

Dear Councillors and others

DECENTRALISED ENERGY: I DON'T LIKE THE CLEAN ENERGY COUNCIL OR ITS ASSOCIATES BECAUSE OF THE WAY THEY WRITE AND SET UP THEIR WEBSITES

As a result of addressing an item in Sydney Lord Mayor Clover Moore's email newsletter about attending the Council of Capital City Lord Mayors, I came upon the article entitled 'Decentralised energy: What does it mean?' by David Green, CEO of the Clean Energy Council. I wanted to respond, as invited. However, I found it impossible to do so by the supposedly approved website routes. One always wonders whose fault this is. It often makes the private sector look dominating and tricky to the woman who wishes to be more accommodating and who has spent her paid working life as a teacher and a public servant. Although others may not reply, one can at least get through with a considered opinion.

Top Private Service Award: In my experience, however, Microsoft wins the global private responsiveness stakes by a country mile. I found Bill Gate's email address in a book of feminist writings from Gleebooks, so I had a week of exchange with his minions. I told them I couldn't fill in their form as I didn't have a business number and there wasn't room on the form for my attached proposal. A week after I sent it they replied that I was too small to bother about. This was the best response I have ever got; yet I am still hopeful. Ironically, as usual, the questionnaire that was sent to test my satisfaction was a total pile of shit.

Anyhow, I'm sending this to you as I wouldn't like my alternative direction wasted as a result of any apparent lack of interest or willingness to engage with David Green and those like him. The Vancouver Agreement referred to by Clover Moore and the SBS Codes of Practice (2014) are addressed later in related contexts of regional and local place development.

(Jesus, back to bloody engineers again. This is where I came in. Where are Jean Cross, Gaby Grammeno, Helen and those who stole my typewriter and made me use a computer because I gave our new WorkCover branch bad and battered looks. People like them are needed now in planned development from local perspectives. But can David Green type?)

Cheers www.Carolodonnell.com.au

Carol O'Donnell, St James Court, 10/11 Rosebank St., Glebe, Sydney 2037

DECENTRALISED ENERGY: TOWARDS ANOTHER GREAT LEAP FORWARD?

In the article by David Green, CEO of the Clean Energy Council, entitled '**Centralised to decentralised energy: What does it mean?**' it is stated that '*for decades Australia's electricity sector – just like most across the western world - has operated on a model of centralised, state-owned power plants, typically co-located with major sources of fuel*'.

Strangely, Green appears to think this situation is the effect of market logic (rather than state and related institutional and regional logic) when he claims:

the core logic behind the physical co-location of generation plants was that the economic efficiency gains from being positioned close to the fuel source (typically coal or large hydro) were greater than the economic inefficiency of transmission losses from transporting power long distances to major population and industrial centres'.

The above is wrong for key reasons. Firstly, Green should not assume that key power resources controlled by government got that way as a result of theoretical market operations.

NSW was first established as a penal colony and grew from the related state logic and support. As Marx pointed out, the key point of having a government is to control key resources in the interests of some group or related persons and preferably to maintain one's position at least, which gives us the forces. Modernity sprang from feudal and tribal origins.

In Australia, many now believe the elected government aim is expected to be serving the interests of current and future generations, and that historically this is also likely to be related to the reason why so many centralised, state-owned power plants have been co-located with major sources of fuel. From this perspective power is a vital resource like the army and land is the major prize upon which all related construction takes place. As far as I know, (which isn't much because of all the divisions between economic and social law, with the earlier feudal logic often still dominating), Australian government seeks state and related institutional and regional logic. For planning, one ideally starts with the global and related regional plan of which the local is part. The latter are often a force ignored at one's peril. The related importance of SBS and other translation and development services are addressed later in regard to the SBS Codes of Practice which help set good directions on the whole.

Green's 'core logic' also appears wrong because key power transport costs cannot normally be avoided, as he suggests may be the case. The rich do not often choose to have huge mines and/or high risk plants located in dense cities, especially lately. Remember the gas explosion at Bhopal or the effects of the recent tsunami upon the nuclear plant in Japan. The cost of resuming land in big cities is usually also too great to make it rational economics.

Decentralised sources of power generation and related competition are ideally constructed in more clearly and openly related regional contexts of planning and safety. How does Green assess risk? *When Green states the Victorian market is 'fully liberalised' what does this mean? How do the fund management relationships serve the people? How is risk conceptualised and treated in relation to health and protection?*

Clover Moore discussed the Vancouver Agreement with the Council of Capital City Lord Mayors. ***Risk is ideally discussed in related housing and insurance contexts which are better engaged with grounded reality to reflect new NSW insurance requirements.*** (I guess they are new but perhaps they are old and strata managers and others ignored them. This is discussed later and attached.)

In short, the definitions, aims and ideal relationships between goals, competition and risk in Green's article are unclear and seem only financially driven for the top. That is not how government works ideally or in reality. A veiled and controlling business approach was also the Enron issue, reflected in the problem of lying, hiding and confusing people so as to drive the share price. Hence the famous response, 'Ask asshole'. This confusion of the customer so as to sell product, supposedly backed by science, partly explains the fact that today Pew research claims that the US is now at its most unequal since 1928. (The only way is up?)

In a related discussion of integrated power generators and retailers, Green states:

One reason why such tight concentration of market share occurs across the world is that the scale of investment and risk is too big to accommodate more than a handful of players

This tautology merely states that to produce something big, one must normally be big. The nature of the risks taken in the process are opaque. There are public consequences in the pretence that the only way is up until the crash appears to take all experts by surprise. (What again? Gee, let's hide our winnings and move on while they clean up the mess that is left.)

Australian government and industry saw the problem of passing on risk from the global and local centres so developed funds to reduce risk instead, as discussed later and attached.

In any market, freer or not, the business aim must usually also be to grow bigger to continue to exist against the global competition, unless one has a captured market, as a result of regulation, which may be related to public or consumer safety goals. Surely it is the nature of aggressive competition to wipe out smaller competitors? One would seem wrong or a fool not to do it. (Men are from Mars, Women are from Venus, etc. It sure seems so in business.)

Green seems to assume the happy view, which is that competition leads to markets clearing in increasingly equally informed and benign ways for all. This is not the case as global inequality is increasing. Periodic financial collapses particularly affect the weakest, who cannot recover what they lost in the collapse. In this regional context the aims of government ideally appear to involve safer competition to serve broader and more diverse communities.

One therefore first asks Green: **How will *vertical integration allow companies to offset their risk*? How will this be expected to relate to government, ‘gentraders’ (integrated generators and retailers), miners, key funds and related communities?**

What kind of ‘different ownership model’ does Green propose and how does it relate to a Renewable Energy Target and the Large Scale Generation Certificates which the article deems a ‘risk’ (italics in the original). How is this industry constructed already?

Guys, let me into the wind farm and land secret. Of power technologies one might see out a window they often appear to the pig ignorant like myself to be the biggest waste of time and money one has ever seen anywhere on such a huge global scale. One guesses this is to do with acquisition or ownership of land as well as huge steel and engineering resources. What is comparatively wrong with energy driven by shit and rubbish, which is ubiquitous, plentiful and already produced? The regionally planned, place based, approach ideally addresses market interests without necessarily reflecting them. If Green cannot see this, one worries about the constitution of the Green Energy Council and its affiliates. What do they really do?

Green’s article seems to seek increased power growth for all, so one wonders how this ideally relates to non-renewable foundation resources like land, water and the way that people build and live upon them, fucking, eating, shitting and dying, locally and regionally as a result of the processes of production. Sarah Palin gave a view of the logical market trajectory when she said the only answer to a bad guy with a nuke is a good guy with a nuke. The democratization of the most powerful weapons is naturally market driven. Comrades for Christ’s sake plan a great leap forward not focused on steel, or we will end up with the US model again. The CEO of the Clean Energy Council appears to be a dill. Who brung him?

See the related address attached which is entitled **Mary knew housing was a women’s issue before Jesus: A magic pudding takes a stand with an International Women’s Day Message**. It shows why land, housing and related insurance and fund management require regionally planned and competitive approaches to development. The production, distribution, funding and experience of power may be best understood in related regional and historical contexts with related local directions (or not, for some apparently good reason which may also be openly disputed). In order to learn more:

- 1. Understand the pioneering objectives, design and power of Australian workers compensation, health care, and superannuation service models to deliver more affordable housing and other plans better***
- 2. Take planned regional development and place based routes to land and housing insurance and superannuation planning for fund stability, effective competition and reduced housing cost.***

3. *Develop jointly owned state and community funds which call for competitive services to the place in the interests of key stakeholders and the broader public, so many service providers and advanced manufacturers may flourish.*
4. *Democratic inclusion is required which depends on open fund operation as secrecy is the same as ignorance for everybody else. (Then they may hate and call you corrupt.)*

It would be good to know more about how the Vancouver Agreement (VA) direction discussed by Clover Moore treats risk and related insurances. The website states the VA is an agreement among three levels of government to support local community solutions to economic, social, health and safety issues. It is guided by the principles of coordination, innovation, policy change, investment and monitoring and evaluation. It has four strategic initiatives that frame its actions. These are: Economic Revitalisation; Safety and Security; Housing; Health and Quality of Life. This appear a good direction. It's over? Tell us more. (Canada seems such a beautiful and often progressive nation about its lands and people.)

There have been many inquiries related to land and housing in Australia. At St James Court, where I live under strata title, the papers prepared by the strata manager for the AGM (13.11.2013) as usual stated eight insurances are required by the owners' corporation in compliance with the Strata Schemes Management Act 1996 and the Financial Services Reform Act. These are: **building; common contents; loss of rent; legal liability; personal accident; fidelity guarantee; office bearers and catastrophe insurance**. Having no knowledge of how these are managed in relation to yearly levies paid by the strata owners I rang NSW Fair Trading. I was sent a pamphlet dated November 2013 and entitled 'Responsibilities of the owners' corporation in a strata scheme'. It states the insurances the scheme should have are: **Building; Public liability; workers' compensation; and voluntary workers insurance**. One wonders who else besides me knows about this change which ideally appears to reflect a vitally different view of fund management. If key laws are passed people should get to hear about it.

In regional community contexts it is vital to consider the regulatory and business potential of the states to help make all related business more effective. In the global communications era the potential of SBS in assisting service provision globally, regionally and locally should not be missed. The SBS Code of Practice (2014) notes SBS Radio is the most linguistically diverse radio network in the world. Information and translation ideally perform vital global services also related to development.

The concept of *'integrity'* also seems a vital one to SBS. According to the common dictionary it means *'original perfect state; honesty'*. This is more useful for the logical implementation of World Health Organization and related regional direction than *'justice'* because in the common dictionary the latter is equated to *'fairness; judicial proceedings'*. Lawyers in courts usually work with feudal 'interpretations' which may be idiotic, instead of with common dictionary definitions. Discrimination and risk management are ideally addressed in related global, regional, place and person based contexts as openly as possible, to generate the maximum broader learning.

In the SBS Code under **1.3.1 Indigenous Australians**, rather than providing ‘*the right to seek independent legal advice*’ it seems better and cheaper to give people the SBS Code of Practice so they can use it. The advice to program makers and producers is to ‘*be aware that an indigenous view of indigenous issues may differ from a non-indigenous view*’. This difference may be true in many cases, but the statement appears an invitation to stereotyping as many, black or white, may also think similarly.

As Linda Burney said in a talk when she was Chairperson of the NSW State Reconciliation Committee and Member of the NSW Crime Prevention Council, her consultation had led her to the view that there is no pan-Aboriginal perspective, and that each Aboriginal person can really only speak for him or her self, the same as anybody else. This is not to deny the effects of history but to judge or repair them.

For me, the least satisfying part of this excellent Code of Practice relates to **1.5 Self-Identification when referring to groups and individuals**. After stating that *SBS encourages different groups and individuals to express their cultural identity*, one wonders why the Code goes on to state: *Accordingly, SBS does not impose labels on cultural groups, but will use a group’s self-identification, if it is freely chosen*. Just because I choose to see myself as Lilith the Magic Pudding, Chief Alternative to Faith, does not mean that I am necessarily correct or that others may not label me differently, secretly or in public. One wonders why SBS writes the above in this community.

See attached discussions of direction in housing and the related letter below about expressions of interest in a sale of Green State Power, as invited in the press.

Yours truly, Carol O’Donnell, St James Court, 10/11 Rosebank St. Glebe, Sydney 2037.
www.Carolodonnell.com.au

PROPOSED SALE OF GREEN STATE POWER: ROI

You requested brief particulars of my business and the nature of my interest in receiving documents related to making an Expression of Interest in the Proposed Sale of State Green Power, closing 28.1.14. Apparently you refer to these documents as an ROI.

I have worked most recently in the past with Mr Frank Coluccio and others at Hi-Tech Consulting. See for example the expression of interest in projects I wrote in regard to the development of Wollongong as an Eco-City. This expression was made following the Wollongong City Council (WCC) consent outlined in the Community Engagement Report on the WCC Blue Mile Vision. See www.Carolodonnell.com.au for more on this. You may perhaps wish to contact Mr Coluccio further. I therefore send him this.

In regard to the proposed sale of Green State Power, my related primary interest is in ensuring that the risk management perspectives and forms increasingly being developed by Australian governments of all persuasions since the 1980s are also reflected in the ROI and its aftermath. In this concern I also speak as an investor and self-funded retiree; a resident of NSW and as an Australian taxpayer who formerly worked as a government policy advisor and at Sydney University mainly in relation to insurance, rehabilitation and related person, environment and fund matters. (See more at www.Carolodonnell.com.au)

I am also making the current ROI request as I was previously concerned, for example, that wrong direction was taken in the WSN Environmental Solutions Request for Expressions of Interest (EOI) in regard to the government sale of the waste management business WSN, prepared by UBS Investment Bank and Gilbert and Tobin for NSW Treasury.

At that time I wrote to the Probity Adviser from the perspective of the householder, business and government, to point out that these EOI documents were so misleading, repetitively demanding and uninformative that one assumed few expressions of interest in WSN purchase would be received.

In the current context I primarily write to check the ROI against the recent Planning Bill (2013) which seeks to: (1) put the community first; (2) be easy to use; (3) be efficient and transparent; (4) involve residents in up-front strategic planning for their areas; (5) enable governments and councils to better plan for houses and jobs; (6) plan and deliver infrastructure alongside growth development. The glossary in the White Paper leading to the current Planning Bill (2013) stated '*strategic planning*' *'tells the story about a place, (sic.) including where it has come from, what it is like now, the vision for an area and what will need to change over time to achieve that vision.* This generally requires more open information and operation, including clearer accountability than has occurred in the past.

The ideal way to cut red tape is through more openly joined up government so that it can be seen and dealt with. On 2.10.13, at Sydney Town Hall, Lord Mayor, Clover Moore was keynote speaker at the Australian Local Government Association (ALGA). She pointed out that reform of local government must begin with the recognition that the 'three Rs' of *roads, rates, and rubbish* are a limited aspect of the fundamental council role *which is about creating attractive, prosperous, healthy and safe communities; places where people want to live, work and do business*'. One naturally seeks to learn and inform anybody interested about the sale of Green State Power or other key business in related regional contexts.

Government and community approaches to land, housing, infrastructure, competition and fund management should now be proposed, consistent with holistic aims of state Environment Protection Acts, related aims of subordinate legislation and *key stakeholders*. The latter are those for whose benefit the fund was established, and those who own the fund.

In the context of the current ROI, one is particularly cognizant of the recent Inquiry into Construction Industry Insolvency in NSW (2013) which drew attention to key reasons for insolvencies. These included the costs of preparing unsuccessful bids, the under-bidding necessary to win the scarce job, and the capacity of the larger and/or more powerful organization to pass on the risk of failure to those lower down contracting chains when markets fall, including through late payments for completed subcontractor work.

This may also have implications for the proposed sale of Green State Power, as discussed in the attached submission to the Financial System Inquiry. This primarily addressed the NSW Government Strata and Community Title Law Reform Position Paper (2013) to meet the Financial System Inquiry policy options outlined under (4). These include (4.1) promoting a competitive and stable financial system that contributes to Australia's productivity growth; (4.2) promoting the efficient allocation of capital and cost efficient access and services for users, and (4.3) supporting individuals and businesses to be able to manage their finances by understanding risks and rewards in the financial sector. One likes to think the proposed sale of Green State Power will reflect these government aims, which appear mainstream.

As a resident of Glebe, concerned citizen and taxpayer one therefore is interested in how the proposed sale of Green State Power will be achieved in the context of many related government and private operations, including in regard to power. For example, one wonders,

in this ideally joined-up government, how the new Direct Action policy on climate change may be relevant to the coming sale of Green State Power and also whether it has implications in relation to the Productivity Commission Inquiry into Rural Research and Development. One assumes that Strategic Plans are ideally considered in openly related regional contexts.

Finally I draw your attention to the training and tender problems outlined to Phillips Fox in the feedback below, which used to make me tear my hair out some years ago when I worked in NSW government and later at Sydney University. As well as being the best disinfectant, openness is a vital form of training the trainer.

This is far from the dictatorship of the proletariat. However I hope the above answers your questions and I look forward to receiving the ROI. Related wider discussion with the Australia China Business Forum is attached.

Yours truly

Carol O'Donnell, St James Court, 10/11 Rosebank St., Glebe, Sydney 2037.
www.Carolodonnell.com.au

Public Affairs of Australia Training entitled A Practical Guide to Running and Participating in the Tender Process. (See problems below).

I think that Phillips Fox needs to see your training job more from the perspective of the minister and the electorate to whom he or she is accountable and less from the perspective of the bureaucrat tendering a contract. Public servants who make up tenders often know a lot less about what will have to be done to complete their aims than the people applying for the tender. This may mean that many government tender requirements are not only highly and unnecessarily variable, but also demand piles of what may seem like bureaucratic rubbish to the poor sod filling them in.

For example, I have personally been driven to murderous impulses by trying to complete a NSW Treasury labour contract without a Treasury person being available to answer questions. I also know of builders who hate government because of this kind of problem and refuse to waste any more time and money trying to deal with the public service. The new National Rental Affordability Scheme, in which the Commonwealth and State governments are now cooperating to address the shortage of rental housing and rapidly rising rents by offering a national rental incentive to providers of new housing on the condition that they are rented to eligible low and moderate income households, appears to me to be a very well designed initiative. However, it requires Commonwealth and State bureaucrats to cooperate effectively. Will they? Your training was not encouraging, in that it seemed likely to appeal to the state bureaucrat's desire to firmly establish him or herself as Boss of Projects (BOP), as distinct from as a more reasonable helper.