

# 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](mailto:eco.consultation@ofgem.gov.uk) by **close of business on 8 July 2016**.

## 1. Respondent Details

Organisation Name:	PEPA – Property Energy Professionals Association
Completed By:	Mark Cook
Contact Details:	<a href="mailto:markcook@pepassociation.org">markcook@pepassociation.org</a> . 07833 380 066

## 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.

Age, if statistically important, should be included. However, the most pressing inclusion must be a location based variable. Geography is too complex but PEPA does support an Urban/sub-urban/rural type approach.

### 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.

Good method but PEPA strongly believes on site measurement is vital in creating accuracy and consistency. If there are issues with measuring then we should focus on helping make measuring better.

#### 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.

Looks good

**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.

**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.

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

## 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.

**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.

There are many aspects that could be examined such as is the relationship between % covered and score linear or is it skewed. IE is downstairs (50% of area) = 50% of score.

This adds complexity and for the application here – PEPA supports the current method as simple and consistent.



## 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.

Clarity around the timeline for the process of introducing new scores is needed. Also, should an appeal type process be applicable?

**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.

Whilst simplicity is introduced – it's still not simple enough for just anyone. It may be possible to have someone less qualified than a DEA – but not unqualified. Others are qualified but bias may be introduced based on the area from which the person carrying out comes from