

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:	InstaGroup
Organisation type:	Managing Agent / Installer / System Designer
Completed By:	Peter O'Neill
Contact Details:	peter.oneill@instagroup.co.uk 07702 718155

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.

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.

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 approach is key and was the reason a majority of the industry supported a move to deemed scores from RdSAP. This is also in line with how previous obligations such as CERT operated.

It is important that the full benefit of this simplification is realised across the industry and the requirement to provide detailed measurements is also removed. Ofgem have an important role to play in achieving this via simplification of the deemed score survey form and expressing clearly that detailed measurements and floor plans etc are NOT an Ofgem requirement under audit. In turn this will help to drive supplier behaviour.

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.

--

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.

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.

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 is a sensible level and in line with previous obligations where deemed scores were used

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.

It is important that overall simplicity is achieved in these scenarios, to this end we urge Ofgem to be very clear around the methodology and rules involved such as rounding and thresholds.

If deemed scores are already adjusted to accommodate scenarios from 67% up to 100% then there are two possible approaches which are not clear currently. For example at CWI measure treating 57% of the property:

- (1) You could claim 57% (rounded) of the full ECO3 deemed score however it could be argued that the initial deemed score has already factored in scenarios of down to 67% so claiming 57% (rounded) of the full ECO3 deemed score would be double counting most of the omitted areas.
- (2) You could claim the POPT difference between the actual POPT (57%) and the threshold (67%) giving you a rounded of 90% POPT against the new ECO3 deemed scores.

In the interests of keeping this simple we would recommend Ofgem keep the same POPT approach but move back to 10% rounding for ease as most of the issues which the 20% bandings aimed to resolved will be dealt with by the proposed approach to deemed scores using the 67% rule. For absolute clarity our recommendation is that POPT would be rounded to 10% intervals and adjusted against the full ECO3 deemed score. In this example given about you would claim 60% of the deemed score. Option 1 above might analytically make more sense however the complexity around calculating and validating percentages would become extremely complex.

Clarity around these rules are required quickly to allow training and IT systems to be developed ready for the start of ECO3.

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.

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.

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.

n/a

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.

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.