



**New South Wales Government**  
Independent Planning Commission

## **TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING**

RE: DINAWAN SOLAR FARM (SSD-50725959)

### **STAKEHOLDER MEETING**

PANEL: SUELLEN FITZGERALD (Chair)  
SIMON SMITH

STAKEHOLDER: ALAN MORAN

LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE: 10:00AM – 12:30PM  
WEDNESDAY, 4<sup>th</sup> MARCH 2026

**<THE MEETING COMMENCED**

5 **MS SUELLEN FITZGERALD:** Mr Moran, before we get started today, I wanted to make a brief opening statement. I'd first like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Gadigal land, and I acknowledge the –

**DR ALAN MORAN:** Gadigal, I've never heard of that, what's that – oh, that's – sorry, that's the Aboriginals, is it?

10 **MS FITZGERALD:** That's right, yes. We're here in Sydney on Gadigal land.

**DR MORAN:** Oh, right.

15 **MS FITZGERALD:** And I acknowledge the traditional owners of all the land from which we virtually meet today. I'd also like to pay my respects to their Elders past and present.

20 Today we're going to be discussing the state significant development application for the Dinawan Solar Farm. My name is Suellen Fitzgerald. I'm the Chair of this Panel, and I'm joined by my fellow commissioner, Simon Smith, and staff members from the office of the Independent Planning Commission here in the room with me.

25 In the interests of openness and transparency, we'll be recording this meeting, and a full transcript of it, Mr Moran, will be available on the Commission's website in the next few days.

30 Now, you've got a 5-minute slot for your presentation to us today. I'll give you a hoy at the 4-minute mark so you can know where you are in your submission to us. And now, with those remarks, over to you.

35 **DR MORAN:** Thanks, Ms Fitzgerald. It's Dr Moran, by the way. I've got a great deal of expertise in economics generally and the energy sector. My main issue with the Dinawan Project is that this is totally dependent upon the forced contribution from the taxpayer and from the consumer. It offers no value whatsoever. In fact, it offers negative value. The various government assistance programs in which this depends, amount to about \$16 billion, and Dinawan is [one \$15 billion? 00:02:10] a year, and Dinawan is one particular contributor to that impost that the taxpayer and the energy commissioner has to pay.

40 And there are many reasons why this is required. I mean, you would have heard a lot about the transmission effects and the scouring of the earth that that's caused by. And so, those transmission requirements are there, because wind power is less dense and more intermittent, needs a lot more wires and poles than the sort of power that is gas and electricity and coal electricity, which it's replacing.

45 So, it needs all additional parts of assistance for transmission itself. It also needs additional systems because of its intermittency within the grid. It needs backup. And that backup for the intermittency has to be, normally has to be coal or gas. And in

doing so, remarkably, is itself a counterparty to the intermittent level. These wind farms are only operate at 30-something per cent of capacity, coal of course operates ideally at 95% capacity. And because the wind is subsidised, it is able to offer its product at negative prices, which of course no commercial entity could ever do. And in doing so, it knocks out the commercial entities.

We can see the effects of this in the cost of electricity which has more than doubled over the last 10 years as solar and wind have achieved higher and higher penetrations. Penetrations that are totally dependent upon subsidies from the government. The latest subsidy agenda issue is the so-called Capacity Investment Scheme which is Canberra Orwellian news speak, if you like, because it doesn't offer any capacity – in fact, it offers the opposite. And this is in addition to other schemes like the LRET Scheme and soft loans that the government provides and indeed is in addition to the massive cost which could even amount to \$40 billion of Snowy 2 which, again, is just backup for these sorts of facilities.

And you would know that because there's been some publicity in the past, that the hapless landowners who have agreed to these facilities being on their property, are likely to be forced to pay for the costs of rectification of the land in the events that the sponsor itself will go bankrupt either on purpose or because it simply isn't making any money in the final years.

The risks of these sorts of power are great to the community that home then. We've already seen this in Australia with the catastrophic breakdown of electricity as a result of the dependence on wind and solar in South Australia. We've seen it on the smaller scale in Broken Hill. We saw it last year in Iberia in Spain and Portugal, parts of southern France, again caused by a sudden lack of wind, some lack of sun, which are developments that occur quite regularly and which, if they are to be countered, required very, very high costs.

And it's no wonder indeed that the costs basically, if you look at an international scale, you can see that Australia used to be the cheapest, just about the cheapest, provider of electricity in the world until we started replacing our coal, forcibly replacing our coal by subsidised wind and solar.

**MS FITZGERALD:** Dr Moran, Dr Moran, sorry to interrupt. Just to let you know, you're at the 4-minute mark.

**DR MORAN:** Okay. If you look at the different levels of price in the world, Australia is now considerably more, about twice as much as China and the US and Mexico and India, places which basically have very much less wind than us. We're still below the UK and Germany and Spain, which have more wind and solar than us. So, seven countries are acting even more detrimentally to their interest than Australia.

So, basically, we've got the failure of wind and solar is very likely to occur and to impose considerable costs on us. And finally, the whole rationale for these developments is that we have to prevent, or said to have to prevent carbon dioxide emissions, or reduce them, or go to net zero, whatever the phrase is of the present time.

But, you know, there is no possibility of that occurring. Net zero on the world scale is impossible and was never taken seriously by India and China who are not the biggest producers of CO<sub>2</sub> in the world. And President Trump basically kiboshed it as soon as he arrived into office and indeed they've left the Paris Agreement now.

5

So, there is no possibility – there is no possible gain to the world from Australia abating its emissions in the way we're doing, and all we can do is incur costs. And we're seeing additional costs even this week being announced by a new tax on imports, the carbon contents of imports. Because the costs imposed on Australian manufacturing and suppliers generally are so great that we can't compete, so we are going to have to pay another tax to keep out the more competitive imports from countries that don't have the irresponsible energy policies that we in Australia have adopted.

10

15

**MS FITZGERALD:** Thank you, Dr Moran. I'm going to have to bring that to a close. We've got other speakers to hear from. If you have got further information you'd like to put through to us in a submission, you can make a written submission to the portal on our website or via email. The deadline for those is midnight on Sunday the 8th of March. And I can assure you we do read all of the written submissions that come through to us.

20

**DR MORAN:** Okay. Thank you.

25

**MS FITZGERALD:** Thank you for bringing those issues to our attention, we appreciate the time you've taken to do that.

**DR MORAN:** Okay. Thank you very much.

30

**MS FITZGERALD:** Thank you, Dr Moran.

**>THE MEETING CONCLUDED**