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What has the RET delivered?

• The objectives:
  
  • encourage the additional generation of electricity from renewable sources

  • reduce emissions of greenhouse gases in the electricity sector

  • ensure that renewable energy sources are ecologically sustainable.

• The RET has delivered on the objectives as designed, but not always as designers, proponents and opponents had anticipated.

• The additional cost of renewable energy has been increasing with the target and has been passed on to consumers.

• The cost of the RET to consumers has been small, relative to other cost drivers

• The RET has exerted some downward pressure on wholesale prices
The Review: conclusions and recommendations

• Key conclusion:
  • the RET has helped to establish the renewables industry in Australia and is now a high cost approach to reducing emissions in the future.

• Key recommendations:
  • Amend the RET in the light of changing circumstances and relative costs of emissions reduction
  • Close the scheme to new entrants or allocate a future share of 50% of new growth to renewables
  • Abolish or bring forward the phase-out of the Small-scale Renewable Energy Scheme
  • Remove the requirement for further statutory reviews
  • Remove prospects of double counting between the RET and the Emissions Reduction Fund, the CEFC or ARENA
Why is the RET a good thing?

• Has supported the growth in renewable electricity generation

• Represents a low-cost market mechanism that delivered renewable energy as designed

• Provide reasonable certainty for investors in renewable energy

• Has reduced emissions in the absence of an economy-wide climate change policy – the only policy left standing.

• The cost to consumers has been relatively low, with downward pressure on wholesale prices offsetting upward pressure on retail prices
Why is the RET a bad thing?

• Became disconnected from the electricity market when the 20% target was converted to a fixed generation target. The result has been a pie fight.

• Became disconnected from climate change policy with the fixed price emissions trading scheme (aka “Carbon Tax”)

• Despite promised certainty, the RET has been subject to continual reviews which have opened up the key parameters each time.

• Became an easy target for climate change sceptics in an era of rising electricity prices

• Fundamental design flaws became potentially fatal
What next?

• Possibilities:
  • Adoption of one of the Panel’s recommendations
  • Revert to “real 20%” target
  • Exclude aluminium and extend time period beyond 2020
  • Maintain status quo to 2016 (the default option)
  • Extend the RET to a Clean Energy Target (CET)

• Issues
  • There is no good outcome – therefore, least bad
  • A deal that doesn’t stick or is just a delay doesn’t work
  • Need for a deal between the major parties
  • Move back to the main agenda of climate change policy – just as ugly
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