

Author name: M. Scott

Date of submission: Tuesday, 19 March 2024

Your submission for this review:

It is imperative that electricity quoted prices and their associated "costs" accurately reflect the inclusion of the "Service Supply Charge." Omitting this charge from the quoted price results in an understatement of the true cost to the customer, as it represents an unavoidable component of the bill. The lack of transparency in bill calculations is deeply concerning and raises questions about its permissibility. For instance, it is unclear whether customers receiving a "Solar feed-in Tariff" are subjected to a higher "Service Supply Charge." If this is indeed the case, the quoted solar feed-in tariff of \$0.03 - \$0.06 is misleading and inaccurate. It suggests that customers with solar feed-in are potentially incurring costs for exporting solar energy to the grid. The absence of well-defined feed-in tariff rates and the potential disconnection of solar feed during peak generation periods significantly influence potential income. These factors notably affect the involvement of ordinary households in solar energy production, highlighting the lack of effective representation within the system, which is evident in the unfairness of the arrangement. How could anyone consider shutting down clean solar energy in favor of coal-fired power generation a viable option? When rooftop solar energy is contributed to the grid without requiring any initial investment from the generators or suppliers, the calculation of a distribution cost of \$0.023 per kilowatt-hour with the installation of smart meters appears questionable. This discrepancy raises concerns about the accuracy and transparency of the pricing mechanism, suggesting a potential exaggeration of costs associated with solar energy distribution.