

Energy Company Obligation (ECO) U-Value Consultation Questionnaire – Feb 16



Making a positive difference
for energy consumers

Background

The questions below relate to the consultation on requirements for over-writing U-values for cavity wall insulation measures which can be found on our website :

<https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/publications-and-updates/eco2-consultation-requirements-overwriting-u-values-cavity-wall-insulation-measures>

Our proposals consist of three main parts:

- a. introducing an upper limit for overwritten U-values,**
- b. stipulating the evidence that we expect to be in place when a U-value is overwritten and how we expect inputs to be collected, and**
- c. a regime to monitor these measures; we suggest three approaches for implementing monitoring.**

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. If you do not wish to answer a question please select 'N/A'. The questionnaire should be completed in typeface and returned via email to eco.consultation@ofgem.gov.uk by close of play **7 March 2016**.

Respondent Details

Organisation Name:	EWIS LTD
Completed By:	PAUL JONES
Contact Details:	p.jones@ewis-ukltd.co.uk

1. U-value Limit

1.1 Do you agree that it is unreasonable for the U-value of a cavity wall measure to exceed 1.6 W/m²K in premises in the age bands B-K?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
- N/A

Please provide details and supporting evidence for your response below.

AS THE MAJORITY OF ETT CAVITIES HAVE BEEN DONE THE REMAINING REQUIRE A MORE CALCULATED APPROACH AS DEFAULTS DO NOT ACCURATELY REFLECT THEIR CONSTRUCTION OR BENEFITS.

1.2 Do you agree that we should implement a limit of 1.6 W/m²K for overwritten U-values for cavity wall measures in premises in age bands B-K?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Dont Know
- N/A

Please provide details and supporting evidence for your response below.

ACCURACY FOR THE REMAINING STOCK NEEDS TO REFLECT TRUE RETURNS FOR THE CLIENT.

2. Evidence Requirements

2.1 Do you agree that relevant inputs should be collected for the U-value calculation via an intrusive inspection, using a borescope for example?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
- N/A

Please provide reasons for your response below.

WIDTH OF CAVITY IF IMPORTANT FOR BOTH THE COMPLIANCE AND ACCURACY OF CALCULATION. BOROSCOPES SHOULD ALWAYS BE USED TO ASSESS CWI.

2.2 What types of evidence do you suggest would support the inputs used for a new U-value calculation?

Please provide reasons for your response below.

FORMS ARE CURRENTLY AVAILABLE AND IN USE AT PRESENT.

2.3 Do you agree that the types of evidence listed in paragraph 2.5 are practical to provide?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
- N/A

Please provide reasons for your response below.

2.4 Do you agree that the evidence listed in paragraph 2.5 is sufficient to support an overwritten U-value?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
- N/A

Please provide reasons for your response below.

CURRENT COLLATION INFORMATION IS SUFFICIENT.

2.5 Do you agree that the inputs for a U-value calculation should be collected by an independent person to increase confidence in the accuracy of overwritten U-values for CWI measures?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
- N/A

Please provide reasons for your response below.

OCDEA - QUALIFIED AND COMPETENT.

2.6 Do you agree that an independent person collecting the inputs for a U-value calculation would be practical to implement taking into consideration cost, time and customer journey implications?

- Strongly Agree

- Agree
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
- N/A

Please provide reasons for your response below.

OCDEA VISITS ALL PROPERTIES WHETHER THEY REQUIRE A U VALUE CALCULATION OR NOT.

3. Option 1 – Additional Monitoring Questions

3.1 Do you agree that option 1 would increase confidence in the accuracy of overwritten U-values for CWI measures?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
- N/A

Please provide reasons for your response below.

WITH ADDITIONAL MONITORING QUESTIONS AND A SET REQUIREMENT FOR EVIDENCE.

3.2 Do you agree that option 1 would be practical to implement, taking into consideration cost and time implications?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
- N/A

Please provide reasons for your response below.

SYSTEMS AND QUALIFIED PERSONNEL ALREADY IN PLACE.

3.3 Do you agree that a score monitoring agent is suitably qualified to answer the proposed questions relating to the U-value inputs?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
- N/A

Please provide reasons for your response below.

NEEDS TO BE OCDEA/SAP ASSESSOR QUALIFIED TO MONITOR.

3.4 Do you agree that the proposed additional score monitoring questions are appropriate for identifying where overwritten U-values are incorrect?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
- N/A

Please provide reasons for your response below.

QUESTIONS ARE FINE BUT EVIDENCE NEEDS CLARIFICATION.

3.5 Are there any additional questions that you think would help to identify inaccuracies in overwritten U-value calculations?

Please provide reasons for your response below.

FIXED TEMPLATE FOR EVIDENCE COLLECTION.

3.6 Can you please estimate how long you think it will take for these new questions to be implemented into your

systems?

Please provide reasons for your response below.

MAXIMUM 30 DAYS.

3.7 Do you foresee any issues if the questions were implemented during a monitoring quarter?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know
- N/A

Please provide reasons for your response below.

ALL WORK IN SYSTEMS. DATE NEEDS AGREEING FOR SURVEYING NOT INSTALLING AND A 3 MONTH CLEAR DOWN ALLOWED.

4. Option 2 – Ongoing Monitoring

4.1 Do you agree that option 2 would increase confidence in the accuracy of overwritten U-values for CWI measures?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
- N/A

Please provide reasons for your response below.

5% RANDOM MONITORING WORKS.

4.2 Do you agree that option 2 would be practical to implement, taking into consideration cost and time implications?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
- N/A

Please provide reasons for your response below.

AS ABOVE - 5% RANDON MONITORING WORKS. 5% MONTHLY INCREASES WORKLOADS AND CLEARS OLD MEASURES. QUARTERELY WOULD BE BEST.

4.3 If we were to implement a new monitoring regime in order to verify the accuracy of overwritten U-values for CWI

measures, do you agree with the sample size and reporting timeframes outlined in paragraph 2.12?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
- N/A

Please provide reasons for your response below.

ACCEPTABLE

5. Option 3 – Audit Regime

5.1 Do you agree that option 3 would increase confidence in the accuracy of overwritten U-values for CWI measures?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
- N/A

Please provide reasons for your response below.

RANDOM REGULAR AUDITS ALWAYS WORK BEST.

5.2 Do you agree that option 3 would be practical to implement taking into consideration cost and time implications?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know
- N/A

Please provide reasons for your response below.

TOO ONEROUS ON ALL PARTIES. RANDOM REGULAR AUDITS ALWAYS WORK BEST.

6. Additional Questions

6.1 Do you have concerns with U-values being overwritten for other ECO measure types?

Please provide details and supporting evidence for your response below.

NO

6.2 If you do not agree with any of proposals outlined, could you please suggest an alternative approach which you consider would provide assurance that U-values are being accurately overwritten for CWI measures?

Please provide details and supporting evidence for your response below.

AGREE WITH OPTION 1 - CLARITY OF EVIDENCE REQUIRED AND QUALIFIED OCDEA ASSESSMENT.

6.3 Do you agree that the proposals outlined above will enable U-values to continue to be overwritten for CWI measures where this is appropriate?

Please provide reasons for your response below.

CLEAR EVIDENCE AND QUALIFIED ASSESSMENT MEANS ACCURACY AT THE FRONT END.