

Energy Company Obligation (ECO) consultation: Updating Deemed Scores for ECO3 Questions



Background

The questions below relate to the consultation seeking views on our approach to updating the deemed scores for ECO3, should it be introduced as set out in the Government consultation. The consultation can be found on our website.

This consultation is open for six weeks from 4 April to 16 May 2018.

Notes For Completion

Please complete all relevant sections of the document by selecting an answer for the question and then providing reasons/evidence for your response in the box provided. The questionnaire should be completed in typeface and returned via email to eco.consultation@ofgem.gov.uk by **close of business on Wednesday 16th May 2018**.

1. Respondent Details

Organisation Name:	Association for Technical Monitoring Agents (ATMA)
Organisation type:	Trade Body
Completed By:	Neil Bowles
Contact Details:	01296 311890

1. Updates related to RdSAP and Fuel Prices

Q1. Do you agree with our proposal to apply the RdSAP v9.93 updates across all wall types which currently use a pre-installation U-value of 2.1 W/m²K?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ N/A

Please provide reasons for your answer and include as much detail and evidence as possible.

It would seem sensible to reflect the U-value currently being used for RdSAP v9.93 for consistency if nothing else

Q2. Do you agree with our proposal to use the most up to date fuel prices available from the Product Characteristic Database (PCDB) for the deemed scores throughout ECO3?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ N/A

Please provide reasons for your answer and include as much detail and evidence as possible.

The same applies as per Question 1

2. Proposed Alternative to Percentage of Property Treated

Q3. Do you agree with our proposed approach to removing POPT for the majority of measures by identifying average treatable areas and adjusting the scores accordingly?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ N/A

Please provide reasons for your answer, and if applicable provide an alternative approach including as much detail and evidence as possible.

This removes an area of concern (calculating POPT) as highlighted in the POPT consultation. That said, there will still be a calculation needed and therefore guidance material must be clear and easy to understand. Compliance with PAS2030 and PAS2035 should still be applicable

Q4. Do you agree with our use of English Housing Survey data to identify average treatable areas for SWI, CWI, loft insulation, flat roof insulation and underfloor insulation?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ N/A

Please provide reasons for your answer, and if applicable suggest an alternative source of data with justification including as much detail and evidence as possible.

There needs to be some conformity in data that's used and guess this is probably the best place to start.

Will the EHS data be used for Scotland ?

Q5. Do you agree with our use of English Follow up Survey data to identify average treatable areas for heating measures?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ N/A

Please provide reasons for your answer, and if applicable suggest an alternative source of data with justification including as much detail and evidence as possible.

Same applies as per Q4.

Q6. Do you agree with our use of Ofgem data and industry opinion to identify average treatable areas for RIRI and park home insulation measures?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☒ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ N/A

Please provide reasons for your answer, and if applicable an alternative approach with justification including as much detail and evidence as possible.

RIRI - There is a potential that an average weighted factor could lead non compliance with PAS and not treating the more difficult elements. Due to the complex nature of this measure involving the application of multiple insulation products, the existing POPT methodology should be left as is. Without it, suppliers and the supply chain will find it very difficult to be able to evidence that the minimum requirement has been met if ever challenged. Installing less than 100% in most cases go against building regs as there is a higher risk of condensation if areas of the loft space are left untreated. Compliance with PAS2030 and PAS2035 should still be applicable

Q7. Do you agree with our proposed approach for measures for which there is insufficient data available to identify treatable areas?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ N/A

Please provide reasons for your answer, and if applicable suggest an alternative source of data with justification including as much detail and evidence as possible.

Q8. Do you agree with our minimum requirement that at least 67% of the property is treated in order to qualify for the full ECO3 deemed score?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ N/A

Please provide reasons for your answer, and if applicable an alternative approach including as much detail and evidence as possible.

This will potentially throw up more challenges with Technical Monitoring. An accurate measurement MUST still be taken by the installer so that the TMA can consider overturning any fails.

Will there be a tolerance built in to the TM process ?

How would a TMA deal with less than 100% measure being installed but it fulfills the 67% to claim the full deemed score. For example, a detached property having 3 walls cavity filled would achieve 75% and therefore claim the full deemed score. If there was no apparent reason to not fill the 4th wall then surely this must be a fail.

Does this method encourage the supply chain to install less than 100% ?

Compliance with PAS2030 and PAS2035 should still be applicable

--

Q9. Do you agree with our proposed approach of using POPT to score measures which do not meet the 67% minimum requirement?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ N/A

Please provide reasons for your answer, and if applicable an alternative approach including as much detail and evidence as possible.

Follows a process that already exists and should therefore cause little disruption to the supply chain.
Will there be a tolerance built in to the TM process?
Compliance with PAS2030 and PAS2035 should still be applicable

3. Updates to the format of deemed scores

Q10. Do you agree with our proposed format for deemed scores?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ N/A

Please provide reasons for your answer, and if applicable alternative suggestions with justification including as much detail and evidence as possible.

4. Updates to Room-in-Roof Insulation Scores

Q11. Do you agree with our proposal to update the assumed size of the floor area of the room-in-roof used to develop the RIRI score?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ N/A

Please provide reasons for your answer, and if applicable please suggest an alternative approach including as much detail and evidence as possible.

Yes as this now incorporates the anomalies which is found in RIR areas.

Q12. Do you agree with our proposal relating to the assumed levels of insulation in the elements of the room-in-roof used to develop the RIRI score?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☒ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ N/A

Please provide reasons for your answer, and if applicable an alternative approach including as much detail and evidence as possible.

Care should be taken on how installers are evidencing the age of a RIR. There is often limited evidence on building reg's planning portals. Thoughts are that most RIRI measures will go / have gone through as Pre 1966 and therefore the reduced assumed U-value is unfair. A property post 1983 should probably be discounted for ECO3.

What evidence should TMA's be expected to see to qualify the age of the RIR?

5. Updates to scores for heating measures

Q13. With regard to upgrades for inefficient mains-gas and LPG boilers, do you agree with the assumptions we have used to identify the pre-installation efficiency for non-condensing boilers?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ N/A

Please provide reasons for your answer, including as much detail and evidence as possible.

Q14. Ofgem are responsible for determining what constitutes a similar efficiency rating to non-condensing boilers and for electric storage heating with a responsiveness rating of 0.2 or less. We are in the initial stages of developing our position on this area and we welcome views from stakeholders. In responding you may have regard to the following non-exhaustive examples of issues to consider;

- (i) A methodology for determining this rating for each heating type
- (ii) Data sources that we could use

Please provide reasons for your answer, including as much detail and evidence as possible.

6. Updates to scores for Park Home insulation measures

Q15. Do you agree with the proposed update to the park home insulation deemed scores?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ N/A

Please provide reasons for your answer, including as much detail and evidence as possible.

This should negate the need to provide U-values (pre and post) and it is clear that evidence (6.7 to 6.10) has been sought to get to this figure.

7. Invitation to Provide General Comments

Q16. We are also interested in high-level and material issues which are relevant to and likely to have a substantive impact on our approach to improving deemed scores for ECO3, for example, you may have views on:

- (i) How could we streamline our administrative processes to further the main objectives of the deemed scores;
- (ii) How could we amend the underlying assumptions or methodology to improve the deemed scores.

Please provide as much evidence and detail as possible in your response.