

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: [REDACTED]
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 2026-04-30T22:24:44.0000000
User:
[REDACTED]

I understand that electricity networks need stable revenue to maintain poles, wires, substations, meters and other shared infrastructure. My concern is that a single high fixed charge may create resentment among very low grid users and, over time, encourage some households to disconnect entirely if that becomes practical.

Some homes with large solar and battery systems may import very little electricity, but can still help the system by sending excess clean energy into the grid instead of wasting it.

I suggest the AEMC consider two additional tariff options.

1. Almost Off-Grid Backup

This option would suit homes that can mostly power themselves with solar and batteries, and only want grid electricity as rare backup during long cloudy periods or the shortest winter days.

These households would pay a small yearly backup fee plus a high price for any electricity they actually import. They would not receive normal solar export payments. Instead, their excess solar would be exported to the grid for free, where it is useful.

This would make backup grid power more expensive than normal electricity, but still cheaper and cleaner than running a petrol generator. It would also reduce the incentive for households to disconnect completely.

2. Shared Value Solar Exporter Plan

This option would suit homes that remain normal grid-connected customers, but import very little electricity and export excess solar or battery power.

These households would pay a lower fixed charge than the proposed high fixed charge. In return, they would receive half of the normal payment for exported solar or battery energy, with the remaining value helping to support the grid.

This gives low-import solar households a fairer option without treating them as fully off-grid.

If a home sends stored battery power to the grid during evening peaks or shortage periods, it will receive a better export price than for ordinary midday solar export. For households on a lower fixed-charge plan, half of that reward would still contribute to network costs (otherwise they can pay the increased yearly fee you're proposing).

The principle is simply to encourage high solar households to export electricity to the grid, especially during peak periods, and keep very low grid users connected and contributing excess clean energy rather than encouraging them to disconnect or waste it.

==

From: [REDACTED]
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 2026-04-29T20:53:26.0000000
User:
To: The AEMC Project Team,

CC: Mr Steve Georganas MP, Federal Member for Adelaide,

Dear AEMC Project Team,

I am writing to formally lodge my objection to the proposals in "The Pricing Review: Electricity pricing for a consumer-driven future" (Project EPR0097). I am copying my local Federal Member, Steve Georganas MP, into this submission as this policy directly impacts the cost of living and private debt obligations of constituents in the Adelaide electorate.

Please accept this as a late submission. I only became aware of the profound financial impact of this review following the reporting in The Age ("Backlash against scheme to raise grid costs for solar, battery owners," April 28, 2026). As the article notes, modelling suggests "payback periods for solar and

batteries will extend... with some owners potentially \$400 to \$700 worse off per annum."

The Financial Reality: Private Debt & Interest My decision to install a solar and battery system was a long-term financial commitment. To fund this, I took out a significant loan and am currently paying monthly interest. This investment was made in good faith, based on the regulatory environment and "payback period" projections provided by the government at the time.

By shifting toward higher fixed network charges, the AEMC is moving the goalposts mid-game. This is not a "theoretical" policy shift for me; it is a direct hit to my household budget. It extends my "payback period" and makes it harder for me to service both the interest and the principal of my debt.

The Impact: Winners and Losers Based on the draft report and current modelling, the proposed "equity" framework appears fundamentally flawed. It penalizes those who have taken the most initiative to support the grid's transition:

The "Winners" under EPR0097

The "Losers" (Households like mine)

High-income households with high usage and no solar.

Solar and Battery owners who have invested to reduce grid reliance.

Large electricity retailers (guaranteed "fixed" income).

Investors with Debt paying interest on a changing ROI.

EV owners who charge from the grid at night.

Low-usage households (pensioners/renters) with high fixed costs.

Key Arguments for Reconsideration:

* Retrospective Policy Impact: This proposal acts as a retrospective penalty.

Unlike large-scale energy corporations that receive regulatory certainty for

their investments, individual households are being told their financial plans

can be undermined at any time. This destroys the "social license" required

for the energy transition.

* Disincentivizing Grid Support: I invested in a battery to support grid

stability. If my fixed costs remain high regardless of how little I draw from the grid, the financial reward for being a "good grid citizen" disappears.

* Economic Inequity: While the Commission argues this is about fairness, it ignores the financial risk and capital outlay taken by early adopters. Punishing those of us who used our own capital (and debt) to build distributed generation—reducing the need for expensive new "poles and wires"—is economically counterproductive.

I urge the Commission to reject the shift toward higher fixed network charges. Do not penalize households that have taken on private debt and interest payments to provide the very decentralized solutions the Australian grid needs.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

==

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 2026-04-28T10:03:42.0000000
User: [REDACTED]

To the Australian Energy Market Commission,

So you've come up with a proposal to increase fixed charges. What are the objectives of this change? It seems obvious that it's designed to give more guaranteed income for the poles and wire providers. You've already enacted a market ruling that means residential rooftop solar contributors are paid a tenth of the price charged by retailers. I understand that the network is undergoing huge changes, but hasn't rooftop solar helped ease the cost to the system of the need to prolong the expensive coal sourced power infrastructure? We've done our bit and this is our reward?

Get real. Publish what you expect from consumers, government, power generators, (all levels), and retailers.

This subscription method is a [REDACTED] way of screwing over the consumer. Why don't you focus on user pays? This would be a fairer way of charging. If I use gigawatts of power that means I have a greater claim on system resources. How about you tackle proposed data centres as a source of future income? They're

going to make huge profits in the future? Give us a break. Do it via User Pays not Subscription. Give us some respect.

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 2026-04-28T08:15:21.0000000
User: [REDACTED]
To the Australian Energy Market Commission,

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

Whilst some electricity consumers may be able to absorb these costs, the effects of Recommendation 5 on the progression to clean energy are devastating. This hurts all of us, and makes the battery subsidy unviable. It's the easy way for industry participants to cover their costs instead of a more honest look at their viability. Perhaps it's time there was some fallout.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 2026-04-27T06:58:42.000000
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: Improving compensation frameworks
Organisation: Personal submission - confidential First Name: [REDACTED] Last Name:

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

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

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

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

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

The poles and wires companies should instead build their own battery storage, like community batteries, to capture the "free" excess solar still available, and sell it back to the consumer at full price. For years we have heard from them about the "solar glut" but nothing was done to exploit it.

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

Thank you for considering my submission.1

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Contact: [REDACTED]
==
From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 2026-04-25T16:28:22.000000
User: [REDACTED]

To the Australian Energy Market Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Contact: [REDACTED]

==

From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 2026-04-25T13:40:09.0000000
User: [REDACTED]

To the Australian Energy Market Commission,

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

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

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

This is blatantly unfair and regressive by nature. Those who can easily afford the cost increases will take no notice and yet it is exactly those same people who have the most connections and influence in our society.

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Contact: [REDACTED]
==
From: noreply@123formbuilder.com
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 2026-04-25T13:08:54.0000000
User: [REDACTED]
To the Australian Energy Market Commission,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for considering my submission.

Yours Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Contact: [REDACTED]
==
From: [REDACTED]
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 2026-04-25T12:17:40.000000
User:

To whom it may concern,
We object to any mechanism by the AEMC that undermines public installation and use of solar panels and batteries, including raising the cost of connecting to the network. We have the right to invest in our own electricity supply to enjoy its financial benefits so we expect this privilege not to be destroyed by the AEMC. The AEMC must largely pay for its own infrastructure and be mindful that it is not spending unnecessarily on it. It is grossly unethical to raise any connection fee just because households determine to do the right thing for the environment and save on their bills.
Thank you.
Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

Sent from my Galaxy

==
From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au

To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 2026-04-24T08:25:13.0000000
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: Small changes to Integrating Price-Responsive Resources rule Organisation: None First Name: [REDACTED]
Last Name: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED] Phone Number: [REDACTED]

Comments:
I wish to express my disagreement with increasing network costs further. In 2028 I plan on doing a big upgrade to my current grid connect solar power system and installing a battery. I could install up to [REDACTED] kW of PV panels. I also will be buying an EV with either V2G/V2H capability, or V2L to use instead of generator backup. Whether I supply energy to the grid when the sun doesn't shine is entirely dependant on whether it is worth my while financially, and whether I feel the government and providers can be trusted to not pull the rug out from under that financial viability. There is potential for the system to help supply the grid in times of peak usage, thereby lowering the wholesale price of electricity in peak times, and so lower the price of electricity for everyone. It could be a source of income in my retirement. However if I don't feel it is worthwhile financially, I will install a smaller system and go off grid. The grid will then lose me as a supplier in peak times and I will refuse to pay any network charges that lobbyists may convince the government to impose. So don't consider trying to force people that go off grid to keep paying for the network. Whatever decisions are made should include consideration of whether they erode trust in government not to be controlled by vested interests.

[REDACTED]
URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/29662>
==

From: DoNot.Reply@aemc.gov.au
To: Submissions@aemc.gov.au
Date: 2026-04-23T12:07:45.0000000
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: ECGS Enhancing reliability and supply adequacy arrangements Organisation: [REDACTED] First Name: [REDACTED] Last Name: [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED] Phone Number: [REDACTED] Comments: We are already

paying a supply charge to the power co. Just because we have a battery and does not draw anymore from the grid, why should we pay more for the supply charge? Beside, what the power co is paying for the feed-in from us is pittance which they on sell it to other users at a huge profit. 26 times more base on my current plan. This is just greed. Does not pass the pub test.

URL: <https://www.aemc.gov.au/admin/structure/contact/messages/29592>