16 February 2024

To Whom is it may Concern,

As requested, I have detailed below is my written submission on the Draft 2024 ISP in line with your questions. Nothing is confidential.

To clarify my position, I believe Australia had an energy system that supplied cheap, reliable and affordable energy and the market was then distorted by Pricing mechanisms and Subsidies to ensure Coal Fired Power stations were not viable. China continues to build Coal fired Power stations and grow emissions at faster than Australia's total output.

Renewables are not Renewable as they are made using Fossil Fuels on many different materials that cannot be recycled. Renewables are generated by Wind Turbines and Solar Panels and rely on the Weather when we are advising that Climate Change is happening and the Climate in unpredictable. Australia can make zero difference to the Climate as our Emissions are negligible. We supply the Cleanest Coal in the world and if used everywhere would reduce Global emissions by 20%. I just want open honest debate.

The Statement below on Page 7 is not correct and if it was so why are we using Taxpayer's money to heavily subsidise infrastructure and electricity bills. Why are using a Pricing Mechanism to make sure base load power is unaffordable.

> "Coal-fired generators, the ageing workhorses of Australia's electricity supply, are now retiring. They are less reliable, more difficult to maintain, and less competitive against firmed renewable supply.

Questions.

1. Do you that the proposed optimal development path for transmission, generation and storage will support a reliable, secure and affordable NEM.

<u>Response to Question 1</u>

I have no confidence that the NEM will supply reliable, secure and affordable energy.

My understanding is that the cost of the Transmission grids to supply intermittent Energy in NSW is $100 billion. There is no way that the infrastructure costs required for the Transmission grid can be justified to supply Intermittent electricity to 8 million people in NSW. Electricity prices will be unaffordable, and Batteries are not going to solve the problem. They are expensive, have very limited storage and are toxic. They cannot be recycled.

My key questions are as follows.

1. Wind and Solar energy cannot be costed as standalone as they need Baseload Power to maintain supply. How is the cost or this energy added to the costings used.What % of the available Capacity is used in the calculations?
2. How is the lack of availability of wind and solar applied to the costings used?

3. How is the cost of the need to upgrade the grid to allow renewables to feed the grid added back to the costings?
4. What do we do with the Wind Turbines and the Solar Panels and toxic Batteries at the end of their life and how is that cost considered.
5. What is the life of the assets used for Solar, Wind and Battery used in the costings. Whi is responsible for the Restoration of the Land?
6. A significant reduction in GDP will occur. Is the cost of the loss of the agricultural land made unavailable added to the costings?

There does not appear to be a Business Case to justify the Investment in Renewable, Intermittent Energy and all I see it taxpayer money being used to profit overseas companies who take the Subsidies and then on sell all the liabilities.

The CSIRO report is based on incorrect assumptions. Coal fired power stations are incorrectly depreciated over 30 years, while Wind Turbines and Solar Panels are over 25 Years. There are many more examples.

The statement on Page 26 is not incorrect. There is no way that requirements will be the same as in 2050. What about Labour's immigration plan? "Taken as a whole, households are forecast to draw about as much from the grid across a year in 2050 as they do now".

2. Do you think that the proposed timing and treatment of actionable projects in the Draft 2024 ISP will support a reliable, secure, and affordable NEM.

Response

There is no way that the timing of Projects will ever support the closure of the next Coal fired Power station. I attach details of the failed Northern Territory Solar Panel project. Renewable electricity trips the Grid. There is no certainty that Snowy Hydro 2 will ever be completed. My suggestion is stop the Rollout and focus on proving the Concept modelling actually availability of the Intermittent energy, make documented assumptions and then build a Business Case to justify the project.

On Page 29 he statements below is incredibly misleading.

"The level of renewable energy injected into the grid regularly sets new records. On 24 October 2023, 72.1% of total NEM generation came from renewable sources, a new record for a 30-minute period. At maximum available output from wind and solar generation, plus the actual dispatched output from other renewable sources, renewable potential represented 89.9% of the total NEM supply at that time."

Coal and gas generated electricity on average is required about 65% to 80% of the time.

This statement is also incorrect.

The Australian Capital Territory achieved its target to source 100% renewable electricity from renewable generators in 2020 and has emissions reduction targets of 50-60% reduction by 2025 (from 1990 levels), 65-75% by 2030, 90-95% by 2040 and net zero by 2045.

3. Does the Draft 2024 ISP accurately reflect Consumer Risk Purchases

   Response

   The Draft 2024 ISP has a number of misleading statements and concern me greatly. As a Consumer I am extremely concerned and after the total loss of Power in Victoria this week to over 500,000 households.

4. Do you have advice about how social license can be further considered in the ISP or advice on how to quantify the potential impact of social license through social license sensitivity analysis.

   It is clear with the number of Protests and Australian's questioning the viability of Wind Turbines and Solar Panels as well as the destruction of the Environment AEMO has real issues. With the cost of electricity skyrocketing, it seems to me that AEMO need to look at effective baseload power options ie Coal, Gas and certainly Nuclear.

5. Do you have any feedback on the Addendum to the 2023 Input assumptions and scenario reports which is published alongside this report?

Yours sincerely

Michael French