



23rd May 2019

RE: NEW ENERGY TECH CONSUMER CODE

As a large sized renewable energy retailer and significant contributor to the growth of the solar industry, Our company supports the underlying motivators of wanting to improve processes in the renewable industry. Whilst we already adhere and have been practising high standards of ethical code of conduct to help increase consumer protection and benefit consumers, We strongly feel there are flaws in this code of conduct which we do not agree with that would be non-conductive to business in general.

It has come to light that a large majority of the industry has not been consulted before deciding to model this code. There are over 6000 solar retailers and associated industries and only 82 were consulted for input. It is not possible that a decision can be made on behalf of the other 5900 plus retailers. It is also obvious that the larger scale retailers who contribute significantly have not been consulted or have been omitted from this modelling.

Whilst there are many other points within the code which we do not agree with, These are some of the main points we would specifically like to address in further detail which strongly do not agree with.

- Conflict of Interest on CEC part

The clean energy council has developed the code of conduct which is extremely similar to the CEC retailer code of conduct. By proposing a New Energy Tech consumer code, this is seen as an aggressive and anti-competitive manoeuvre by the CEC to further monopolize and capitalize on an income stream which is extremely valuable to them by indirectly ostracizing retailers who do not agree with their code. Protecting the retailers who do sign on to the code.

The code will only promote and publicize retailers whom are signatories to the code, therefore causing consumers to think that any retailer who is not a signatory is "non-compliant" or "illegal". We are certain that this will cause many businesses and retailers to suffer a large financial loss.

- Requirement for signatories to only use licensed credit providers and regulated credit products when offering third party finance

We believe that by removing the option for customers to use Buy Now Pay Later (BNPL) is removing consumer choice and competition in the market. It is not normal for an industry regulating body to have control over these settings in an economy and especially when it can be so damaging and is anti-competitive. BNPL has been around for a long time and is widely used in many industries and have proved an extremely popular and easy option for both vendors and customers to use. Many consumers find the process of a licenced credit provider too complicated and troublesome which presents as a large roadblock to the sales process. This will in negatively affect retailer businesses and largely reduce the uptake of renewable energy.



- Quote and Contract requirements

Much like all businesses, sales are detrimental to a company's survival. To have to provide a written quote to consumers who already wish to purchase new energy tech followed by a contract is a much longer sales process. This will add significant time and process cost to the business and resulting in a much more expensive product as these costs are then passed on to the consumer making New Energy Tech more expensive.

In summary, we hold a strong view along with our customers who have been consulted that this code will have a negative effect on the industry and will greatly reduce choice for consumers and pose as anti-competitive to the majority of retailers who operate in this space.

Kind Regards



Heuson Bak
Director

