

From: [Jenny Maclaren](#)
To: [Submissions Mailbox](#)
Subject: Fw: Consultation Paper - More Efficient Distribution Prices
Date: Monday, 18 February 2019 5:25:04 PM

Submission on the Consultation Paper – More Efficient Distribution Prices

I have read through your consultation paper, and although it is true that solar panel and EV owners may need to pay some more for their use of the grid, I found various weaknesses in your proposal. They are best expressed in a series of questions:

1. Why concentrate on a factor that is only 27 % of the average power bill?
2. In para 2.2 you give the reasons for changing the status quo as “it doesn’t signal accurately enough times of congestion” and “it causes consumers to over-invest in technologies (such as solar power)”, but you don’t bother to address the first of these reasons. Why don’t you promote investment in smart technology that can deal with this? Your own Fig 2 shows its value!
3. Why are you promoting an idea that has already been discredited in various US states where big electricity companies have tried to foist it on consumers?
4. Why is the consultation paper so backwards-looking – describing solar panels and EVs as “a problem”? It should be looking at the opportunities instead and encouraging their uptake for the greater good.
5. And in a similar vein .. why do you talk about the “economic cost of having EVs and solar panels” while ignoring the huge economic and environmental savings with the drop in fossil fuel usage, and the benefits of more widely spread power generation in times of civil emergencies?
6. Why does the consultation paper purport to be looking out for the poorer consumer when the poorer consumer will be disproportionately hit by having an 80% fixed rate and only 20% usage rate? No chance of economising! And actually no motive to, for the rich.

Jennifer Maclaren (Mrs)