

Energy Company Obligation (ECO) Deemed Scores Consultation Questions

Background

The questions below relate to the ECO2 consultation on deemed scores which can be found on our website :

<https://www.ofgem.gov.uk/publications-and-updates/eco2-consultation-deemed-scores>

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 8 July 2016**.

1. Respondent Details

| | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Organisation Name: | Dorset County Council |
| Completed By: | Jon Bird, European Policy and Funding Officer – this is an Officer Response only, it has not been endorsed via the Council's Decision Making Process. |
| Contact Details: | j.bird@dorsetcc.gov.uk |

2. Methodology

Q1. Do you agree with our selection of the key variables to use as the main inputs for calculating the deemed scores?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Don't Know

If not, please clarify which aspect you do not agree with and suggest an alternative, with reasoning.

It could be improved by removing the heating type, since ECO-funded measures are generally long lasting improvements, while heating systems will converge to a similar level of Carbon intensity within the lifetime of the insulation.

3. Property Archetypes

Q2. Do you agree with the method used in developing typical property archetypes in order to remove the need for measuring property dimensions?

- ☒ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Don't Know

If not, please clarify which aspect you do not agree with and suggest an alternative, with reasoning.

The inclusion of Park Homes is welcomed

4. Primary Heating Sources

Q3. Do you agree with the approach to accounting for all primary heating sources present in the housing stock?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Don't Know

If not, please explain your reasoning and evidence your preferred approach.

Q4. Do you agree that we have appropriately accounted for heating systems present in the housing stock either as an input for the deemed scores or in Table 1?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Don't Know

If not, please clarify which additional heating systems you believe need to be accounted for.

See comment on question 4: Simplification by removing heating type would improve access and deliverability at the expense of short term reductions in Carbon savings.

5. Measure Types

Q5. Do you agree that the deemed scores include all main measure types?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Don't Know

If not, please clarify which additional measure type you expect will be installed.

Q6. Do you agree with our proposals for differentiating within measure types?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Don't Know

If not, please clarify where alternative differentiation should be applied.

Q7. Are there any measure types where you think that further differentiation is warranted? If so, please clarify which measure type could benefit from further differentiation and suggest an approach.

Q8. Are there any areas where you could benefit from further guidance in using deemed scores?

No. This approach appears to be simple, which will reduce costs and increase cost effectiveness.

6. Scores

Q9. Do you agree with the deemed scores produced?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☒ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Don't Know

If not, please clarify which particular score(s) that you believe do not accurately reflect the savings for a measure.

The actual deemed scores are almost irrelevant – the actual savings will be the same regardless – the key is to have a simple, deliverable scheme.

Q10. Do you agree that it would be useful to also provide the deemed scores as lifetime savings (i.e. after applying all relevant multiplication factors), to make the relative value of each measure easier to identify?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☒ Agree
- ☐ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Don't Know

7. Percentage of property treated

Q11. Do you agree with the proposal to use 'percentage of property treated' to identify whether 100% of a score should be claimed?

- ☒ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Don't Know

If not, please explain your reasoning.

8. New Scores

Q12. Do you agree with our proposed approach for applying for a new score from April 2017?

- ☒ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Don't Know

If not, please explain your reasoning, which specific parts of the process you do not agree with and inform us of your preferred approach.

Q13. Do you agree that we should determine whether or not to accept an application, and specifically what is a 'significant' improvement in score, on a case-by-case basis?

- ☐ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☒ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Don't Know

9. Score Monitoring

Q14. Do you agree that a DEA is not required to check inputs used when identifying a deemed score for a measure?

- ☒ Strongly Agree
- ☐ Agree
- ☐ Neither Agree Nor Disagree
- ☐ Disagree
- ☐ Strongly Disagree
- ☐ Don't Know

If not, please clarify why you do not agree and provide an alternative approach with your reasoning.

There is no comment box for Question 13, which is probably the most important question of all. While innovation is to be encouraged The “new measure” route provides an opportunity for a repeat of suboptimal situations reoccurring such as the huge number of CFLs funded under CERT or the Exhaust Air Heat Pumps allowed/encouraged through Appendix Q of SAP. I suggest the “new route” option is removed and alternate methods for testing and proving new technology are used prior to acceptance in ECO-funded programmes.