

A review of the RET review panel

Canonical: <https://northmoregordon.com/news/a-review-of-the-ret-review-panel/>

Details:

[Summary](#) | [Article](#) | [Current use](#) | [Related guidance](#)

About this update

This dated news record has been reorganised for clear reading and connected to current guidance.

Publication date: June 5, 2014.

Status note: Present-tense statements, market figures, deadlines and program details in the archived record belong to its publication date. Check current official sources before making a decision.

What this article reported

> Good report by the ABC - showing that 3 out of the 4 individuals on the Renewable Energy Target review panel have a long history in oil, gas & coal. What's more the head of the panel (Dick Warburton) stated only a month ago that he did not believe climate change was due to human activity.

[Read the source](#)

[Climate Change, Renewable Energy Target \(RET\)](#)

How to use this information now

For current use, confirm the applicable scheme rules, regulator notices, market date and reporting period. Keep historical prices or forecasts separate from present quotes and verified outcomes.

Separate source-reported facts from forecasts, targets and commentary. For a current project, retain the official source, version, effective date, assumptions and decision record in the evidence file.

Related guidance

[Carbon advisory](#)

[Current articles and guidance](#)

[Contact Northmore Gordon](#)

What was the main concern raised about the RET review panel's composition?

An ABC news report highlighted that 3 out of 4 individuals on the Renewable Energy Target review panel had long histories in oil, gas and coal industries. This composition raised questions about potential conflicts of interest in reviewing a renewable energy scheme, particularly given that the panel's work would influence Australia's renewable energy policy direction and the commercial viability of renewable energy projects. Such representation could bias recommendations affecting scheme structure and eligibility rules.

What did Dick Warburton, the RET review panel head, state about climate change?

Dick Warburton stated only a month before the article's publication that he did not believe climate change was due to human activity. This position was significant because it raised concerns about the panel head's alignment with the scientific consensus underpinning renewable energy policy. Since Australia's renewable energy schemes are fundamentally linked to emissions reduction objectives, a

panel head questioning anthropogenic climate change creates tension between policy rationale and leadership perspective.

How might the RET review panel's composition affect renewable energy project development?

The panel's composition and the head's stated climate views raised concerns about potential bias in reviewing the Renewable Energy Target scheme. Projects seeking renewable energy certificates, grid connection pathways, or investment cases depend on stable, evidence-based policy frameworks. Concerns about panel impartiality could affect investor confidence, certificate valuations, and the commercial viability of renewable energy developments across Australia's industrial and utility sectors relying on RET instruments.

Why is the composition of review panels important for renewable energy investment?

Review panels assessing national energy schemes significantly influence policy, certificate eligibility, and investment frameworks. A panel with fossil-fuel industry conflicts or misaligned climate views could potentially bias recommendations affecting the RET's structure, eligibility rules, or financial viability. This directly affects renewable energy project economics, certificate quantities and values, renewable electricity claim credibility, and long-term commercial planning for facilities seeking RET pathways like STCs, LGCs, or REGO certificates.

How does this issue relate to Northmore Gordon's renewable energy services?

We advise clients on renewable energy certificate pathways, moREnewable100 procurement, and renewable electricity claims under schemes like the RET, REGO, and LRET. Policy stability and impartial scheme design are essential to these services. Concerns about review panel composition highlight the importance of understanding policy context when assessing scheme eligibility, certificate sustainability, and long-term renewable energy strategy for industrial clients and utilities relying on renewable attribute procurement.

What broader implication does this review have for carbon accounting and renewable claims?

The RET review panel's work shapes rules governing renewable electricity attributes and carbon accounting frameworks in Australia. If panel recommendations are influenced by fossil-fuel industry perspectives rather than climate science, they may affect the integrity and acceptance of renewable energy claims, Scope 2 accounting methodologies, and the credibility of renewable energy certificates used in corporate sustainability reporting, net-zero commitments, and environmental due diligence assessments required by investors and regulators.

Why should businesses care about the independence of energy policy review processes?

Businesses making capital investments in renewable energy, energy efficiency, or decarbonisation depend on stable, impartial policy frameworks. Review panels that lack independence or have industry conflicts create uncertainty around certificate eligibility, scheme continuation, and financial returns on renewable energy investments. This uncertainty affects investment case assumptions, funding decisions, certificate price forecasting, long-term energy strategy planning, and the commercial viability of renewable electricity procurement commitments for industrial and utility sectors.

How should clients assess renewable energy scheme risk in light of policy review concerns?

Clients evaluating renewable energy projects or certificates should separate technical viability from policy stability. When assessing RET pathways, renewable electricity claims, or investment cases, distinguish between scheme mechanics (eligibility, evidence requirements, timing) and policy risk (review findings, potential rule changes). We recommend documenting scheme assumptions, monitoring regulatory developments, and where material, stress-testing financial models against adverse policy scenarios to ensure renewable energy strategy remains resilient across different RET review outcomes.

