

R. J. and L. V. Campbell

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Telephone [REDACTED]

E-mail: - [REDACTED]

Qld. B. S. A. License Number: 527703

Date: Wednesday, September 19, 2012

To: [Click here and type recipient's name]

Queensland Competition Authority  
GPO Box 2257  
Brisbane QLD 4001  
Telephone: (07) 3222 0555  
Fax: (07) 3222 0599  
Email: electricity@qca.org.au

Telephone: [REDACTED]

Subject: **Estimating a Fair and Reasonable Solar feed in Tariff for Queensland**

Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to submit to the Authority my views with respect to the future setting of the Feed In Tariff for Queensland as not only a Queensland Resident, a power consumer and a present owner of a small Solar system on our roof, currently obtaining the 44 cents F.I. T.

We have had our 1.5 kW (8 panel) system now for 14 months, so this provides me with real time experience figures of not only the system costing but also the benefit received from having this installation.

At the time we purchased the system we out layed in excess of \$4000 including changes required for our meterbox. The first year's savings amounted to approx \$500 which includes the amount saved via peak power tariff charges we would otherwise have paid for kWh consumed plus a tiny average 1 kWh exported and receiving the 44 cents FIT then available. Based on these figures it would have taken 8 years plus to recover the capital cost of the installation.

I realize over this past two months the cost of Solar panels and other associated equipment has dropped considerably, but not by half as labour cost has increased, the rebate multiplier for STC's reduced and from next month the revised Australian Standard 5033 have all contributed to the increased costs of getting Solar systems up and running.

I would urge the Authority to take serious note of the effects the sudden and dramatic decreases in previous FITs in other States has had on the Solar industries there due to the lack of incentives for customers to install Solar systems. Queensland has an abundant resource of Sunshine and it would be a very sad day if all that potential was to be killed off by any hasty decision regarding FITs in this State.

Like many average households our daily consumption over a whole year works out at around 25 to 29 kWh of which our small 1.5kW array only offsets around a ¼ to 1/3 of this. So may I make the observation that maintaining a maximum 5 kW limit on Solar systems with an FIT based upon both in terms of price and duration in years to repay that capital cost will greatly assist retaining that customer incentive and not destroy the Solar industry which has developed in the State over the past few years.

With that in consideration the current 8 cents network providers funded FIT over just a couple of years will not provide that incentive and as result after the present rush of new applications from July 2012 to July 2013 will suddenly come to an abrupt halt and the destruction of the Solar industry that has been built up in Queensland once all the outstanding installs have been completed.

I would make reference to recent Media reports that in the South East Solar installs and lack of new industry has resulted in excess power being generated which cannot be used! Yet our power bills continue to rise, with blame placed in varying degrees to the subsidies for Solar and additional network costing. I understand that excess generation will always be required because of sudden demand increases during "peak" consumption periods. From a layman's perspective additional network costing due to Solar panel take up must be fairly insignificant. Based on the fact that Energex themselves assess the current condition of local networks/transformers etc before approving any network agreement for solar. So there is no reason for this proportion of any tariff increases to be justified unless entire localities require upgrading. Observations in our area only suggest around 20% of households currently have solar installed, and the vast majority seem to be 2 kW or less. In very many instances roof orientation and shading will make Solar generation completely un viable. With regards to the Subsidy portion of any increase may I suggest that any future FIT should be restricted to both cost and duration is adjusted on annual basis so that the incentive remains to invest and repay the capital cost within a reasonable period.

With regards to excess generation is required to cope with peak consumption periods when Solar is not contributing can I submit the following also from experience. Following our Solar install I have been more keenly aware of our own power consumption both during the "off peak" daytime Solar production period and the consumption after 4pm when the Solar system ceases to function. I believe in conjunction with any Solar FIT considerations the Authority should ensure that the price differential charged between the "peak" Tariff T11 and the Controlled Tariff T33 is kept sufficient, so there is a real incentive for customers to go to the expense of rewiring and meter box changes so, as in

our case, all air conditioners/ split heaters, washing machine, drier, dishwasher and swimming pool pump are on T33. Over the past 2 years all of those excessive power consuming appliances have been switched off during the peak period approximately 5.30 pm to 8.30pm with absolutely no disruption or discomfort felt by the household. I fear recent increases in the T33 versus T11 have now partly destroyed that added incentive. This incentive with regards to this expense (in excess of \$1500) must clearly show that such will result in a reasonable pay back period, otherwise customers will not take up that option in such numbers, which, would otherwise relieve the current “peak and non peak” consumption demands imposed upon the network and current generation.

Sincerely yours,

Robert John Campbell