

Energy Company Obligation (ECO) Deemed Scores Consultation Questions



Making a positive difference
for energy consumers

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: | BRUFMA (British Rigid Urethane Foam Manufacturers Association) |
| Completed By: | Mel Price |
| Contact Details: | mel.price@brufma.co.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.

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 document does not take into account fully the diverse range of properties across the UK and fails to capture many of the non-traditional properties that can effectively be treated with high quality thermal insulation products. Properties covered by previous schemes such as stone properties with cavities have not been included despite Ogem guarantees being in existence.

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.

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.

We are disappointed to see that there is no differentiation between insulation types in this section of the document. There is such a wide variety of insulation types available on the market, each with different performance characteristics, that it is impossible to stipulate one thickness of insulation and expect the resultant U-value to be the same. The calculations appear to be based on lower cost, lower performing insulation types which are not suited for use across the entire UK building stock. Similarly calculations appear to be based on one type of building construction when in reality the existing substrates can have a big impact on the final U-value. They do not take into account the various ages of the building stock which again can impact on the final U-values. Such generalization will mean that a significant number of properties will be excluded from funding and this could have a big impact on those that need it most, i.e. the fuel poor.

Our members provide products which can meet the needs of many of the so-called hard to treat properties bringing them up to and beyond the very low aspirational U-values required in this

consultation. Our members have produced which have been appropriate for use in earlier schemes and which are backed by insurance warranties.

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.

Yes we believe there should be a differentiation between both insulation types and construction types as both can have a major effect on the final U-values.

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

Are there any deemed scored for stones properties with cavities?

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.

As per answers to Qs 6 and 7.

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.

We agree that there needs to be some simplification but not at the expense of differentiation, otherwise this will lead to the lowest cost option each time rather than taking a more holistic approach as to what a property needs.

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

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.

- Don't Know