

Dear ESS Team,

I provide the following responses in relation to the proposed amendments of the ESS Rule, as a former Lead Auditor and Measurement & Verification Professional. I am currently a CMVP, CEM and M&VP for the VIC VEU Scheme.

*Question 9: Do you agree with the proposed changes to Clause 7A.1? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.*

I strongly disagree with the proposed changes, as these clearly provide the Scheme Administrator with subjective powers to make any ruling they see fit. As the Scheme Administrator consists of bureaucrats and not energy engineers or practitioners with practical knowledge of implementing energy conservation measures, their opinion of what is attributable and genuine could be unique and unrepresentative of the industry standard with no channels for independent review or appeal of any decision by the Scheme Administrator.

*Question 10: Do you agree with the proposed changes to Measurement Procedures of the PIAM&V method? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.*

I agree in principle to the proposed changes as it makes sense that the measurement procedures are known to be acceptable prior to starting the long measurement periods. It also gives sufficient flexibility should there have to be a change in procedures during a baseline period, resulting in revised dates. However it will depend on the detail of how and when the written explanatory reasoning. For example, will a separate template be provided or will an email from the M&VP suffice?

*Question 11: Do you have any specific concerns in relation to the cut-off date of 17 February 2020?*

I have no concerns with this date and support notification so many months in advance.

*Question 12: Would this change present any particular issues for your business?*

I have huge concerns with the proposed changes to Clause 7A.16. The Method has been in the Rule for many years and one of the biggest problems faced by industry has been the ongoing lack of guidance, plus contradictory and inconsistencies in any materials that have been published. It is my opinion that this concerning lack of administration would be hard-wired into the ESS Rule with this proposed change, especially with 7A.16(d). A blanket statement saying that anything published is part of the Rule, when it clearly would not be in the Rule, opens up the real possibility of changes without consultation, common sense or practicality becoming rubber stamped into the ESS Rule.

In general terms, I am a huge believer in the value of energy efficiency and the potential of the PIAM&V method, but the administration of the method has been disastrous for service providers and the general public. This means I now recommend my clients do not use the PIAM&V Method and despite being based primarily in NSW I work more in VIC. Despite being almost identical in design, the contrast with the Project Based Activities Method in VIC could not be bigger. This method is administered pro-actively, practically and consistently which is leading to wider acceptance and ongoing uptake and I hope for a day that I can say the same about PIAM&V.

Best regards, Simon.

0490 491 868

