
From: Parnell <Parnell@parliament.sa.gov.au>
Sent: Thursday, 25 July 2013 5:02 PM
To: ESCOSA:Essential Services Commission of South Australia
Subject: Review of the Solar Feed-in Tariff Premium

To ESCOSA,

As the mover of the amendment in Parliament that ultimately resulted in the provisions now under question, I would urge the Commission to retain the requirement for the power companies to pay a fair and reasonable price for the renewable energy derived from solar panels.

You can follow a history of my campaign to end the "Great Solar Rip-off" on my web page:
<http://www.markparnell.org.au/campaign.php?campaignn=24>.

In your Discussion Paper, you state that the primary question on which you seek feedback is whether or not it is in the "long-term interests of consumers for the Commission to continue to regulate the FiT Premium beyond 1 January 2014"?

The answer to that question is clearly "Yes", particularly when "consumers" are considered in their role as custodians of a planet that is subject to anthropogenic climate change. In that context, the thrust of public policy across all sectors must be to reduce emissions. A key strategy in reducing emissions from stationary energy is to promote renewable energy over the burning of fossil fuels. Small scale solar PV is a key part of that strategy and public policy should ensure that panel owners are not disadvantaged by being denied a fair price for the excess electricity they generate and export to the grid. Before the regulation of the FiT, a number of energy companies paid nothing to panel owners. If left to the market, they will again try to pay nothing, as has occurred interstate.

I appreciate that the Commission is fond of a more narrow economic definition of its mandate. I urge you to think more broadly, but even on a narrow interpretation, there is a clear benefit to energy companies from exported solar power and the companies should pay a fair price for it. I support the submission already made by the Clean Energy Council in this regard.

Finally, I note that the Discussion Paper refers to the need to address "market failure". I agree. So too does Sir Nicholas Stern, in his authoritative 2007 report:

"The problem of climate change involves a fundamental failure of markets: those who damage others by emitting greenhouse gases generally do not pay."

"Climate change is a result of the greatest market failure the world has seen. The evidence on the seriousness of the risks from inaction or delayed action is now overwhelming. We risk damages on a scale larger than the two world wars of the last century. The problem is global and the response must be a collaboration on a global scale."

Yours faithfully,

Mark Parnell MLC LLB BCom MRUP
Parliamentary leader, Australian Greens (SA)

NB. I am happy for my submission, name and contact details to be published on your website.



Follow Mark on [Facebook](#) and [Twitter](#)

Mark Parnell, Member of the Legislative Council, parnell@parliament.sa.gov.au
Parliament House, North Terrace, Adelaide SA 5000 Ph. 08 8237 9111
www.markparnell.org.au

The information in this e-mail may be confidential and/or legally privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, access to it is unauthorised and any disclosure, copying, distribution or action taken or omitted to be taken in reliance on it is prohibited and may be unlawful.