

Hello,

Please see below for our responses.

Question 1: Do you agree with our proposed format for partial project and full project scores? Please provide reasons for your answer, and if applicable alternative suggestions with justification including as much detail and evidence as possible.

Yes it is easy to filter

Question 2: Do you agree with our proposal to include fixed value uplifts into our scoring matrix and for fixed value uplifts to be notified as measures? If not, please indicate your preferred alternative. When we notify to the utility, would we notify both measures.

Question 3: Do you agree with our proposal to require a post-retrofit RdSAP assessment to determine a project's finishing SAP rating (option 1)? Responses will be considered alongside those received on this topic during part 1 of our scoring consultation.

Pre and Post EPC's will provide an accurate reflection of the property. When the new SAP is released, the post epc and the scores will need to correlate.

Question 4: Do you agree with separate measure and project notifications? If not, would you prefer a single notification? Please suggest any pros and cons to either approach that have not been included above.

The monetary value for a whole house project is much higher than single measures. There will need to be payments released as each measure is installed while waiting for a top up payment as the full project is completed. The final full project notification can be sent through with the last measure notification.

Question 5: Do you agree with our proposal to award deflated PPS to the final measure in a project? If not, please suggest an alternative.

The final measure notification could be a two measure- one of the measure and one of the full project completion. All measures would have been confirmed as compliant by the time the final measure is notified, which would add complete the full project. The payment for the last measure should be the total monetary value attributed to the project. The last measure will need to have the option of confirming it is the last measure, as we may be reaching beyond the minimum required EPC level.

Question 6: Do you agree that in ECO4 we should continue to require supplier generated MRNs to for all measures? If not, please propose any alternative options.

Would it be possible to use a trustmark number to align the scheme references.

Question 7: Do you agree with our proposals for determining the point of completion for the project? Can you suggest any alternatives to determine that a project has been completed?

The last measure would have a post EPC confirmed Sap rating.

Question 8: Do you agree with the assumptions used to develop the partial project scores? If not, please suggest where the assumptions should be changed.

Yes – ASHP will need to be updated when SAP is updated

Question 9: What are your views on our proposal to remove the wall type distinction for heating measures?

It will be accounted for within the EPC rating

Question 10: Do you agree with our proposal to split the standard heating control measure into a programmer and room thermostat measure and a TRV measure?

For manual lodgements through trustmark, the new proposal makes sense, and won't increase administration.

Question 11: Do you have any suggestions on how heating control measure category could be further simplified?

Question 12: Do you agree with the proposed changes to the notification of rare heating systems? If not, please provide alternative suggestions.

Yes

Question 13: What are your views on our proposal to remove pre-main heat source for insulation measures?

SAP accounts for this information.

Question 14: Do you agree that the number of u-value variants for solid wall insulation measures should be reduced? If not, please provide alternative suggestions.

Yes

Question 15: What are your views on our proposal to have a combined park home insulation measure?

We do not currently install in park homes, and do not have the necessary experience to confirm.

Question 16: Do you agree with our proposal to retain the distinction between single and double park homes by creating a "PHI single" and "PHI double" measure?

Yes

Question 17: What are your views on the addition of partial project scores for pitched roof insulation, hybrid wall insulation and district heating system connection measures?

Pitched roof has needed its own score since the FTCH requirements came in.

Question 18: Do you agree with the approach and assumptions used to derive the scores for the pitched roof insulation measure? If not, please provide alternative suggestions.

Question 19: Do you agree with the approach and assumptions used to derive the scores for the district heating system connection measure? If not, please provide alternative suggestions

Kind Regards,

Elinor Jenkins
Technical Director

Tel: 02920 499183



www.cityenergy.co.uk | info@cityenergy.co.uk | HQ: 02920 499183
Registered office: Coptic House, 4-5 Mount Stuart Square, Cardiff, CF10 5EE

City Energy Network Ltd is registered in England and Wales, company no 07889412. The firm is authorised and regulated by the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA) with reference no 718868. You can confirm our regulatory status on the FCA's register by visiting www.fca.org.uk or by calling the FCA on 0800 111 6768.

Please think carefully before printing this email. City Energy Network is committed to protecting the environment for a sustainable future.

This e-mail, including attachments, is confidential and is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient and you have received this e-mail in error then any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. Please contact the sender by return e-mail and delete it from your system. E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, late in arriving or incomplete as a result of the transmission process. We have taken precautions to minimise the risk of transmitting software viruses. We advise that you carry out your own virus checks on any attachments to this message. We do not accept any liability for any loss or damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail.