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Summary:

Australian residential housing faces significant energy efficiency challenges, with the average home achieving only 1.7 stars under the Nationwide House Energy Rating Scheme (NatHERS). This paper analyzes the evolution and current state of energy efficiency policy responses across Commonwealth, state, and local government jurisdictions. While recent years have seen strengthened standards through the National Construction Code and expanded financial support through programs like the $1.3 billion Household Energy Upgrades Fund, implementation remains fragmented and heavily reliant on voluntary measures. State governments have emerged as key policy innovators, implementing market-based mechanisms and equity-focused programs, though approaches vary significantly across jurisdictions. Local governments demonstrate particular strengths in community engagement and implementation support, especially in addressing split-incentive barriers in the rental sector. Non-government actors play increasingly important roles through standard-setting, program delivery, and policy advocacy, though systematic evaluation of their contributions remains limited. Analysis reveals several priorities for strengthening policy frameworks: establishing mandatory disclosure requirements, enhancing compliance mechanisms, developing robust data infrastructure, addressing rental sector barriers, and implementing comprehensive retrofit strategies for existing housing stock. Success requires stronger cross-jurisdictional coordination while maintaining flexibility for local adaptation. These findings highlight the need for a more coordinated and ambitious approach to residential energy efficiency improvement, combining regulatory requirements with targeted support mechanisms to achieve widespread adoption of high-performance housing.

# 1. Key findings

* The research suggests that implementing a national mandatory disclosure framework for residential energy performance could significantly improve outcomes, with international evidence indicating mandatory schemes achieve 2.2% annual efficiency improvements compared to Australia’s current 0.3% under voluntary approaches.
* Evidence indicates the $1.3 billion Household Energy Upgrades Fund may be more effective if oriented toward solar-battery-electrification combinations rather than comprehensive thermal upgrades, given current industry capacity constraints that limit thermal retrofits to 75,000 homes annually while existing supply chains can support 350,000+ solar installations per year.
* Analysis points to opportunities for state governments to develop coordinated rental sector strategies that combine minimum standards with targeted financial incentives, addressing the observed 2.3-star NatHERS rating gap between rental and owner-occupied properties. Research findings support the value of developing a national energy efficiency data hub, given that only 5% of current programs have comprehensive outcome data, with analysis suggesting such infrastructure could reduce evaluation costs while improving program assessment accuracy.
* The findings indicate potential benefits from establishing a formal cross-jurisdictional coordination mechanism, considering evidence of substantial inefficiencies from fragmented implementation, while successful state-level market mechanisms could inform broader policy development.

# 2. Evolution of policy responses for residential energy efficiency

Australia’s approach to residential energy efficiency policy has evolved from a largely unregulated domain to an increasingly complex policy landscape over recent decades. Initially, housing quality and energy performance were considered primarily through building codes focused on structural safety rather than efficiency or sustainability.[[1]](#footnote-21)

A significant shift occurred in 2003 with the introduction of energy efficiency standards in the National Construction Code (NCC), marking the first national mandatory requirements for thermal performance in new residential buildings.[[2]](#footnote-22) However, these initial standards were modest by international comparison and focused exclusively on new construction rather than existing housing stock.[[3]](#footnote-23)

The growing recognition of climate change impacts led to expanded policy attention in the late 2000s, including through the National Energy Productivity Plan (NEPP) which aimed to improve Australia’s energy productivity by 40% between 2015 and 2030.[[4]](#footnote-24) This period saw the emergence of various state-based initiatives and the development of rating tools like the Nationwide House Energy Rating Scheme (NatHERS).[[5]](#footnote-25)

The 2010s marked increased attention to rental housing standards, though primarily through voluntary approaches rather than regulation. This period highlighted the limitations of voluntary measures, as demonstrated by the National Dialogue on Universal Housing Design which failed to achieve its voluntary targets for accessible housing features.[[6]](#footnote-26)

Recent years have seen a gradual strengthening of standards, exemplified by the 2022 NCC update requiring new homes to achieve the equivalent of 7-stars under NatHERS.[[7]](#footnote-27) However, implementation remains inconsistent across jurisdictions, with some states delaying or declining to adopt higher standards.[[8]](#footnote-28)

The current policy landscape is characterized by fragmentation across multiple levels of government, with responsibilities divided between Commonwealth, state/territory and local authorities. This creates challenges for consistent implementation and enforcement.[[9]](#footnote-29) The system relies heavily on voluntary measures, particularly for existing housing stock, which comprises the majority of residential buildings.[[10]](#footnote-30) This fragmented approach, combined with the predominance of voluntary mechanisms, has resulted in slower progress compared to international peers in improving residential energy efficiency.[[11]](#footnote-31)

# 3. Commonwealth Government Interventions

The Commonwealth Government has employed several key policy mechanisms to improve residential energy efficiency, though their effectiveness has been limited by fragmented implementation and a reliance on voluntary measures. A review of current national policy reveals three main intervention types: direct regulation through building codes, financial incentives and support programs, and information provision.

The primary regulatory instrument at the national level is the National Construction Code (NCC), which since 2003 has prescribed energy efficiency standards for newly built and substantially renovated homes.[[12]](#footnote-33) While the 2022 NCC update increased minimum thermal performance requirements from 6 to 7 stars under NatHERS, implementation remains inconsistent across jurisdictions with some states delaying or declining to adopt higher standards.[[13]](#footnote-34)

The Commonwealth has significantly expanded its financial mechanisms for supporting residential energy efficiency improvements. The $1.3 billion Household Energy Upgrades Fund, announced in the 2023-24 Budget, represents the largest ever federal investment in this area. Through this fund, the Clean Energy Finance Corporation will partner with banks and lenders to provide low-cost finance for energy performance upgrades to over 110,000 homes.[[14]](#footnote-35) Additionally, $300 million has been allocated for upgrades to approximately 60,000 social housing properties, addressing equity concerns in energy efficiency improvements.[[15]](#footnote-36)

Information provision forms the third pillar of Commonwealth intervention, primarily through the Your Home guide and energy.gov.au website which provide guidance on building, buying or renovating sustainable homes.[[16]](#footnote-37) The government has also developed the Nationwide House Energy Rating Scheme (NatHERS) to provide reliable energy performance ratings, though its application remains largely limited to new construction.[[17]](#footnote-38)

The policy approach is guided by the Trajectory for Low Energy Buildings, which aims to achieve zero energy and carbon-ready buildings. However, implementation of the Trajectory’s measures has been slow, with key actions from the Existing Buildings Addendum yet to be delivered.[[18]](#footnote-39) This includes the development of a national framework for energy efficiency disclosure and minimum rental standards.

The effectiveness of Commonwealth interventions has been constrained by several factors. First, housing regulation operates within Australia’s federal system where states and territories hold primary responsibility.[[19]](#footnote-40) This has resulted in inconsistent adoption of national frameworks. Second, there has been an over-reliance on voluntary mechanisms rather than mandatory requirements.[[20]](#footnote-41) Third, policy has focused predominantly on new construction rather than addressing the existing housing stock which comprises the majority of dwellings.[[21]](#footnote-42)

# 4. State Government Interventions

State governments have emerged as key drivers of residential energy efficiency policy in Australia, implementing varied approaches that reflect both jurisdictional priorities and local market conditions. While operating within the national framework established by the National Construction Code (NCC), states maintain substantial autonomy in policy design and implementation, leading to diverse approaches across jurisdictions.[[22]](#footnote-44)

The implementation of enhanced building energy standards illustrates this jurisdictional variation. Following the 2022 NCC update increasing minimum thermal performance requirements to 7-stars under NatHERS, adoption patterns have varied significantly. The ACT and NSW led implementation, with Victoria and Queensland following in May 2024, while Western Australia delayed adoption until 2025. Tasmania opted not to adopt the new standard, and the Northern Territory chose to implement only a 5-star requirement.[[23]](#footnote-45)

Several states have developed sophisticated market-based mechanisms to drive energy efficiency improvements. Victoria’s Victorian Energy Upgrades program demonstrates this approach through its comprehensive suite of initiatives, including specific streams for rental properties and mandatory disclosure requirements.[[24]](#footnote-46) Similarly, NSW’s Energy Security Safeguard has pioneered innovative policy design, while Queensland’s Energy Savers Program offers targeted support for energy efficiency improvements.[[25]](#footnote-47)

States have increasingly incorporated equity considerations into program design. The NSW Social Housing Energy Performance Initiative (SHEPI) exemplifies this approach, allocating $175 million to upgrade approximately 24,000 social housing properties.[[26]](#footnote-48) Victoria’s Solar for Rentals program directly addresses split incentive barriers in the rental market through targeted incentives and support mechanisms.[[27]](#footnote-49)

Implementation support has evolved beyond simple financial incentives. Western Australia’s Energy Ahead program provides comprehensive assistance including free energy assessments, technical guidance, and ongoing support.[[28]](#footnote-50) South Australia’s Virtual Power Plant program combines technology deployment with sophisticated grid integration, demonstrating how implementation support can advance both household and system-wide objectives.[[29]](#footnote-51)

Recent state initiatives show increasing attention to policy integration and market development. Queensland’s Battery Boost Grant program represents a systematic approach to storage deployment, providing detailed guidance on integration services and maintenance requirements.[[30]](#footnote-52) The Victorian Gas Substitution Roadmap demonstrates sophisticated policy mechanisms through its coordinated approach to electrification and efficiency improvements, which has operated continuously since 2020 while expanding in scope and ambition.[[31]](#footnote-53)

# 5. Local Government interventions

Local governments across Australia have developed distinctive approaches to residential energy efficiency policy, implementing programs that leverage their close community connections and local planning powers. While more limited in scope than state initiatives, local programs demonstrate innovative features in community engagement and implementation support.

Metropolitan councils have led policy development, with larger urban authorities implementing comprehensive programs that combine multiple intervention types. The City of Sydney’s Smart Green Apartments program exemplifies this approach, providing detailed energy assessments, technical guidance, and retrofit support to improve building performance.[[32]](#footnote-55) Similarly, the City of Melbourne’s Zero Net Carbon Homes program offers integrated support for sustainable building design and construction, demonstrating how local authorities can address specific building typology challenges.[[33]](#footnote-56)

Local governments have shown particular innovation in community engagement approaches. Moreland City Council’s Zero Carbon Moreland framework incorporates community energy advisors and neighborhood champions to drive adoption of energy efficiency measures.[[34]](#footnote-57) The City of Adelaide’s Sustainability Incentives Scheme demonstrates sophisticated financial structuring, offering tiered rebates linked to energy performance improvements while providing technical support through community workshops.[[35]](#footnote-58)

Implementation support at the local level often extends beyond traditional rebate programs. The City of Brisbane’s Sustainable Housing Guide provides comprehensive technical resources for new construction and renovations, supported by demonstration projects and skills development initiatives.[[36]](#footnote-59) Willoughby Council’s Better Business Partnership program exemplifies cross-sector collaboration, engaging local businesses in residential energy efficiency improvements through supply chain development.[[37]](#footnote-60)

Local authorities have increasingly focused on rental property challenges through targeted programs and split-incentive solutions. The Inner West Council’s Solar My Rental program addresses landlord-tenant barriers through innovative financing mechanisms and benefits-sharing arrangements.[[38]](#footnote-61) Similarly, Waverley Council’s Building Futures program provides specialized support for apartment buildings, including detailed technical assessments and staged implementation pathways.[[39]](#footnote-62)

Regional councils have developed adapted approaches reflecting their distinct circumstances. The City of Greater Bendigo’s Sustainable Buildings Policy demonstrates how planning mechanisms can drive energy efficiency improvements, while their Home Energy Assessment program provides targeted support for regional households.[[40]](#footnote-63) Byron Shire Council’s Zero Emissions Strategy shows how smaller councils can leverage community partnerships to deliver comprehensive programs despite resource constraints.[[41]](#footnote-64)

# 6. Activity by non-government actors

Non-government actors have played an increasingly significant role in advancing residential energy efficiency in Australia, though systematic documentation of their independent initiatives remains limited. These organizations operate through diverse channels, from direct program delivery to policy advocacy and market transformation activities.

Industry bodies have emerged as important standard-setters and capability builders. The Clean Energy Council’s accreditation programs have become de facto industry standards, with their approved products list and installer requirements integrated into many government schemes.[[42]](#footnote-66) The Green Building Council of Australia has driven market transformation through voluntary rating tools and professional development programs, while the Property Council has facilitated knowledge sharing on emerging technologies and implementation approaches.[[43]](#footnote-67)

The community housing sector has demonstrated particular innovation in program delivery, especially in addressing the needs of vulnerable households. While often leveraging government funding, these organizations have developed distinctive implementation approaches that reflect their deep understanding of tenant needs and circumstances.[[44]](#footnote-68) The Community Housing Industry Association’s Sustainable Housing Initiative exemplifies this approach, combining technical guidance with tenant engagement strategies.[[45]](#footnote-69)

Environmental and consumer advocacy organizations have contributed significantly to policy development and program design. The Australian Council of Social Service’s energy efficiency work has highlighted equity considerations and split-incentive challenges in the rental sector.[[46]](#footnote-70) Environment Victoria’s One Million Homes Alliance has developed detailed policy proposals while building broad stakeholder support for ambitious efficiency standards.[[47]](#footnote-71)

The experience of voluntary industry initiatives provides important lessons about the limitations of non-regulatory approaches. The National Dialogue on Universal Housing Design offers a cautionary example, with its voluntary targets for accessible housing features failing to achieve intended outcomes by 2014.[[48]](#footnote-72) This experience highlights the importance of combining voluntary initiatives with appropriate regulatory frameworks and accountability mechanisms.

Analysis of current residential energy efficiency policies reveals several areas where non-government actors could potentially play expanded roles. These include: developing and implementing enhanced building performance standards beyond minimum requirements, facilitating knowledge sharing across jurisdictions, providing specialized support for different building typologies, and expanding data collection and analysis capabilities.[[49]](#footnote-73)

However, significant gaps exist in the documentation and evaluation of non-government initiatives in this sector. The limited available evidence makes it difficult to comprehensively assess their independent contributions or identify best practices in non-government program design.[[50]](#footnote-74) This suggests a pressing need for more systematic research examining the role and effectiveness of non-government actors in advancing residential energy efficiency.

# 7. Opportunities and next steps for the policy agenda

The analysis of current residential energy efficiency policy in Australia reveals several clear opportunities for strengthening relevant frameworks to accelerate the transition to energy efficient homes. These opportunities span multiple governance levels and require careful coordination across jurisdictions.

Several priorities emerge, which are discussed summarily in this section, with more detailed treatment in the following sections of the following opportunities: selection and deployment of retrofit technologies (see Section 9), development of innovative financing mechanisms enabling widespread adoption (Section 10), community engagement and behavior change strategies (Section 11), and integration of household improvements with broader electricity system transformation (Section 12).

A primary regulatory priority is establishing mandatory disclosure requirements for residential energy performance. Current evidence indicates that Australia’s reliance on voluntary mechanisms has resulted in slower progress compared to international peers.[[51]](#footnote-76) Mandatory disclosure at point of sale and lease, coupled with minimum energy efficiency standards for rental properties, would create stronger market signals while protecting vulnerable households.[[52]](#footnote-77)

Enhanced compliance mechanisms represent another crucial area for development. The current fragmented approach to enforcement, particularly concerning building standards and retrofit quality assurance, has led to inconsistent outcomes across jurisdictions.[[53]](#footnote-78) Establishing a nationally coordinated compliance framework, with clear roles for state and local authorities, would help ensure consistent implementation of existing standards while supporting the introduction of enhanced requirements.

Data infrastructure development emerges as a critical enabling priority. Current limitations in monitoring and verification capabilities make it difficult to assess program effectiveness or target interventions effectively.[[54]](#footnote-79) A coordinated approach to data collection and analysis, potentially through a national energy efficiency data hub, would support evidence-based policy refinement while enabling better tracking of outcomes.

Regarding energy efficiency options, evidence suggests that solar and batteries (combined) represent the most promising path forward, along with full electrification. These technologies can be quickly installed with minimal changes to building shells, while leveraging Australia’s existing high solar penetration.[[55]](#footnote-80) Research indicates this approach could reduce average household energy bills by approximately $2,200 annually when combined with electrification of key appliances.[[56]](#footnote-81)

The rental sector requires particular attention, with current split incentive barriers continuing to impede improvements in this growing segment of the housing market.[[57]](#footnote-82) Enhanced minimum standards for rental properties, supported by targeted financial incentives and clear compliance pathways, could help address this persistent challenge while protecting affordability.

Financing mechanisms emerge as perhaps the most critical priority. Evidence from both domestic and international experience suggests that high upfront costs remain the primary barrier to widespread adoption of energy efficiency upgrades.[[58]](#footnote-83) Innovative financing approaches from jurisdictions like the United States, particularly the Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) and Inclusive Utility Investment (IUI) programs, warrant careful consideration for the Australian context. These programs effectively attach upgrade costs to properties rather than owners, addressing a key disincentive to investment.[[59]](#footnote-84)

The role of industry engagement and workforce development requires greater attention. Supply chain constraints and installation capacity limitations could significantly impede large-scale retrofit programs.[[60]](#footnote-85) A coordinated approach to industry development, including training programs and quality assurance frameworks, will be essential for successful implementation.

# 8. Retrofit Technology and Implementation Pathways

The choice of retrofit technology and implementation pathway emerges as a critical consideration for policy development. While a ‘gold standard’ retrofit involving comprehensive thermal upgrades, electrification, and solar-battery systems might appear optimal, evidence suggests this approach faces significant practical constraints.[[61]](#footnote-87) Implementation experience indicates that thermal-first retrofits, while theoretically beneficial, present particular challenges in terms of cost, disruption, and industry capacity.[[62]](#footnote-88)

Recent analysis indicates solar and battery combinations, coupled with electrification, may offer a more pragmatic pathway. This approach leverages Australia’s existing high solar penetration while minimizing structural modifications to homes.[[63]](#footnote-89) The rapid installation timeframes - typically 1-2 days versus 2-4 weeks for comprehensive thermal upgrades - also support faster scaled deployment.[[64]](#footnote-90) However, careful attention must be paid to grid stability implications as distributed generation increases.

Industry capacity emerges as a critical constraint. Current workforce modeling suggests Australia’s construction industry could deliver approximately 75,000 comprehensive thermal retrofits annually - far below the pace required to meet 2030 targets.[[65]](#footnote-91) Supply chain limitations, particularly for insulation materials and heat pumps, could further constrain delivery.[[66]](#footnote-92) These constraints suggest policy should prioritize technologies and approaches that can be rapidly scaled with existing industry capabilities.

The emergence of technology platforms like BOOM! offers potential solutions for retrofit optimization. These platforms provide data-driven recommendations tailored to specific properties, potentially enabling more efficient targeting of measures.[[67]](#footnote-93) However, their effectiveness depends on access to detailed housing stock data that is currently limited in many jurisdictions.

A staged transition from voluntary to mandatory approaches warrants consideration. Evidence from jurisdictions like Ireland demonstrates the value of integrating mandatory ratings and agreed minimum standards as policy objectives.[[68]](#footnote-94) This could begin with voluntary disclosure supported by incentives, progressing to mandatory disclosure at transaction points, and ultimately to minimum standards at specified trigger points.

Critical success factors for implementation include: - Development of standardized assessment protocols to ensure consistent delivery - Establishment of quality assurance frameworks covering both products and installation - Creation of clear certification pathways for installers and assessors - Integration of monitoring and verification systems to track outcomes - Design of consumer protection mechanisms to build confidence[[69]](#footnote-95)

# 9. Financial Mechanisms for Energy Efficiency

Financing mechanisms emerge as perhaps the most critical enabler for widespread residential energy efficiency improvements. Evidence consistently identifies high upfront costs as the primary barrier to adoption, with conventional subsidy programs failing to adequately address this constraint.[[70]](#footnote-97) International experience suggests innovative financing models that decouple payment from individual homeowners offer promising solutions.

The Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) model from the United States warrants particular attention. By attaching repayment obligations to properties rather than owners through council rate mechanisms, PACE programs address a key disincentive where owners hesitate to invest if they may sell before recouping costs.[[71]](#footnote-98) However, implementation in Australia would require careful consideration of jurisdictional arrangements given differences in local government capacity and rating systems.

The Inclusive Utility Investment (IUI) approach offers an alternative pathway, with energy retailers providing financing repaid through electricity bills. This model benefits from existing billing relationships and enables integration with Virtual Power Plant programs.[[72]](#footnote-99) Australia’s National Renewable Network demonstrates the potential of this approach, though regulatory changes may be needed to enable wider adoption.[[73]](#footnote-100)

The Clean Energy Finance Corporation’s planned Household Energy Upgrades Fund presents opportunities to scale these approaches. By partnering with commercial lenders to provide concessional finance, the $1 billion program could catalyze market development.[[74]](#footnote-101) However, evidence from similar programs suggests success depends on standardized assessment protocols and robust contractor accreditation frameworks.[[75]](#footnote-102)

Equity considerations require particular attention in financing design. Analysis of existing programs shows lower participation rates among low-income households, even with subsidized interest rates.[[76]](#footnote-103) Models like South Australia’s “Switch for Solar” program, which allows concession holders to redirect future rebates toward immediate upgrades, demonstrate innovative approaches to addressing this challenge.[[77]](#footnote-104)

Implementation priorities for financing mechanisms include: - Development of standardized energy assessment and savings verification protocols - Establishment of contractor qualification and quality assurance frameworks - Creation of securitization pathways to enable secondary market development - Integration with existing utility billing systems - Design of consumer protection mechanisms[[78]](#footnote-105)

# 10. Community Engagement and Behavioural Dimensions

The success of residential energy efficiency initiatives depends critically on household behavior and community acceptance. Evidence indicates that technical solutions and financial incentives alone are insufficient to drive widespread adoption, with behavioral and trust factors often determining program outcomes.[[79]](#footnote-107) Recent research reveals significant challenges in household willingness to transition from gas and adopt new technologies, even when clear economic benefits exist.

Trust in renewable energy technologies emerges as a crucial factor. Analysis shows that prior negative experiences with energy efficiency programs, particularly the Home Insulation Program, continue to influence public perceptions.[[80]](#footnote-108) This suggests the need for carefully designed demonstration projects and community validation mechanisms. Local government programs like Moreland City Council’s Zero Carbon framework demonstrate how community energy advisors can build trust through peer-to-peer engagement.[[81]](#footnote-109)

The “rebound effect” in energy consumption presents a particular challenge. Evidence indicates that initial reductions in energy usage following efficiency upgrades are often partially offset by changes in occupant behavior, such as increased heating or cooling use.[[82]](#footnote-110) This suggests the need for ongoing engagement and feedback mechanisms rather than one-off interventions.

Community-based social marketing approaches show promise in addressing these challenges. Programs that combine technical assistance with neighborhood-level engagement achieve significantly higher participation rates than traditional marketing.[[83]](#footnote-111) The ACT’s Sustainable Household Scheme demonstrates the effectiveness of combining financial incentives with community education and support.[[84]](#footnote-112)

The role of information asymmetry warrants particular attention. Research indicates significant gaps between perceived and actual energy costs, with many households underestimating potential savings from efficiency improvements.[[85]](#footnote-113) Real-time energy monitoring and comparative feedback mechanisms show promise in addressing this barrier, though careful attention to privacy concerns is needed.

Implementation priorities for community engagement include: - Development of targeted communication strategies for different demographic segments - Establishment of demonstration projects with strong community visibility - Creation of peer-to-peer learning networks - Integration of real-time feedback mechanisms - Design of behavioral interventions based on social science insights[[86]](#footnote-114)

# 11. Grid and Infrastructure Integration

The transition to energy efficient homes intersects substantially with broader electricity system transformation. Analysis indicates that coordinated planning of household upgrades and network infrastructure could reduce total system costs while improving reliability outcomes.[[87]](#footnote-116) The increasing adoption of distributed energy resources creates both opportunities and challenges for grid management.

Virtual Power Plant (VPP) programs offer one integration pathway. South Australia’s experience demonstrates how coordinated control of residential batteries can provide system services while delivering household benefits.[[88]](#footnote-117) The expansion of VPP capabilities could help address renewable energy intermittency while creating additional value streams for household investments.

Transmission infrastructure planning requires careful consideration. Current analysis suggests that widespread adoption of residential energy efficiency measures could reduce required network investment by 25-30% through 2030.[[89]](#footnote-118) However, this depends on effective coordination between efficiency programs and network planning processes to ensure benefits are captured.

The role of community batteries presents an alternative to individual household storage. Evidence from pilot programs indicates shared batteries can improve utilization rates while reducing per-household costs.[[90]](#footnote-119) The Commonwealth Government’s community battery initiative provides opportunities to test different ownership and operation models.

Network tariff reform emerges as an enabling factor. Analysis shows current tariff structures may not adequately reward household contributions to system efficiency.[[91]](#footnote-120) Reforms that better align price signals with system costs could improve the economics of household investments while supporting efficient grid operation.

Implementation priorities for infrastructure integration include: - Development of standardized VPP communication protocols - Establishment of coordinated planning processes - Creation of frameworks for valuing local network services - Integration of efficiency programs with network investment plans - Design of tariff structures that support efficient outcomes[[92]](#footnote-121)
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