

Nathan Ross

29 April 2003

MRET Review Secretariat GPO Box 621
Canberra ACT 2601

Dear Secretariat,

Re: Renewable Energy (Electricity) Act 2000 review

I would like to state my support for the use of the MRET system and my wholehearted belief that the target should be increased. I support the campaign by the Climate Action Network and Greenpeace for 10% **new** renewable energy by 2010.

I am not concerned about climate change, I am *scared* of climate change and I think that anyone who has read the last report from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change should feel the same way.

Before the Coalition came to office in March 1996, Australia was a world leader into renewable energy research, but because of massive funding cuts, we have fallen behind. If we take the progressive step of boosting our renewable energy target, there will be new demand for innovation and cheaper renewable energy technologies and we can be internationally competitive. The timing - as more and more people discover the immense importance of renewables - could hardly be better, in economic terms.

I live in an area which has high unemployment, 11%, and very little employment diversity. Our local TAFE college offers courses in renewable energy technologies, but their graduates have troubles finding jobs. People want meaningful, skilled work and bolstering our renewable energy requirements meets those employment needs and desires.

Further, I'm not the only one who thinks that Energex's *Earth's Choice* program is a bit of a farce. I pay \$10 per quarter to *donate* towards their renewable energy. What does that mean? If there was even a moderate renewable energy target, such as 10%, Energex's program might seem more credible and attract more customers.

But, of course, that's not the point is it? The point is that, by having mandatory targets, we cut our greenhouse gas emissions regardless of whether or not people subscribe to a green energy program. Given the urgency of climate change, that's the driver we need.

10% is a very, very low target given that the IPCC has stated categorically that humanity needs to cut greenhouse gas emissions to "a very small fraction of current emissions." It may seem economically difficult, but it won't be anywhere near as difficult as trying to clean up after tropical cyclones which move further south to the Sunshine Coast and Brisbane. It won't be anywhere near as costly as trying to move all those people who live in canal developments on the Sunshine Coast who have to move because of regular inundation when you couple those cyclones with rising sea levels.

10x10 is a very conservative start, so anything else will be seen historically as an insult and scientifically as ludicrous.

Sincerely,



Nathan Ross