particularly solar) when it intersects with increased reliance on electricity for heat poses challenges for ensuring reliable winter supply of electricity at reasonable cost. This

makes it very important that electrification involves using highly energy efficient options and sensible timing of their use. Your proposal will send completely the wrong signal to householders about undertaking electrification in an energy efficient manner. In addition, electric vehicle charging represents a very large new electricity load. Households need to see a clear and long-lived incentive to undertake charging outside the evening peak otherwise it will lead to a blow out in network costs.

- It will do nothing to address renters lack of access to the financial benefits of electrification, energy efficiency and solar and batteries which is a product of the split- incentive problem afflicting the Tennant-Landlord relationship. Your implied suggestion that electricity retailers will roll-out these technologies to renters via subscription models illustrates a laughable lack of understanding of the credit risks involved in rolling out long-lived fixed equipment to renters who are non-permanent residents of a residential premise.

- Lastly your suggestion that we introduce highly variable dynamic network tariffs only once a network area is close to its capacity limits fails to appreciate the nature of household energy usage behaviours and a naïve understanding of how electricity networks respond to financial incentives within the regulatory framework.

Networks will likely only introduce these tariffs at a minute to midnight before the network needs upgrading because they don't actually want to avoid upgrades and would prefer to grow their asset base so as to milk what are excessively generous weighted average cost of capital allowances that the AER seems happy to repeatedly grant them.

These dynamic tariffs will almost undoubtedly come too late for households to effectively change their energy-using equipment and learn new behaviours. Household energy usage is a product of often long-lived energy using equipment and embedded behaviours that can take quite some time and sustained incentives to change.

In addition, a sudden and highly geographically isolated introduction of dynamic tariffs will likely lead many households to be taken by surprise such that they end up with a rude shock when they get their electricity bills. This could be especially bad for the vulnerable households.

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T15:10:50.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed pricing model

outlined in the Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future draft report. While I support the goal of a modernised grid, the current proposal

unfairly penalises the most vulnerable and undermines the transition to renewable energy.

1. Regressive Impact on Low-Income Households

The shift toward higher fixed network charges is fundamentally regressive.

Low-income households, who typically consume less energy, will face higher

mandatory daily fees regardless of their conservation efforts. This removes

their primary tool for managing energy costs and could leave them significantly worse off financially.

2. Disincentivising Solar and Battery Adoption

The proposed model erodes the value proposition of Consumer Energy Resources

(CER). By increasing fixed costs and potentially reducing variable savings,

the "payback period" for home solar and batteries will be extended. This contradicts the National Energy Objective to serve the long-term interests of

consumers.

I urge the Commission to reconsider these reforms and prioritise equitable

pricing structures that reward, rather than penalise, local generation and

storage.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27862>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T15:10:38.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: resident

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

First It is not fair for existing solar and battery users as their investment becomes less possible to be break even

If the charge reflects less for what user actually use it just encourages people to use more energy which pose a threat to the environment and grid sustainability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27861>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T15:00:40.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Me

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Don't increase the fixed costs of electricity.  
I use a small amount of electricity from the grid mainly in winter.  
I've been considering going off grid, and if you go ahead with your plans  
crease fixed costs I might actually go off grid.  
[REDACTED]

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27859>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T15:00:38.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Individual

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed increase in fixed electricity charges under EPR0097. Shifting a greater proportion of electricity bills into fixed charges would

unfairly disadvantage households that use less energy, as well as those that have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced their reliance on the grid and made significant private contributions to Australia's clean energy transition. It is unreasonable for them to be financially worse off as a result. Increasing fixed charges also weakens the incentive for households to save energy. This change would reduce the financial return on installing solar, maintaining or upgrading existing systems, adding battery storage, or improving energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed energy resources that currently support the grid, particularly during daytime peaks.

Low-use and small households would be disproportionately affected. Pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families would face higher unavoidable costs, regardless of their efforts to manage consumption.

There is also a significant long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households with the means to install solar, batteries and backup systems may increasingly consider disconnecting from the grid. This would shrink the customer base that funds shared network infrastructure, driving costs higher for those who cannot afford to leave. Such an outcome would undermine equity and the principle of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or improved outcomes, and the ACCC has raised concerns about the performance of privatised networks. Pricing reforms should strengthen public trust, not erode it.

With large-scale renewable and transmission projects facing delays, locally generated energy is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is now a central component of Australia's electricity system, not a marginal one. Policy settings should encourage participation in distributed energy, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to maintain fair, usage-based pricing structures and preserve strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy technologies.

For these reasons, I ask the Commission to reject any reforms that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27858>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T15:00:18.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Residential Customer

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I do not support the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097. Electricity pricing should encourage responsible use and reward households that contribute to a more efficient system. A well-designed Time of Use tariff – applying to both electricity consumption and solar exports – is the fairest and most effective way to achieve this. When prices reflect the time electricity is used or supplied, households are empowered to shift demand, invest in batteries, and export energy when it is most needed. These signals help lower system costs and improve reliability for everyone. Increasing fixed supply charges weakens these incentives. When more of the bill is unavoidable, households have less ability to influence what they pay through sensible behaviour, energy efficiency improvements, or investment in solar and storage. That reduces engagement and undermines progress toward a more flexible, distributed energy system. Higher fixed charges also fall hardest on smaller and lower-use households. Many pensioners, renters, single-person households and families carefully manage their consumption. A larger fixed daily fee means they pay more regardless of how efficient they are. If additional support for vulnerable households is required, it should be delivered directly and transparently through government mechanisms such as Centrelink payments, concessions or targeted rebates. Using higher fixed network charges to achieve social policy goals is neither efficient nor

equitable. Targeted assistance is a better and fairer approach. There is also a broader concern. If fixed costs continue to rise, households with the means to invest in solar and batteries may increasingly seek to reduce their reliance on the grid. This would leave remaining customers carrying a greater share of network costs, increasing pressure on those least able to adapt. Electricity is an essential service and the network is critical public infrastructure. Pricing reform should strengthen fairness, encourage participation in clean energy, and support long-term system sustainability. Expanding Time of Use pricing for both usage and solar exports is a constructive path forward. Increasing fixed charges is not. I urge the AEMC to prioritise equitable, time-based pricing that drives efficiency while protecting vulnerable households through targeted support.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27855>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T14:51:03.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Private household with solar and battery

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made

significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong

incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.”

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27853>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T14:50:38.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: [REDACTED]

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: Hi,

The proposed changes are ridiculous. Why would you be trying to financially hurt every household who needs electricity? Why would you want to hurt the renewable energy industry? We have local government campaigns advocating young people enter the renewable energy industry through their local tafe, and then you have these completely ridiculous policy changes that contradict the campaigns. How can something so stupid get this far! No one who isn't getting bribed would think this is a good idea! Corruption at its finest.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27852>

-----

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T14:50:27.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: nil

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I've spent [REDACTED] on a solar and battery system (I've also received substantial [REDACTED] funded rebates for this system). I made this investment to reduce my future electricity bills - I now rarely draw from the grid and export [REDACTED] most nights to support the grid during the evening peak. Increasing the fixed cost of my network connection will drastically change the underlying assumptions of my investment to the point that I would have been better off not installing the battery.

1) The proposed changes will massively reduce the uptake in home batteries - this is bad for the grid, bad for the renewable transition, and good for the vested interests... oh that's why this change is being proposed!  
2) The proposed changes will devalue my investment by impacting the ROI  
3) I will disconnect from the grid if I no longer see value in being connected. a) This will mean that I won't be paying the new network charge (or the old network charge) - if others also do this then we could end in a death spiral e.g. gas pipe networks. b) I will no longer be supporting the grid with [REDACTED] most nights during evening peak (4pm to 8pm).

The proposal takes from Australian consumers/voters and gives to vested interests (future employers of our corrupt political class).

It's about time our leaders put the best interests of Australians first.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27851>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T14:42:12.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Rule Change

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: N/A

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the

customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays, locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever. Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of equity, efficiency and long-term grid stability.”

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27849>

-----  
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au  
Date: 2026-02-13T14:41:34.0000000  
User: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au  
Body: The below submission has been lodged and confirmed on the AEMC Web site.

Submission Type: Market Review

Reference: The pricing review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future

Organisation: Australian citizen

First Name: [REDACTED]

Last Name: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments: I oppose the proposed increase to fixed electricity charges under  
EPR0097.

Increasing the fixed portion of bills will unfairly penalise households that use less electricity and those who have invested in rooftop solar and batteries. These households have reduced demand on the grid and made significant private investments to support Australia's clean energy transition. They should not be worse off because of it.

Higher fixed charges reduce the financial benefit of saving energy. That weakens the incentive for households to install solar, maintain or upgrade older systems, add batteries, or improve energy efficiency. Over time, this risks slowing the growth of distributed clean energy that supports the grid, especially during daytime peaks.

Small and low-use households will be hit hardest. A pricing structure that shifts more costs into fixed charges disproportionately affects pensioners, renters, apartment dwellers and energy-conscious families.

There is also a serious long-term risk. If fixed charges continue to rise, households who can afford solar, batteries and backup systems will increasingly consider leaving the grid altogether. That would shrink the customer base that pays for shared network costs, pushing prices even higher for those who cannot afford to disconnect. This creates a two-tier system and undermines the idea of electricity as an essential service.

Electricity networks are natural monopolies and a critical public good. Many Australians already question whether privatisation has delivered lower prices or better outcomes. Even the ACCC has raised concerns about how privatised electricity has failed consumers and the broader economy. Pricing reforms should strengthen trust in the system, not weaken it.

At a time when large-scale renewable and transmission projects face delays,  
locally generated energy in cities and towns is more important than ever.  
Rooftop solar is not marginal – it is a core part of Australia's  
electricity supply. Pricing reforms should encourage participation, not  
discourage it.

I urge the AEMC to protect fair usage-based pricing and maintain strong  
incentives for households to reduce demand and invest in clean energy.

Please reject changes that increase fixed charges at the expense of  
equity,  
efficiency and long-term grid stability.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/27848>