

RESIDENTIAL RE GRANTS PROGRAMME –CONSULTATION SUMMARY¹ (GRANT SCHEME DESIGN QUESTIONS)

Q1. Determining the Grant Level	Q2. Appropriate Grant Level	Q3. How to Trigger a Review
<p>Determining Factors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ CO2 ▪ System capacity ▪ System price vs. fossil fuel <p>Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Labour cost: new build vs. existing? ▪ Mismatch between the technologies 	<p>Level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 25%; 30%; 50%; Between the ranges presented ▪ Fixed Grant will stop price inflation; Fixed grant will discourage new products <p>Relative Levels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Biomass and solar too low vs. heat pumps ▪ Solar combi too high vs. solar ▪ Vertical HP too high vs. Horizontal HP 	<p>Trigger</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inflation, including fuel price ▪ Additional funding ▪ Disproportionate demand <p>Caution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Too much change could cause confusion
Q4.1. Programme Eligibility	Q4.2. Limits to Developers	Q4.3. DIY
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Both new and existing: eligible ▪ Renters: not feasible (except some LA tenants) ▪ Local Authorities: No (some said yes) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The new build sector: eligible, but the grant should go to the home owner ▪ Developer eligibility: majority said no ▪ No support for large developments; some said yes for units < 5. SEI House of Tomorrow for > 5 units ▪ Encourage developers to allow for RE at design stage so that the owner has the option 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Most felt they should be excluded; significant disagreement, if commissioned properly ▪ General agreement that it was okay for simpler technologies ▪ Perhaps a lower grant for DIY? ▪ Perhaps a 6-month trial period for DIY?
Q5. The Use of Standard Forms	Q6. Programme Risks	Q7. Programme Promotion
<p>Quotations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should not be detailed ▪ Should contain standard info, e.g. €/kW <p>Contracts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Little support for a standard contract <p>Commissioning Checklist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Broad Support; this is critical ▪ Payment to occur after certification 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Market stalls when the scheme ends ▪ Pellet price and quality ▪ Lack of enforcement of standards ▪ Can the market meet demand? ▪ Can SEI process applications fast enough? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This is important ▪ TV and mass media not required; word of mouth is sufficient ▪ Have a brochure in the planning pack

¹ This is not an exhaustive summary; it highlights some of the recurring themes or divergent opinions. A fuller representative of the comments received at the workshop and the written comments subsequently received is detailed in the detailed summary document which accompanies this summary

RESIDENTIAL RE GRANTS PROGRAMME –CONSULTATION SUMMARY (QUALITY ASSURANCE MECHANISM)

1. Training and Inspection	2. Equipment Lists	3. Standard Forms
<p>Training</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Critical for installers, salespeople, designers</i> ▪ <i>Skillsnet a key organisation, as is METAC</i> ▪ <i>Tie in with RE Installers Academy material</i> <p>Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Products should only get on the list if the manufacturer provides training (initially)</i> 	<p>Requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>CE Standards</i> ▪ <i>Minimum / High efficiency standards</i> ▪ <i>Quality of fuel is important</i> <p>Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>How do we get on the list?</i> ▪ <i>Are foreign tests acceptable here?</i> ▪ <i>Is SEI setting itself up to be liable?</i> 	<p>Forms</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Some standardisation would be good (for both quotations and contracts)</i> ▪ <i>Do not highlight price info in quotations</i> ▪ <i>There should be a standard commissioning checklist</i> <p>Installers List</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Should require training and experience</i> ▪ <i>There should be a policing board for removal</i>
4. Training / Experience / Insurance	5. Sizing / Quotation / Contract	6. Advertising Standards
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>There is a lack of recognisable standards to train to</i> ▪ <i>First six months: some self regulation?</i> ▪ <i>TCC and insurance both a must</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Have a standard application form</i> ▪ <i>Estimates should be written</i> ▪ <i>Not clear where liability lies: installer, supplier, manufacturer?</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>RECI: a good example</i> ▪ <i>Should not denigrate each others' products</i> ▪ <i>Only authorised sales staff</i> ▪ <i>Cooling off period is problematic</i> ▪ <i>Servicing should be mentioned at placing of contract</i>
7. Customer Complaints	8. Open Discussion	9. Other Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Does SEI have a liability if it "endorses" products and installers via a list?</i> ▪ <i>Consumers and installers need to know their rights</i> ▪ <i>Consider some form of arbitration</i> ▪ <i>Be careful about public reprimand!</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Will funds for some technologies be ring-fenced?</i> ▪ <i>Will SEI be able to cope initially?</i> ▪ <i>The industry should work towards self-rule</i> ▪ <i>The cost of retrofit is much higher: address this!</i> ▪ <i>Don't force the industry to grow too fast</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Have the Quality Charter voluntary initially</i> ▪ <i>Launch is premature</i> ▪ <i>No retrospective grants allowed</i> ▪ <i>Unfair advantage to heat pumps</i> ▪ <i>Fuel quality!</i> ▪ <i>Annual meeting would be advantageous</i>