



Dear Sir / madam

We hope you will consider this late submission. There has been very little publicity about this proposed bill and inquiry, and we only just found out about it.

We strongly support the introduction of feed-in tariffs for renewable energy as quickly as possible, at a level which will lead to over 20% of Australias energy to be generated from renewable sources, in addition to energy now generated by hydroelectricity, by 2020.

Feed-in tariffs are a key to growth of the renewables industry. Feed-in tariff policy is proven to give results – as exemplified by Germany and Spain.

In 2005, 10 per cent of electricity in Germany came from renewable sources and 70 per cent of this was supported with feed-in tariffs.

In 2007, 14 percent of electricity in germany came from renewable sources. (6.4% wind, 3.4% hydo, 4% biomass and biogass)

There are about 170,000 people working in the renewable energy sector in Germany, which has an industry turnover of €8.7 billion.

In 2006, Spain generated 20% of its total electricity demand from renewable energy (10% from hydroelectcity, 8% from wind) . Spain has a strong feed in tariff regime.

Tariffs are paid by the taxpayer based **on actual results** – ie actual renewable energy generated. This compares with the huge amounts of taxpayers money gifted by this government to the coal industry for CCS development without any guarantee of results.

It is a much better use of taxpayer funds than compensating fossil fuel power generators for the cost of buying carbon permits (as proposed in the Governments Green paper on carbon trading)

There should be long term security for the tariffs to provide certainty about investment.

We do not think a feed-in tariff should automatically apply to biomass. An evaluation process should be developed which considers criteria such as the total GHG balance of the particular case, water use, impact on the soil and impact of foregone food production.

We would not support any attempt to extend the feedin tariff to Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) because:

- this technology is already being substantially subsidized by the taxpayer in the form of R&D and access to cheap land and water. This federal government is also attempting to indemnify private CCS operators against the risk of CO2 leaks – ie to get the taxpayer to pick up the public liability insurance cost.
- GHG emissions from the mining and transport process are substantial even if (as is very unlikely) all the CO2 produced by burning the coal can be buried.

Rowan Huxtable
President