George Rizos

PO Box 60

Kingston QLD 4114

Email:[redacted]

Phone:[redacted]

1 August 2026

The Honourable David Janetzki MP

Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership

GPO Box 611

Brisbane QLD 4001

Mr Luke Hughes

Senior Policy Advisor (Energy)

Office of the Treasurer

Email: treasurer@ministerial.qld.gov.au

Re: Your Reference QT02872-2026 — Response to Complaint Regarding Solar Feed-In Tariffs in South East Queensland

Dear Minister Janetzki and Mr Hughes,

Thank you for your response dated 29 July 2026 (Reference QT02872-2026). I appreciate that the Treasurer's office replied, and I note the response was signed by Mr Hughes on the Treasurer's behalf.

While your response acknowledges the issues I raised, it does not adequately address the central concerns of my correspondence. I therefore wish to respond to the points made in your letter and place a number of specific questions on the public record.

---

1. On Deregulation and Market Competition

Your response notes that South East Queensland operates within a deregulated retail electricity market and implies that competition delivers good outcomes for consumers.

I accept that deregulation is the current policy framework. My concern is whether the market is producing genuinely competitive outcomes for households that export electricity.

If competition were functioning effectively in this part of the market, we would reasonably expect retailers to compete for solar customers by offering materially different feed-in tariffs, just as they compete through different retail pricing structures, discounts and incentives.

Instead, feed-in tariffs across major retailers have converged to almost identical levels of approximately 4–5 cents per kilowatt-hour, despite significant differences in retail tariffs and product offerings.

Competition appears to exist primarily for the electricity consumers purchase, not for the electricity consumers supply.

Such convergence does not suggest meaningful competitive pressure on feed-in tariffs. Rather, it raises the question of whether competition is delivering better outcomes for solar-exporting households at all.

Accordingly, I ask:

- What evidence does the Queensland Government rely upon to conclude that competition is delivering favourable outcomes for solar-exporting households in South East Queensland?
- Why have feed-in tariffs consistently declined while retail electricity prices have continued to rise?

---

2. On Wholesale Electricity Prices and Consumer Outcomes

Your response correctly notes that the significant growth in rooftop and utility-scale solar has placed downward pressure on wholesale electricity prices during daylight hours.

I do not dispute this.

However, this explanation addresses only one side of the equation.

If wholesale electricity prices have fallen substantially because of consumer investment in rooftop solar, why have retail electricity prices paid by households continued to increase over the same period?

Solar households have seen the value of their exported electricity reduced because of lower wholesale prices, yet households purchasing electricity have not experienced an equivalent reduction in retail pricing.

I recognise that retail electricity prices include costs beyond wholesale electricity, including network charges, metering, environmental obligations and retailer operating costs. Nevertheless, the Government's response does not explain whether Queensland consumers are receiving a fair share of the wholesale savings created by widespread rooftop solar generation.

Accordingly, I ask:

- What analysis has the Queensland Government undertaken to determine how the financial benefits created by consumer-owned rooftop solar have been distributed between retailers and consumers?
- If such analysis exists, will it be released publicly?
- If rooftop solar has significantly reduced wholesale electricity prices, what proportion of those savings has flowed through to Queensland households via lower retail electricity prices?

These questions go to the heart of whether the current market is functioning in the interests of consumers.

If the Government considers the current outcomes to be consistent with a competitive market, I request that it explain how those conclusions were reached and identify the evidence upon which they are based.

---

3. On the Advice to Increase Self-Consumption

Your response suggests that households can maximise the value of rooftop solar by shifting electricity consumption to daylight hours or investing in battery storage.

While I understand the technical logic of that advice, I am concerned by what it represents as a policy position.

When Queensland households—including my own—made decisions to invest many thousands of dollars in rooftop solar systems, government policy, financial incentives and industry messaging consistently presented exported electricity as a material part of the economic case for investment.

The advice now contained in your response—that households should focus primarily on self-consumption rather than exports—represents a significant shift in those economic assumptions.

Many households made irreversible financial commitments based upon the reasonable expectation that exported electricity would continue to receive fair value within a competitive market.

Suggesting that households now purchase battery systems to compensate for declining export returns effectively asks consumers to make a second substantial capital investment because the original economics have deteriorated.

The advice to increase daytime self-consumption also assumes that households have the flexibility to significantly alter their daily routines. For many Queensland families, this is simply not practical. Adults are typically at work, children are at school, and homes are largely unoccupied during the hours when rooftop solar generation is at its highest. While some discretionary loads—such as dishwashers, washing machines or pool pumps—can be scheduled to operate during the day, the majority of household electricity consumption occurs when people are actually at home, particularly during the evening. In practical terms, the Government's advice appears to place the responsibility on households to reorganise their lives around electricity market conditions, rather than expecting the market to provide fair value for the electricity those households generate.

If exporting surplus electricity is no longer intended to be a meaningful component of the economics of rooftop solar, then it is reasonable to ask why successive governments encouraged households to install systems specifically designed to export significant amounts of electricity into the grid.

At a minimum, the Government should explain when this policy position changed, what analysis supported that change, and how households were expected to adapt after making irreversible investments based on the previous policy settings.

More broadly, this issue extends beyond current solar owners.

If households conclude that government-supported investments can become materially less economical through policy inaction, public confidence in government-supported energy initiatives—including rooftop solar, battery storage and broader electrification initiatives—will inevitably be undermined.

That outcome would not only affect existing solar households but also the Government's long-term energy transition objectives.

---

4. On the Queensland Competition Authority Review

I welcome the Treasurer's direction for the Queensland Competition Authority to monitor electricity prices, retailer fees and market behaviour from 1 July 2026 and to prepare an independent assessment of market competitiveness.

This is the first substantive indication that the Government recognises concerns regarding the operation of the retail electricity market.

However, to understand whether this review will adequately address those concerns, I seek clarification on the following matters:

- What are the full Terms of Reference for the QCA review?
- Will the review specifically examine feed-in tariffs and competition within the solar export market?
- Will it assess whether solar-exporting households receive a fair share of the value created by their exported electricity?
- Will it examine the relationship between wholesale electricity prices and retail electricity prices?
- Will it assess whether the benefits of lower wholesale prices have flowed through to consumers?
- Will the review be released publicly, and on what timeframe?

Most importantly:

If the review concludes that competition is not delivering effective outcomes for solar-exporting households, what policy options is the Government prepared to consider?

Specifically, would the Government consider introducing a regulated minimum feed-in tariff for South East Queensland, similar to the protections already available to consumers in regional Queensland?

A review that merely observes market outcomes without identifying potential remedies provides little reassurance to consumers. I therefore ask the Government to explain what actions it is prepared to take should the QCA conclude that the market is failing to deliver competitive outcomes.

---

5. Conclusion

I remain of the view that households in South East Queensland require the protection of a regulated minimum feed-in tariff.

The response I have received explains why wholesale electricity prices have fallen but does not explain why the financial benefits created by consumer-owned rooftop solar have not flowed proportionately back to those same consumers through lower retail electricity prices or fairer export returns.

Nor does it provide evidence that the current deregulated framework is producing genuinely competitive outcomes for solar-exporting households.

In the interests of transparency and informed public discussion, I intend to publish both the Government's response and this correspondence so that other Queensland solar households can better understand the Government's position on this issue.

I also continue to pursue this matter through the Queensland Parliament petition process and through my local State Member, as I believe this issue affects thousands of households across South East Queensland who made significant investments in good faith under successive government energy policies.

I respectfully request a substantive written response to each of the questions raised in Section 4 of this letter.

Yours sincerely,

George Rizos

01/08/2026

cc: Mr Cameron Dick MP, Member for Woodridge