

Emma Watts <emma.watts@theenergycharter.com.au>

---

## Energy Charter feedback

---

Tony Wood

Tue, Oct 16, 2018 at 4:59 PM

To: "emma.watts@theenergycharter.com.au" <emma.watts@theenergycharter.com.au>

Emma,

I have read and welcome this initiative. It is a constructive step, although it will not of itself regain the confidence of customers and the community.

Here are some comments on the Draft for Consultation. They are brief and I would be happy to discuss further if useful. They are critical, although I would hope constructive, as praising the good bits is not likely to be helpful. Having said that, I do like the structure and broad content.

1. There is little by way of industry self-reflection. Why has confidence eroded? How did it come to this?
2. There seems to be a lot of work put into avoiding the use of the term "climate change". That feels a little strange since it is climate change that is driving the transition to cleaner energy solutions as described in the Introduction. The term "new energy solutions" also seems very vague. Why are new solutions needed?
3. The Introduction refers to a loss of confidence, but the Charter seems to assume this is only from customers. What about other stakeholders such as communities?
4. The Principles in Action does describe outcomes and actions. I assume that while actions are necessary, real performance will come from delivered outcomes. These may necessarily be company or sub-sector specific.
5. Given the depth and breadth of the recent ACCC report on electricity affordability and the approach being taken by governments to its recommendations, I would suggest the Charter would be more credible if it reflected on that's reports conclusions. As you know I am sure, Rod Sims has been very critical of the industry's lack of action that led to his report.
6. Building on point 2 above, the Charter would seem to dance around the idea that lower emissions are or could be to the benefit of customers. Is that correct?
7. Principle 3 would seem to rule out fossil fueled energy ("without harm to the environment"), yet allows for "continuing to deliver conventional services". That seems problematic unless you deny that burning coal and gas are harming the environment.
8. Principle 4 proposes that customers should be rewarded if they choose to engage. That would seem to reinforce the idea of a "customer loyalty tax". That interpretation may misrepresent the intent, but it could be worded better.

Overall, this is an essential, if late, beginning to a long journey. I trust the businesses stay the course and it really does result in dealing with the real challenges facing the industry.

Regards,

Tony

Tony Wood AM

**GRATTAN** Institute | Energy Program Director