






Submission to Senate Inquiry into the Solar PV Rebate

Survey Responses from the Adelaide Buyer's Group

Andrew Dickson (0418 866 470, andrew.dickson@windprospect.com.au)

1. Was your ability to purchase a solar PV (electric) system influenced by the introduction of the means test on the Federal solar PV rebate?

I purchased my solar PV system before the means test was introduced, so I wasn't affected by the means test		24	12%
I dropped out of the solar PV group purchase specifically because the means test was introduced		51	25%
I am unaffected by the means test, and I have ordered (or will soon order) my solar PV system		93	45%
I am unaffected by the means test, but I didn't order for different reasons		13	6%
I am affected by the means test, but despite not qualifying for the rebate, I have ordered a solar PV system anyway		0	0%
Other, please specify		24	12%
Total		205	100%

Open ended responses to Question 1:

1	Recently separated & income no longer combined
2	I am affected by the means test & have decided not
3	I will be affected, so will delay my purchase 4now

4	Affected as home owned by family trust
5	ineligible based on 06-7 tax yr eligible 07-8taxyr
6	Incomechange-hesitant decision 'til i c accountant
7	May not purchase in the future if no rebate
8	no affect, yet to order system
9	appl 4 PV b4 end of finan yr, means test affects
10	see below
11	I'm not sure whats included in the means test
12	Currently waiting on tax notice of assessment
13	we are affected by the means test, deferring decis
14	I have still not committed as still in plans stage
15	Not yet, income is just below \$100k.
16	Means test will delay decision until new house pur
17	I may be affected by the Solar PV Means Test
18	I waited until the new financial year to purchase
19	affected by means test but haven't purchased yet
20	Our low income means we cannot afford the "gap".
21	I may have to drop out - depends on income
22	unaffected this year, but would be in normal years
23	Yet to determine my elegibility due to a CGT event
24	Purchased before end of tax year to get rebate

2. Can you please give an indication of your household's combined taxable income? (Please note, this information is only collected in summary form. No identifying information about you is being collected so you cannot be identified in any way).

Less than \$100,000 per year		127	62%
Between \$100,000 and \$150,000 per year		60	29%
Between \$150,000 and \$200,000 per year		13	6%
Between \$200,000 and \$250,000 per year		4	2%
Above \$250,000 per year		1	0%
Total		205	100%

3. Which combined household taxable income level do you think is appropriate for a means test on the solar PV rebate?

\$100,000		9	4%
\$150,000		49	24%
\$200,000		47	23%
\$250,000		23	11%
Other, please specify		77	38%
Total		205	100%

Open ended responses to Question 3

1	No means test gives the best signal to the world
2	all should be means tested & graded rebates
3	None, but if any, should be graduated rebate
4	large families use high energy & need incentives
5	Should not be means tested for the planet's sake.
6	Green Energy should be means tested
7	I dont beleive there should be a means test
8	None
9	I do not think it should be means tested

10	I don't think it should be means tested.
11	none as more green tech=less pollution
12	doesn't matter as any increase in solar is the aim
13	none
14	Rich can afford bigger systems/should be encouragd
15	no means test, they are far too expensive
16	Do not agree with a means test on renewable energy
17	\$100k fair, but \$200k would get better uptake
18	No limit if govt capped first in should benefit
19	there should be no means test whatsoever
20	No means test
21	No means test
22	none, with such an important issue for our future,
23	there should be no means test
24	None - this provides net benefit to everyone
25	does there need to be? its about environment
26	None - solar power should be encouraged
27	None
28	none
29	should not matter how much you earn, environment?
30	none should be available to all
31	Irrelivant- saving the planet more important
32	Nil, we should encourage anyone to save co2!
33	none
34	None, it should be encouraged across the board.
35	Should not be means tested.
36	no means test
37	-. Encourage more buyers to drive price down.

38	None
39	see below
40	None - buying SPV is a community service
41	No means test
42	A larger scale solar PV scheme would be best
43	It does not matter it's to save the world
44	none - it's just good policy that needs to be enacted
45	No means test
46	Not limited by income
47	rebate inversely proportional to income
48	not appropriate
49	None the government should encourage EVERYBODY
50	none - get them out there
51	\$500 000
52	none
53	none
54	No means test.
55	I don't think it should be means tested.
56	Low-Interest Loan Scheme should be intro-50K hh
57	None they should be happy we are contributing
58	No-means testing for anyone
59	None, like the first home buyers grant.
60	Why should it be means tested
61	No means test.
62	around 75 to 80 thousand
63	PV is expensive. get systems in regardless income
64	none- the earth does not care about income
65	none, the environ doesn't care about your income

66	\$0, the environment doesn't care how much you earn
67	I don't believe there should be a means test.
68	Should not be means tested
69	I don't think it should be means tested.
70	No means test. Why should one group be penalised
71	Unrelated to income - environmental benefits
72	none
73	none, totally missing the point to means test this
74	No limit
75	No limit. This is a value issue, not affordability
76	no means test - we all pay the electricity tariff
77	But sliding scale not all or nothing

4.

An alternative approach for Government support for solar PV installations is the introduction of a "gross metered feed-in tariff". Such a tariff would pay owners of solar PV systems a fixed amount of money per kWh of electricity generated by their system, regardless of the amount of electricity they consume. So, for example, every kWh of electricity generated could earn 44c, compared to the cost of approximately \$18c per kWh for electricity purchased from a retailer. Such a feed-in tariff has been used in Germany and has resulted in widespread investment in solar PV systems, because investors and householders have a predictable income from their solar PV assets, and they can therefore invest with certainty in solar PV systems.

Do you believe that a gross metered feed in tariff would be more effective than a means tested rebate for solar PV systems?

Yes, a gross metered feed-in tariff would be better than a means tested rebate		95	47%
No, a means tested rebate is better than a gross metered feed-in tariff		27	13%
Not sure		81	40%
Total		203	100%

5. Do you have any other comments or suggestions for the Senate enquiry? If so, please feel free to do so anonymously, or feel free to also include your name and email address with your response.	
1	The means test may disadvantage some making it impossible for them to purchase. We should have a scheme where as many as possible instal them, expecially from an environmental point of view.
2	Re question 4 - GMFIT would still require substantial capital investment - perhaps a combination of rebate and GMFIT would be best, but I have not given the matter much consideration.
3	The overall objective to provide cleaner energy should not be directly linked to social & economic status of community members. High enery uses should be given incentives to source cleaner energy and it is more likely that the high users are high income earners.
4	This whole effort is about conservation and non-polluting self-sufficiency. Governments should do all in their power to encourage and support households to go greener by the minute.
5	Any positive action to improve and increase the use of Green Energy should be considered by all governments
6	<p>Our income is variable - and around 100k a year. It is hard for us to see if we will be inside or outside the guideline and it is all or nothing. Lots of people are like that these days. Also there is a lot of difference between affordability if you have a family depending on the income. The family units which find it harder to justify the expenditure - like us - and are both working hard to make that 100K a year are also some of the biggest energy users - so probably environmentally would make more sense to encourage to use green power alternatives. If it has to be income based - it should take into account the size of the unit and the number of people living there.</p> <p>I think for our family, when we get the solar panels, it ill be interesting to see how we can attempt to "live within our means" electricity wise. Having a rainwater tank has certainly changed our behaviour to do with water - I am wondering if having a solar power unit will have the same effect on our energy use... resulting in an even greater benefit. A sa representative of the community, and as people able to make policy that will affect the world the next generation will inherit -the government should be doing all it can to support people who are trying to do the right thing energy wise.</p>
7	We should be doing all that we can to encourage people adopting this and other green technology. It is only through such measures that we will begin to reduce carbon output.Make it easier not harder!
8	at \$100k family income with a \$300k+ home loan, without the grant, I can't afford a solar PV system. Why is this means test lower than any other government level, childcare, etc??
9	A guarenteed metered feed in tarrif payable by electricity retailers should be implemented in addition to a government rebate scheme that is not means tested. If we have been able to afford a non means tested baby bonus how can we afford not to subsidise the uptake of clean energy?
10	<p>Hi Andrew,</p> <p>I answered "Not Sure" to Q.4 because I couldn't put in a right answer. My answer is that they would need to increase the feed in tariff dramatically to match the \$8K rebate - it would take a very large system to make any reasonable return at 44 cents. Having said that, the 44 cent state feed-in significantly affected my decision to proceed, so is extremely valuable. A hybrid system of rebate and feed-in is probably still required until prices fall. I don't see why large-scale generators such as yourself don't qualify for the feed-in too, just quietly. If they did, I reckon we'd see solar farms being established.</p> <p>On the means testing questions, I believe that opening up the rebate system to everyone leads to the greatest chance of takeup. This will lead to higher volumes, investment in the technology and lower prices.</p>

	<p>The success of this scheme does tend to suggest that price is the main concern for adoption. If the figure of 450-odd households that have taken up this offer is compared with Mike Rann's press release of 1st July (http://www.climatechange.sa.gov.au/PDFs/010708_feed-in%20starts.pdf), which states that the PV installation rate in SA is 357 per 100,000 houses, then if we presume there are about 500,000 houses in SA, which would be about right, then this single act has increased the takeup in SA by 20% in one fell swoop. If that isn't provenance then I don't know what is. OK, it's probably only 1 MW at peak generation, but I think it's an important step forward.</p> <p>Hope this helps. Would love to be a fly on the wall at the Senate hearing. Good luck!</p> <p>Simon Brewer simon_brewer@yahoo.com</p>
11	<p>We should be using everything possible to encourage people to use solar power so barriers to entry should be reduced, not put in the way.</p>
12	<p>I believe that the more green power the better. Surely the gain in income from not providing the rebate would most likely be offset by need to increase the size of the grid and station output. If the houses are more self sufficient then maybe be cost of the distribution infrastructure could be reduced.</p> <p>Thanks for putting in the effort, and good luck with your proposal.</p>
13	<p>bitterly disappointed that I was excluded from the scheme. It is highly probable that the investors in new technology are likely to come from higher SES groups initially; so rather than seeing a non-means test subsidy as subsidising the rich it would be better to perceive it as encouraging early adopters</p>
14	<p>In question 4, I don't think these are mutually exclusive. I would like to see both, and solar pv systems compulsory on all new constructions, residential and commercial.</p>
15	<p>Re survey q.4. The ACT has just passed a gross metered generation paid at 3.88 times the current rate--see http://mickgentleman.com.au/?p=218</p>
16	<p>It was a very disappointing decision of the government; I was on the verge of becoming solar.</p>
17	<p>We all consume power; the richer you are, the more you can afford to put a large PV system on your roof, so benefitting all society. Thus a rebate should still be used, as we all obtain the benefit of reduced dependence on fossil fuel.</p> <p>The advantage of a rebate is it helps with the purchase of your system UP FRONT, when you need the money! Feed-in tariffs should not be excluded, as these encourage the use of PV and also appropriate good maintenance, as long as the Victorian tariff system is NOT used.</p>
18	<p>The costs are so expensive that middle and low income earners cannot afford them, even with the rebate. Thus a means test has backfired no doubt. Wealthier people should be encouraged to get them as they may use more power.</p>
19	<p>Renewable energy needs to be supported (and fast tracked) as a serious energy option instead of a second best brother to the carbon energy, and one of the best ways of doing this is encouraging market participation.</p>
20	<p>Initial outlay needs to be lowish to encourage uptake. Could give a rebate which is then repaid by upper income families by keeping cost of buy-back of their electricity at a low rate. Once rebate repaid, their power could earn at the higher rate.</p> <p>I think it's worth the investment of keeping the rebate for families over \$100 000 in order to get a greater uptake. Another idea - a formula that divides household income by the number of people in the household? eg DINKS on \$100 000 don't get it, but a couple with 4 kids might.</p>
21	<p>If the government is serious about reducing carbon output then the level of the means test is set too low for those families with a mortgage to consider.</p>

22	I can't answer Q4 because S Aust has a feed in tariff. My answer would be a rebate and feed-in tariff as i believe we have in S.A, now.
23	I think pv systems should be mandatory on all new buildings. Our German friends have borrowed money to purchase a 5kW system because it will be paid for in less than 10 years and after that time it all profit.
24	I acquired my solar panels prior to the rebate being increased to \$8K and did this on an income of \$60K. I tend to think that a combined income of \$100K, in Adelaide, is more than sufficient to fund one's own panels (let's not forget there is some personal benefit to having them, they're not an entirely altruistic investment). That said, it may be possible to fund a graduated subsidy for people with a household income of between \$100K to \$150K, as a reasonable compromise.
25	Gross metered system would need to be viable for investor. If so it would be surer than the stockmarket. What is aim of govt encouraging install of solar? If to reduce emissions then why means test? bfdempsey@internode.on.net
26	Question 4 is incomplete in terms of options, and asks one to decide which is the lesser of two evils. Both a non-means-tested rebate AND a gross-metered feed-in tarrif would be preferable and would really drive investment in household solar systems.
27	Solar PV is simply not economically effective without the rebate. It is bizarre that a government should actively discourage installation by those most likely to be able to afford it.
28	If we were really serious about getting renewables in Australia, we would support and grow the industry for making the solar panels and other components in Australia instead of importing mainly from China.
29	When we want people to take up solar, it is crazy not to offer incentives to everyone, whatever the cost. We should be pleased if there is a budget blow out for this. Pay for it by cutting new defence toys. Equity is important but it should be handled another way. We need as many people as possible to take up solar. The feed-in tariff is great and a good incentive and is a must irrespective of the rebate..
30	solar pv systems should be built in Australia (under licence if necessary) It is one item that lends itself to the old 'import replacement' theory.
31	Systems should have a pay back period competitive with any financial investment.
32	Germany seems very advanced in technology and uptake so their policies should be examined closely.
33	In the event of the owners tree branches blocking the sun at times between 10am and 4pm, a grant of up to \$1000 towards their removal, KEN BERRIS AT ken.dot@BIGPOND.COM (SORRY< computer playing up with capitals)
34	The whole philosophy behind the means test is flawed. Means tests are generally applied to social welfare benefits where the person being means tested is a beneficiary. In the case of PV rebate the entire community benefits and thus it should be paid regardless of the income of the PV system purchaser.
35	I do not believe that transition to sustainable electricity generation can be entirely left to the market. A gross metered feed-in tariff &/or elevated means test for the rebate represent our community's investment in its own future! We cannot address the challenges we face with 'consumer-based' thinking.
36	The focus needs to be on the environment
37	PV installations are to benefit the environment and solar development, not the buyers.
38	As part of the new home owners grant - those building new homes could, be required to install PV at

	least up to the value of the government rebates.
39	Not sure about the economics of the system/process, but I find it strange that the means-testing has come in at the time that public understanding of the issues that lead towards choosing 'green', sustainable power has finally reached the masses - surely we should be encouraging all households to adopt these strategies.
40	While appreciating the need for fiscal responsibility, the decision to introduce teh means testing on PV sent a very mixed message in relation to teh Rudd Government's response to climate change. We were literally one day away from putting our deposit down for PV. We were saving for our deposit: we purchased our house 2 years ago, & I assure you there was no disposable income in this "high earning" household: purchasing PV's was going to put us in extra debt when we were already maxed out, but a commitment we wanted to make. That commitment has evaporated with the means testing, & I will observe with interest the statistics on PV uptake in the next 12 months.
41	The more solar and or wind installations the better.
42	This was a very sudden change and is an active disincentive for those most likely to be able to afford to do so.
43	Means testing for such an environmentally responsible initiative is just plain dumb - If a amount is put aside in the federal budget then it should not rely on whether you are "rich" or poor but on a first come first serve basis - as long as the other critera apply such as - on principle place of residence, one per household etc.
44	We should aim to have as many people as possible put solar panels on their roof. The infrastructure is already in place to distribute the electricity and co2 emissions are saved (at least during the day).
45	Rich and Poor contribute to GreenHouse Gas alike. Rich use more electricity because they have more "toys" and are not budget conscious. Ergo, getting them onto Solar saves more GreenHouse Gas emmissions.
46	Our income is only just above the limit. we were planning to instal solar power, but the means test was introduced JUST before we were to commit to buying a system. We were very disappointed as we now have to consider borrowing money if we want to go ahead. As one of us has semi retired and the other is 56 yrs and we still have a high mortgage, we are reluctant to take on more debt.
47	My wife and I have reared eight children (Brady bunch) and all of these children have been solid and productive citizens. Our last child completed his University honours degree two years ago and most of the others also completed higher education. We were just about in the financial position - at last - to instal the solar panels because we were both working hard to build an asset to see us into retirement. We were appalled when the decision was made to exclude us from the subsidy that would have made our involvement possible. It seemed just so unfair. Terry and Gael Maloney <bahloo2@optusnet.com.au>
48	Slightly lateral thinking, but installing individual PV cells on roofs is probably very inefficient. What about companies building PV "farms", where individuals can elect to place their PV cells. ie they don't put it cells in their roof, but at the "farm", which would have economy of scale. The individuals would receive the same rebates and increased payment for the electricity produced as if it were on their house roof. Neil Thies neilthies@primusonline.com.au
49	Those who own businesses/ companies can manage their taxable incomes to be below the threshold. Those on wages cannot. As a company owner I am able to organise my taxable income to ably suit the means test. Is it effective?
50	South Australia has a great solar resource which must be taken advantage of for our future.
51	I understand why they means tested it, but I think it is short sighted thinking on the governments part.

	Steve Jenkins swjenkins@adam.com.au
52	I believe the means test is a very backward step. It is likely that those with a low household income will only use the rebate to purchase a small system, where those of us with average or higher incomes, (and now not qualify) are likely to use the rebate as an encouragement to buy a large system, and hence have a greater environmental effect. We were looking to buy a 2kW or larger system, but that has been postponed due to the withdrawal of the rebate.
53	We had the paper work prepared and were within days of sending it in, when the sudden and immediate means test was applied – we were very disappointed to miss out. We had become much more "eco minded" and this was to be another step in that direction. In that one decision by the Rudd government we have been set back and, more importantly, has changed our mind set. Why bother about being "eco minded" - obviously the rich do not have to worry, and according to Rudd we are rich! We have an income of over \$100,000 but with mortgages and other expenses we are certainly NOT rich Mr. Rudd - we cannot afford the initial outlay without the rebate! If the rebate was returned we would want to be involved again and, more importantly, the message sent to us would be that we can be involved in helping reduce carbon emissions etc, and that our contribution is important. Jeff Smith jeff.smith@unisa.edu.au
54	Instead of a total cut from benefit through the mean test, the benefit could be reduced for higher income brackets. Gov't should encourage solar as it is clean and effective in Australian conditions.
55	I dont know how we will be affected by the means testing but I would have thought it is everyones best interests to make it as simple as possible to invest in solar power.
56	Solar energy is expensive - even for high incomes. Even with rebate - it is still out of reach for low income. So new means test means no-one will buy them - which will keep price high because volume is low. Also keeps risk adverse companies like Origin from taking the plunge an investing in commercialisation of new technologies. If this was election time - the means test would put me off Rudd. This goes against the spirit of my green vote for him in the last election - we feel betrayed!
57	The purpose of the rebate should be to maximise the uptake of solar panels, not social engineering. Solar panels are discretionary purchases. Rich people need to be encouraged to make the purchase just as much as do poor people.
58	rebates to encourage retrofitting houses to include rewiring and installation of new meters with import export meters. recently i had the house rewired, a huge bill from the electrician was one thing, then of-course ETSA connected the new 2 phase meter/meterboard for import power and "J" tariff power. On the day of installation, for the ETSA electrical worker keyed in codes for importing power, then keyed in the code for "J" tariff, then lastly, he keyed in the code for exported power (the latter coding took what appeared to be no more than one minute of pressing buttons, or maybe one button 10 times) What I think is outrageous is that to have the ETSA electrical worker key in this last export code cost me \$400. This is an added cost for the householder that seems opportunistic. Indeed, the householder who is retrofitting and facilitating export of energy to the grid should be encouraged, not penalised (which this \$400 fee appears to be...) if a fee must be paid, then make it a token \$20, not \$400, which is an appalling abuse of their position (the householder commits to pv cells, then has no choice but to pay the fee to have their meter coded to accommodate an export code. Surely pressing a few buttons 10 more times, when you have just pressed the same few button 15 times doesn't reasonably incur \$400 worth of work. If it does, well then as a consumer, and investor in pv cells, i want to know why.
59	I believe that in Australia with the present technology, wind is a more viable renewable power source than solar (hot water is a very different story) so supporting access at a reasonable price to wind power that has been generated and distributed from our many high wind-run locations is better option than subsidizing solar systems.
60	Looking at Australia's natural competitive advantages, it would seem short sighted and short term not to

	provide a stimulus to enable Australia to become a leading global adopter of solar technologies.
61	We couldn't afford solar PV without a substantial rebate - so I've opted for alternative 2 above. But why are these two schemes presented as mutually exclusive? Why not a rebate as a long-term, interest-free loan which is paid off by using some of the money earned from generation?
62	If there is a net benefit to the whole community from getting more people to install SPV, then the rebate should not be means tested. If there is no benefit, then there should be no rebate.
63	If I had not received the rebate I would not have installed a solar system. It appears to me that the people most likely to be able to afford solar but still with a rebate are dual income families earning around the \$100000 mark two other families in our street are in that bracket and have cancelled their solar systems after the means test came in
64	The small size of the solar PV scheme introduced by Howard suggested to me that it was primarily a political gimmick intended to launder the image of the government. When will someone get serious?
65	I struggle to balance Eco issues and my budget. I've put in water tanks and solar hot water system I want to do solar PV panels to be independent with my own supply please help.
66	now that means test is in its unlikely that we will do anything about solar hot water
67	Good policy shouldn't exclude people. There are clear reasons to do it. It'll not only drive investment but also competition and innovation.
68	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The level of the income threshold used is very inconsistent with other levels used to define "richness" eg medicare surcharge, changing of tax levels, pensions. 2. In the capital cities a combined family income of \$100k is barely sufficient to provide for a family's needs especially in the light of rising fuel and diesel costs and mortgage costs. 3. The system discriminates against self employed people as it is usually very difficult to accurately assess taxable income until well after the year has ended thereby delaying the installation or causing people to drop out. 4. The rebate ought to be greater if a bigger system is chosen so that more is generated and could be put back into the grid.
69	A test that reduces the use of solar power makes a mockery of the Australian 2020 Summit
70	given that the funds set aside for the rebate in this year's budget are finite, I think a means test is appropriate. Perhaps the rebate could operate alongside a "gross metered tariff". An &/or basis.
71	This cap sends a strong message to voters of the government's lack of commitment (and vision) to climate change, particularly when the baby bonus, designed to increase our population and energy use, is capped at \$150,000. The excitement for what the new government would do to ensure our children's future has been dampened considerably. Encouraging change at the household level makes the Australian community more resilient to the inevitable changes we currently face. It also gives people hope and the feeling that they can contribute to the solution. It appears that profits and big business are currently pulling the strings.
72	Many people (including me) need an initial rebate to get started, then a metered feed-in tariff would be an added incentive. Many people, like me, have always installed their own power & WATER saving devices with great sacrifice AT THEIR OWN EXPENSE & it is really disappointing that we cannot claim any rebates in retrospect for these considerable expenses incurred prior to the government's "start" date! Solar systems on motor-homes & caravans should also be eligible, as these are saving an enormous amount of electricity by the ever increasing number of travellers, particularly, but not exclusively, retirees who often struggle to "make ends meet".
73	Base load energy for industry . . . solar to grid for domestic. Let all see who pollutes/consumes and receives subsidies!
74	My wife stopped working (coincidentally) which got us under the means test limit. Otherwise we would

	not have been able to afford a PV system
75	We should be encouraging the renewable energy industry but this is having a devastating effect. we are deferring installing PVs until federal gov reverses its decision so good luck with your submission
76	Im sick of the politicking over climate change and tools government are failing to utilise appropriately - if every household was required to have and subsequently supported to have PV systems, solar hot water, greywater and rainwater plumbed to the house then the residential sector would be on the way to self-sufficiency for power and water. Many people live that dream in eco-villages across the country - its not hard to do and its not that expensive to implement and sustain.
77	The rebate, if gross-metered feed-in tariff not introduced, should not be limited to \$8000. Why effectively limit people to installing 1kW systems when they may be prepared to install much more if there was a greater rebate.
78	The higher income earners are more likely to lead the way with Green Technology, and set the trend. Telling them they must pay more than everyone else to do that will mean few will do so, and lower income people now have a bleak future since the Rudd government has pushed Australia down the toilet.
79	The means testing introduced in the Budget is a stupid and retrograde move, inconsistent with the green credentials Labor tries to project.
80	we live in a rural area in south australia, we are very concerned about sustainability and environmental aspects of our community. we have recently moved house and were going to put in a solar system but have stopped due to the means test.
81	Solar PV systems should be encouraged, for a range of public policy reasons.
82	The government should be doing everything possible to get pv cells on all houses!
83	In response to q4, a combination may be effective with a reduced rebate overall, but an incentive to supply to the grid with a higher feed in tariff
84	I would like to do more for the environment but need some support to implement it. Once again, monetary issues dictate environmental degradation which is highly detrimental to the future of our country.
85	Q4 doesn't apply to stand alone systems. Encourage everyone to participate by ensuring everyone has access to solar no matter what income level. Lower income level hh would immediately benefit from the reduced cost of electricity (bearing in mind that behavioural change is a huge part of the solar-system working well) by opting for low-interest loan support to make up the difference between rebate and actual cost.
86	The metered feed in tariff is fine for those that have the ready capital to invest in the PV installation which are those that would go ahead without the rebate. It is only the rebate that allows those low to middle income earners or those households that have two members on just over the basic or average wage. If the rebate was to cut out at a reasonable level of affluence such as \$200,000, then all members of the community are more likely to take up solar power generation.
87	I contacted several Politicians to complain about the means test and received the standard Govt reply. I can not understand why they only allowed for \$8000 for up to 6000 homes in Australia for 2008-09? Aust can only make a difference globally by example and advocacy. Govt actions must be more supportive of initiatives to tackle climate change so they have a sound basis with which they can advise and influence developing countries. Mrs Chris Parry, Past President of Home Economics Institute of Australia (SA)
88	It concerns me that with all the climate change issues that the Government is introducing any type of scheme that may have a negative impact. Also isnt it better to encourage everyone to purchase PV systems and if the higher income with

	assistance purchase these systems wont that then decrease the cost for the lower income earners in the future!!
89	I would also like to see a rebate or incentive system that extended to rental or holiday homes- particularly those that may be unoccupied for a large proportion of the year and would therefore be feeding energy back into the grid. It makes good energy sense for everyone, so I look forward to it!
90	The rebate should not be means tested, like the first home buyers grant it should be available for everyone. It's dual fold purpose is to boost the solar industry and help reduce carbon emissions - means testing doesn't help either of these things. Now is the time to boost the solar industry and encourage investment in renewables - prior to means testing, this grant was achieving really making a difference to an other wise fledging industry. The public is appalled at the introduction of the means test. People like us who have low enough income to be eligible for the grant, don't have the disposable income to make the additional investment necessary on top of the grant.
91	A means test set at \$100K is absurd as it is those it excludes who can afford to spend money on PV systems, but only with the rebate. The \$100K test is clearly designed to kill the rebate scheme, which will have a devastating effect on the take-up of this renewable energy. It is time Australia lead the world in this area, and not followed. Our reliance on fossil fuels will be our undoing.
92	no
93	Some rebate (regardless income because PV expensive, so likely to be installed w/ disposable income) + feed in tariff, as providing source of electricity at peak times
94	The recent changes send the message that the environment is not important. We are building a house and finding it very hard to make simple proven changes to reduce our impact on the environment.
95	The gross metered feed-in tariff has been very successful in Germany but the details of a scheme need to be outlined. A upfront rebate lowers the barrier of entry for households.
96	A scheme of encouraging as many people as possible to install PV systems is needed.
97	The idea of solar is to cut down on emissions, we all should be encouraged to do what we can regardless of our income.
98	Sometimes a household has a large amount of money available only once, eg inheritance, a subsidy would help out in that case. The gross metered feed-in tariff being high would help defray costs to those families, so I'd like both the subsidy and the high feed-in tariff.
99	<p>Firstly, I think the rebate & the gross metered feed-in tariff are compatible, especially to get a real kick start along. The 20% renewables target looked good for a little while, but now that Al Gore has set down the Challenge to America for 100% renewables before the next 10 years we should try to match or do better than that.</p> <p>The rebate has just started to get "the everyday Australian Household" beginning to think and even aspire to the possibility that Solar PV's could be within their reach. If we run the rebate scheme for a few more years (without the means test or with a higher threshold) we ensure that the idea of Solar PV's as being affordable and achievable reaches a threshold in the everyday consciousness and enables people to feel they are contributing meaningfully to the task of abating the Climate Crisis.</p> <p>The gross feed in tariff then takes over as an incentive to expand to larger systems and for households to achieve 100% solar electricity for their homes.</p> <p>The rebate and the feed in tariff go further than just get the installed hardware in place and reduce emissions. They begin to effect the consciousness and the feelings of achievement that we can and are part of the solution.</p> <p>Colin Endean kunmanara@internode.on.net</p>
100	Government should give 100% support for installations. Does a means test matter? - more important to install as many solar panels as possible - forget the means test.

101	dlaslett@hotmail.net.au
102	The current Australian Standards regarding construction and Building Codes need to be revised in order to save energy. Efficient construction has not and cannot be invented by Australia. A well proven and tested methodology based on Northern European Standards need to be adopted. Some European products are not available in this country due to Australian required testing, even though the European test are more rigorous. The current Estate bureaucracy hinders application of good energy saving products. Australia does not need more power. It needs to waste less. Mandatory double glazing and subsidies to retrofit houses will save the nation's carbon emission substantially.
103	I believe need a rebate and a feed in tariff. With rebate payback about 10 years, without rebate is about 23 years for me. I was signing up for the principle not to make money but now too expensive. Someone on a household income of <\$100,000 would be unlikely to have the available cash
104	people on very low incomes should be helped we need to have panels on all roofs keep up the good work jan.carter3@bigpond.com
105	The rebate made it possible for us on a low income(\$32,000 family of five) to consider and actually purchase a solar system. Without the rebate even with good feed-in tariffs there is no way we could find the lump sum to get started in the first place. Kirilee Anderson kirileeandlyall@bigpond.com.au
106	Everyone should be encouraged to participate for the good of the environment not just because they can afford it.
107	I think means testing solar power is insane, a huge step backwards for the environmental movement. Samantha Nielsen nielsen11@dodo.com.au
108	We are on a government pension and are considering solar system installation. The rebate should be available to everyone regardless of income level. It really is the only way to push for alternative energy adoption. We all have to pay the power rate regardless of income or taxation rate so if the Federal Govt. is fair dinkum about pushing alternative power generation the rebate should be available to all (take a look at private health cover rebate as an example). Margaret & Roger Bills. billsmj1@tadaust.org.au
109	A friend suggested a system of offsetting the electricity bill against an investment in large scale solar power stations as a more effective option than individual households installing PV panels (more efficient in material use & final power generation). Dave Lambert draftwrite@adam.com.au
110	Any thoughts of having a rebate (no means test)so that people can get into the PV system, households paid a gross metered feed-in tariff of say 40c per kWh, but there is an expectation that households pay back say, half of the rebate, this money can then be used to offer more rebates, to get more people into the PV system. leeg@adam.com.au
111	Just to say we will exceed the income level for this year, so I pushed very hard to purchase in the last tax year. It seems mad that for a small increase in salary (as we had) you suddenly lose all of the \$8,000 rebate.
112	every encouragement should be given to help people buy solar in the national interest.