

Hello,

In your ISP, it seems you haven't taken into account the true costs for Consumer Energy Resources. The ISP can't claim to be modelling the 'whole system', when billions of dollars of costs borne by consumers are omitted. For example if the system depends on my house battery, then it's a system cost. Please cost CER properly.

Is the system that you guys model actually reliable? It seems your model matches the exact weather patterns, and doesn't account for unpredictability of the weather. The model assumes that we can build and retire 'just-in-time' capacities in order of gigawatts around significant weather events. Is this realistic? You then selectively pick a business case to support rushing transmission infrastructure. You do this by creating huge 6-year 'actionable windows' for HumeLink for example. Then you model perfect alignment with Snowy 2.0, VNI West, CWO REZ, and an El Nino/La Nina to support the business case for completing it several years earlier, when these things don't align. Please model building HumeLink at the time the Feedback Loop notice is approved.

Cherry-picking a date three-years later makes a mockery of all the arguments used to support a 'staged' approach in the 2022 ISP, which is meant to allow the project to be delayed if costs increase.

Please also model an actual 'do-nothing' baseline, so we can get a true cost for the energy transition. All scenarios demand every carbon target and renewables target be met, and the ISP is useless to evaluate the actual cost of meeting those targets. We need an actual baseline model. Please make one.

We NEED to include nuclear power in our energy system. Are we adults here? Let's sign a faustian deal with the devil and get on with it. Let's be pragmatic here. You guys know that nuclear power is the answer. Yes it will be expensive initially. Long term it is the most reliable energy source - and I just want long term reliability.

Cheers,
Stojan