

**Associate Professor Kieran Fallon  
MD (ANU) MB BS (Hons) MExSpSc MHEd FRACGP FACSP**

Feed-in Tariff Secretariat  
Department of the Environment, Climate Change, Energy and Water  
GPO Box 158  
Canberra ACT 2601

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Feed-in tariff scheme review

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this review.

Those of us who are scientifically literate understand clearly that climate change is a serious matter and that methods of energy generation need to be addressed as part of a plan to avert the multitude of problems that are already and will be visited upon us if we act late or not at all.

The responses of both the federal and ACT governments are insufficient to satisfactorily address the climate change issue. In fact, by actively encouraging an increase in the populations of both the nation and this territory they are working actively against what they are trying to correct.

The feed-in tariff scheme is a wonderful idea. It is expensive to have a system installed and it is expensive for the population of the ACT to support the tariff but as Sir Nicholas Stern has indicated we either pay a little now or a lot more later. The population cannot continue thinking that it is OK to do nothing if a cost is involved. Governments need to make it clear that there will be a cost. Their reticence to do this places our planet in jeopardy.

Households who choose to install photovoltaic or other energy generating systems should continue to be rewarded for their investment by a feed-in tariff at current levels, indexed for increases in the price of electricity. There will be pressure for a gradual erosion of the benefit of these systems. I note that already the feed-in tariff applicable to new systems is likely to be reduced. This should not occur. People need to be encouraged to install these systems.

The carrot is in place and should remain so. The stick is a more vexed issue. My only concern here is for low income households. However higher electricity costs and in fact any costs can often be mitigated by personal forward planning – a strategy not too often taken up in our community.

Be that as it may there are some truly unfortunate members of our community who need to be protected and perhaps all retirees, those on others forms of pensions, the disabled, etc could be provided with a form of discount or subsidy as some are now. There are precedents for this.

This brings me to the key issue of expansion of the feed-in tariff to larger generators. I support this. Clearly we will never have total supply by photovoltaic/wind generation, etc but we should be moving gradually to maximumisation of renewable supplies. So as not to place an undue and rapidly developing impost on consumers I favour a graduated approach whereby the size of the systems which can attract a feed-in tariff is increased over time.

In relation to the specific questions posed in the shaded boxes in the options document

1. I support a cap on the scheme. This should be fairly liberal so that the population is gently forced into paying the real cost of clean energy. Economies of scale may help here. An annual cap should not compromise the economic situation of those already operating under the feed-in tariff.
2. The \$150 price impact scenario seems a reasonable middle course to take. The short and long term job impacts related to this scenario are of little concern. As society progresses certain type of jobs will become irrelevant and this is quite normal. The numbers are not great.
3. The Clean Economy opportunity is a clear factor in expansion of the scheme. Short term employment growth as a consequence of this should be supported but not by fostering population growth which only increases our environmental impact.
4. No comment
5. I think that the inclusion issue is overdone. All through society there are situations where everything is not equal. However I believe that the concept of community –owned generation sites is appropriate. The ACT government should facilitate these by specific purpose land grants without cost to these facilities. However, this and a general administrative function should be the only government involvements in these facilities.
6. No comment

Yours sincerely



Kieran Fallon  
23 February 2010