

Hello EC Panel,

Thank you for all the great work you are doing to raise the bar in the industry.

I mentioned on the online forum that of my clients was given information by an energy retailer [details provided] that was misleading, the following is the case study.

History;

The [business] customer moved in to a green build site on 22.01.2020 and installed a 39.6kW solar system on 20.04.2020.

The site was classified as Large Market on a demand tariff however the 100MWH consumption was not required by this customer. A delay with the first bill meant that the customer was unaware of the demand charges until some months later.

When the first bill was received they contacted 'the energy retailer' concerned about the high cost of power, **particularly the demand charges.**

I do wish to note here that the energy retailer case manager did reply in length on this occasion and was very helpful regarding the solar system questions.

However he also noted that the demand charge was a **network charge and could not be removed. This is true when consumption is over 100MWh but not appropriate for this customers usage.**

Please see below copied from;

[From: Case Management](#)

[Sent: Monday, 31 August 2020 3:26 PM](#)

The solar won't be feeding into the manufacturing, from what it appears the solar might only be benefitting the office usage not the manufacturing side of things.

Unfortunately we are not able to remove the demand charge as this is imposed by the network distributor, changing retailers would not result in the removal of demand charge.

We are more than still happy to arrange a meter inspection if you believe there is still a problem with this meter.

Solution;

After a review of the sites consumption we determined that the network tariff (demand tariff) was not appropriate for their annual estimated usage.

They did not need to be on a demand tariff at all.

I filled in a network tariff change request form (Qesi form) and sent to 'the network operator' [details provided] the non-demand network tariff was approved and backdated to the move in date of 22.01.2020.

Billing;

- The energy retailer was notified by the network operator [details provided] to amend the bill. The total amount to refund is \$3363 for the 8 months.
- Without the tariff review the annual cost would have been approx. \$5,500 extra on their power bill.
- The energy retailer still has an open case as the bill has been republished 3 times but has still not been backdated to the correct date of 22.01.2020 only to 12.03.2020.
- The billing is a dogs' breakfast and with no version control is difficult to navigate.
- They have backdated to the 12th March and the outstanding is still worth over \$700 to the customer.
- I have 76 emails between the energy retailer, the network operator & the customer in total. Many not answered by the energy retailer.

I shudder to think how a customer could work this out, and unfortunately this is not an isolated case.

Retailers really need to have a qualified personal handling these types of customer queries and be available to discuss directly on the phone.

The customer has also now paid our fee for service to resolve this as they were completely fed up and thought there was no use pursuing it.

Thank you.

Kind Regards,
Sharon



Sharon Musker
Founding Director
Business Energy Strategist

✉ sharon@wiseupenergy.com

☎ 07 3162 0737

📞 0428 918 180

🌐 www.wiseupenergy.com



PO Box 95 Ferny Grove QLD 4055



Energy Cost Management
The Smarter Way to Purchase Energy

Please note; This email, including any attachments, is confidential. If you have received this email in error, please advise the sender and delete it and all copies of it

from your system. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you must not use, print, distribute, copy or disclose its content to anyone.