

**Q1. Respondents are asked to provide any comments or evidence they have in relation to the equality impact of the proposed changes.**

No comments.

**Q2. Do you agree that the final date for schemes bids to be submitted to the Programme Administrator should be put back to 31st December 2012 to allow more time for schemes to be developed following this consultation?**

This is a sensible approach given the slip in the normal timeframe.

**Q3. Do you agree that the NISEP funding should remain static at the 2012-13 level until the NISEP is reviewed or a new energy efficiency measure is introduced?**

This is acceptable given that it is an interim measure for 2013/14 only and the future of NISEP is part of the wider planning on energy policy.

**Q4. Do you agree that Solar PV should be the only type of renewable energy measure approved for NISEP schemes? (Bearing in mind that, as per Section 2.1 of the Framework Document, measures promoted must be in customer's financial interest i.e. the present value of the lifetime customer benefits should exceed the cost of the measures.)**

Yes, we agree.

**Q5. Do you agree that a 10% ring-fence of funding for innovative and renewable energy measures (Solar PV), is more appropriate than a 5% ring-fence for renewable (Solar PV) and a 5% ring fence for innovative?**

This appears to be wise given previous experience.

**Q6. Respondents are asked to comment on what the appropriate level of incentives should be for delivery of NISEP schemes.**

The proposed cap of £470,000 is reasonable and we are in agreement with it.

**Q7. Do you have any comments on or issues with the revised Accedence Document contained in Appendix 8 of Annex 1?**

No comments.

**Q8. Do you think that the guidance regarding compliance with State Aid, now contained within the Framework Document, is clear and adequate?**

It would be helpful to clarify if the incentive payments under NISEP are regarded as state aid or come under the de minimis ruling?

**Q9. Do you have any comments on the additional clarification in the Framework Document regarding procurement arrangements, sub-contracting arrangements and partners?**

This section of the framework document is now very clear.

**Q10. Do you have any comments on the revised Section 2.5, Payment of NISEP Funding, in the Framework Document?**

Monthly claims are welcomed. The section on VAT provides better clarity for new primary bidders.

#### **Additional Comments**

The cost effectiveness levels required make it very challenging to deliver a fully funded package of heating and insulation to a fuel poor household. Given that these customers are unable to make any contribution it should be a priority to ensure they receive a full package of measures when they are identified.