# Reforms to the Energy Performance of Buildings regime

CIBSE response

26th February 2025

***RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS***

***Question 1*** *- To what extent do you agree or disagree that information using an energy cost metric should be displayed on EPCs? Please select one option for each building type.*

**Domestic buildings**
~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
~~Neither agree nor disagree~~
Agree
~~Strongly agree~~

**Non-domestic buildings**
~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
~~Neither agree nor disagree~~
Agree
~~Strongly agree~~

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning, and provide any evidence to support your view.*

CIBSE agree it should be displayed, but:

- this should be alongside the assumptions on tariffs, as 1) they may vary from the tariff actually adopted by occupants, and 2) they may become quickly outdated, as noted in the consultation.
- It must be very clear, if costs continue to exclude plug-in appliances – this could be very confusing to consumers, so it would be better, on balance, to include them as a set assumed allowance, and state that assumption.
- Until the ratio of gas vs electricity costs is addressed, any rating based on energy costs will tend to be detrimental to all-electric buildings, even if they are low energy use and low carbon. This must be addressed, especially if cost ratings continue to be used in policy, as otherwise policy will keep discouraging moving away from fossil fuels.

This information will also become much more useful when HEM becomes available to homeowners as an “open” version where they could modify set assumptions (i.e, the Future Homes Standard and EPC wrappers) to match their actual occupancy and heating patterns, as well as energy tariffs.
We agree this should account for regional weather variations.
We agree the tension between updates and stability is to some extent unavoidable. On balance, regular updates are preferred to assist decision making. Making HEM open for bespoke inputs would also allow users to decide whether to update the energy costs, before targeting measures.

***Question 2*** *- To what extent do you agree or disagree that information derived from a fabric performance metric should be displayed on EPCs? Please select one option for each building type.*
**Domestic buildings**
~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
~~Neither agree nor disagree~~
~~Agree~~
Strongly agree

**Non-domestic buildings**
~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
~~Neither agree nor disagree~~
~~Agree~~
Strongly agree

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.*

Fabric performance is independent from occupants and a key factor for policy to address and for building owners and occupants to understand, to inform decision making e.g. when selecting or improving a building.

***Question 3*** *- When evaluating the fabric performance of buildings, which methodology do you think should inform the basis of calculating a fabric metric? Please select one option for each building type.*

**Domestic buildings**
~~No preference~~
~~Don't know~~
~~FEES~~
HLP/HTC
Other

**Non-domestic buildings**
~~No preference~~
~~Don't know~~
~~FEES~~
HLP/HTC
Other

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.*

The proposed option in this consultation is FEES. This is very difficult to understand, due to **significant drawbacks from FEES**:

- They take account of fabric performance (although only partially – see details below), not ventilation, therefore they only provide a **partial picture** of what design and retrofit can influence to reduce thermal demand. Fabric performance matters as it is independent from users, and can be influenced by original design, by retrofit, and is within reach of regulations. The choice of ventilation is similar, although more influenced by users. The Technical Annex is incorrect where it states that the FEES "estimate both space heating and cooling demand" (page 15): without taking account of the actual ventilation system, this is not the case.
- They are highly **theoretical,** preventing as-built or in-use verification or even just any meaningful comparison – see details below
- By adding up heating and cooling requirements , and especially diving heating requirements by four (presumably to create a "season-equivalent sum??), they 1) hide where opportunities for improvements are, and 2) provide a completely **false picture** of the relative importance of each.
- They are **very opaque** to homeowners, and even among parts of industry. This is a fundamental hurdle to action, and related to how theoretical and verifiable they are.

In their current form i.e. from SAP 10.2 (03-02-2022), **FEES are highly theoretical**, and far from representing the actual dwelling, in particular (full list in section 11 of SAP 10.2):

- They use an average UK climate: this is a fundamental drawback. This provides a completely theoretical and misleading assessment of heating requirements, and therefore of opportunities for improvements. A home in Cornwall or in Northern England will be provided the same FEES, while having different needs and opportunities for heat loss and solar gains.
- They assume natural ventilation with intermittent extract, not the actual system: this may be acceptable to represent the fabric alone, but does not provide a full picture of what design and retrofit can influence to reduce heating requirements

- They have set assumptions on the heating system's responsiveness and controls, not those of the actual one: again, this may be acceptable to represent the fabric alone, but does not provide a full picture of what design and retrofit can influence to reduce heating requirements
- They have set assumptions on overshading of windows: this means FEES cannot represent actual heating and cooling requirements. The Technical Annex is incorrect where it states that in the FEES "all influences on the overall heating and cooling demand (…) can theoretically be accounted for, including solar gains" (page 15): without taking account of the actual ventilation system, this is not the case.

We therefore strongly **recommend NOT to adopt FEES in their current form, and to give real consideration to the following options**:

- HTC/HLPs: we agree with the limitations i.e. not accounting for solar gains, and providing the same measure (i.e. heat loss rate) in different locations independently from the weather. However, a significant benefit is that they provide opportunities for verification (as supported through the SMETER programme). It is acknowledged that, until recently, HTC/HLPs were only available through co-heating tests, which prevented routine roll-out; from the new testing methods that have emerged in the last few years, some are less reliable than others (as evidenced by the SMETER programme), and there are remaining uncertainties and situations where an HTC/HLP measurement should be treated with caution. To address this, CIBSE are currently producing a Technical Memorandum on HTC / HLP testing methodologies, with recommendations on what they can and cannot do, data requirements, testing approach and how to interpret the results (including uncertainty). This guidance will be technology-agnostic, peer-reviewed, and CIBSE hope it would inform their application in EPCs and for Building Regulations purposes.
- Space heating demand and space cooling demand: it is highly surprising and disappointing that this metric is not even mentioned in the Technical annex, given its relevance and wide use in industry. It gives a full picture of fabric and ventilation factors, independently from heating systems. While not directly verifiable, it has a track record through Passivhaus, and not only in low-energy homes, and an approximate comparison can at least be made with the heating / cooling delivered by systems.
- Energy use for space heating and/or cooling: this has the downside of including the performance of systems, not just heating / cooling requirements, but is verifiable e.g. through in-built metering within heat pumps.
- Alternatively, FEES in a fundamentally revised form may have a purpose, but there would need to be significant changes in order for them to be less theoretical, and closer to being verifiable.

If space heating and cooling are added, this should 1) be a sum of the real annual totals, to reflect the real relative importance of each, and 2) the components should be shown alongside the total. Without both these points, the sum cannot be meaningful, and cannot inform decisions on new build design and retrofit.

As a related point, CIBSE recommend that serious attention is given to in-built metering of heat outputs from heat pumps (e.g. by product regulations or incentives), allowing data on "space heating delivered" and "DHW delivered" to be easily recorded and accessed. This will:

- Help in the assessment and improvement of heat pump performance.
- Help in the assessment of building performance, differentiating thermal from electrical energy uses.
- Support consumers, builders and heat pump manufacturers, should complaints arise of high energy costs (e.g. following the installation of heat pumps, or following a more substantial retrofit): having the data will help identify whether the system is performing correctly and high costs are due to high heating requirements, or not.

***Question 4*** *- To what extent do you agree or disagree that information based on a heating system metric should be displayed on EPCs ? Please select one option for each building type.*

**Domestic buildings**

~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
~~Neither agree nor disagree~~
~~Agree~~
Strongly agree

**Non-domestic buildings**
~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
~~Neither agree nor disagree~~
~~Agree~~
Strongly agree
If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.

***Question 5*** *- What are your views on the design principles and the scope for a Heating System metric? Please provide evidence where possible.*

CIBSE agree with the objectives to take account of the system's environmental impact and efficiency. We are unsure what is meant by taking account of the fuel's sustainability: we assume this refers to biomass systems; in that case, there are wide variations in practice between different sources, so would the rating make set assumptions about that fuel the occupants may use, or apply the same rating to all biomass systems?

The GWP of refrigerants, and its potential for leakage (depending on system design) is not mentioned. We recommend this should be included in the system rating.

To help with decision making and understanding from occupants, we think a checklist or ranking approach would be more effective than a quantitative metric. The ranking should be associated with very clear characteristics and opportunities for improvements. For example (shown here for illustration, without including biomass in the illustration):
1 - Lowest: fossil fuel based & inefficient
2 - fossil fuels, efficient;
3 - Electric, inefficient and/or high peak demand (e.g. direct electric, old storage heaters);
4 - Electric, mid-efficiency (e.g. low efficiency heat pump, high temperature system, poor controls);
5 - Electric, high efficiency, but low usability and/or high GWP refrigerant and/or high likelihood of refrigerant leakage, such as VRFs where the refrigerant circulates within the building rather than being enclosed within the heat pump product;
6 - Electric, high efficiency, high usability, low GWP or low likelihood of leak.
7 – Electric, high efficiency, high usability, low GWP, low likelihood of leak.

***Question 6 -*** *To what extent do you agree or disagree that information based on a smart readiness metric should be displayed on EPCs? Please select one option for each building type.*

**Domestic buildings**
~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
~~Neither agree nor disagree~~
Agree
~~Strongly agree~~

**Non-domestic buildings**
~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
~~Neither agree nor disagree~~
Agree
~~Strongly agree~~

***Question 7*** *- What are your views on the definition, design principles and the scope for a smart readiness metric? Please provide evidence where possible.*

We agree with the list of features (Technical Annex page 21) which could be taken into account in a smart readiness metric. We also agree that it should be based on regional weather, to take proper account of factors such as PV generation and self-consumption potential. In any case, we also recommend that renewable energy generation (used by the building, and exported) should be reported separately, as part of the secondary information provided on EPCs.

It is not clear, within that list, whether the “other forms” of energy storage capacity refer to fabric storage – this should be acknowledged.

It is not clear from the proposals whether government intends to reward in the same way, features from which the building occupant (and the energy system) will benefit regardless of their behaviour i.e. truly built-in or automated, and those which will rely on their behaviour or choice (e.g. use of smart meter information to inform behaviours, use of a smart tariff, smart appliances etc). CIBSE’s view if that, if both are accounted for, they should not be weighed in the same way, or ideally the EPC should include the “smart readiness” without user-dependent features, and the one with i.e. full potential. Measures which have a large influence, and on large loads, should also be acknowledged differently e.g. those which can help reduce and shift peak heating load, such as thermal storage.

This would point to a scale or ranking system, similar to the approach for heating systems (see Q5), or the EU Smart Readiness Indicator, which make it clear to users what characteristics are present and what actions could be taken.

More generally, CIBSE would add that smart readiness is not an objective in itself: its purpose is to help operate and manage buildings, to enhance how they meet the needs of the users as well as performance aspects such as the indoor environment, energy costs, carbon emissions, and demand management. For example, a building could be very “smart ready” but still have such a high peak energy demand that, despite its measures, it would put pressure on the grid. We think that at this stage, while there is not yet a widely adopted approach, it is still useful to consider:

- more quantitative and outcome-focused approaches e.g. proportion of the load (peak) which can be shifted, which should then be accompanied by a list of the existing features and those not present but possible, in order to be actionable. A single quantified metric would necessarily be reductive though e.g. % of the peak load which can be shifted, would not take account of the benefits, over the whole year, of on-site PVs (without battery).
- Alternative ways to promote and implement “smart readiness” e.g. through technical requirements in regulations, products, or other means.

***Question 8*** *- To what extent do you agree or disagree that information from an energy use metric should be displayed on EPCs? Please select one option for each building type.*

**Domestic buildings**
~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
~~Neither agree nor disagree~~
~~Agree~~
Strongly agree

**Non-domestic buildings**
~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
~~Neither agree nor disagree~~
~~Agree~~
Strongly agree

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.*

Energy use influences all objectives from government: costs, carbon, and demand management (low energy buildings typically also have low peak demand). It is understandable by consumers, and does not rely on variable conversion factors such as carbon and energy costs.

***Question 9*** *- If an energy use metric is to be displayed on Energy Performance Certificates (EPCs), which type of energy use measurement should be used to calculate this metric? Please select one option for each building type.*

**Domestic buildings**

~~No preference~~
~~Don't know~~
~~Delivered energy~~
~~Primary energy~~
Other (please specify) : Total energy use i.e. "delivered" + supplied from on-site systems. We also strongly recommend that "delivered", in the case of heat / cool networks, should not be that "at the meter" of the property, but accounting for the network efficiency (i.e. generation and distribution), to provide a like-for-like comparison with buildings with on-site systems.

**Non-domestic buildings**
~~No preference~~
~~Don't know~~
~~Delivered energy~~
~~Primary energy~~
Other (please specify)
*If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.*

CIBSE recommend Total energy use i.e. "delivered" + supplied from on-site systems. We also strongly recommend that "delivered", in the case of heat / cool networks, should not be that "at the meter" of the property, but accounting for the network efficiency (i.e. generation and distribution), to provide a like-for-like comparison with buildings with on-site systems.

Delivered energy only provides a partial view of building's energy use. Because the potential from on-site systems will already be accounted for in the carbon metric AND the smart readiness metric, it is really important that the EPC does provide information on the total energy use i.e. that from all supplies (on site or gas / grid / heat / cool networks). This should be accompanied by information on the breakdown of what is provided by each energy supply, including gas, grid electricity, on-site generation (used by the building, and exported) being reported separately, and heat delivered from networks.

***Question 10*** *- To what extent do you agree or disagree that information from a carbon based metric should be displayed on EPCs? Please select one option for each building type.*

**Domestic buildings**
~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
~~Neither agree nor disagree~~
~~Agree~~
Strongly agree

**Non-domestic buildings**
~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
~~Neither agree nor disagree~~
~~Agree~~
Strongly agree

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.*

We agree that carbon should be displayed, and it can be a useful metric in the existing stock, which is currently largely reliant on gas, but this can also be addressed by a combination of energy use metric & heating system metric. Carbon as a metric will reduce in usefulness as the grid decarbonises and buildings move away from fossil fuels. At that point, metrics truly reflecting building performance itself (smart readiness, fabric and energy use) will be even more relevant.

***Question 11*** *- To what extent do you agree or disagree with incorporating smart metering technologies, like SMETERS, into the energy performance assessment framework for buildings? Please select one option for each building type.*

**Domestic buildings**

~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
~~Neither agree nor disagree~~
~~Agree~~
Strongly agree

**Non-domestic buildings**
~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
~~Neither agree nor disagree~~
~~Agree~~
Strongly agree

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.*

See Q3 – we think this should be considered as part of the fabric / heating requirement metric. This will require attention to metering of on-site generation systems as well as EV charging, alongside development of the SMETER methodologies (see also CIBSE plans for guidance on HTC testing, in Q3). Alternatively, we recommend considering whether and how, if HTC/HLP was not used as a metric on its own, its measurement (for both new and existing building) could feed into the HEM calculation, i.e. HTC / HLP as an input), in effect replacing (superseding) design estimates such as U-values with a global value for fabric heat loss. MHCLG should work with DESNZ on this, as part of the development of HEM.

***Question 12*** *- Do you have any views on key transition issues?*

***Question 13*** *- What should be the validity period for Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) ratings?*
Don't know
Less than 2 years
2 years
5 years
7 years
10 years

***Question 14*** *- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the approach for any changes to validity periods to only apply to new EPCs?*

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Neither agree nor disagree
Agree
Strongly agree

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.*

On balance, CIBSE agree that the validity period should be shorter than 10 years. More importantly, we recommend requiring updates when significant works are carried out (e.g. any works that falls within the scope of Building Regulations), and when the property changes hands (i.e. sale or new rentals). This should not be an excessive burden, compared to the financial transactions in these cases, and should be made even easier with digital building passports, allowing simpler updates of the elements that have changed.

***Question 15*** *- To what extent do you agree or disagree that a new EPC should be required when an existing one expires for private rented buildings?*

~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
~~Neither agree nor disagree~~

~~Agree~~
Strongly agree

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.*

This is important for consumer protection, so that tenants understand their property's performance and possible alternatives.

***Question 16** - To what extent do you agree or disagree that the regulations should be amended so that a property must have a valid EPC before it is marketed for sale or rent?*

~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
~~Neither agree nor disagree~~
Agree
~~Strongly agree~~

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.*

***Question 17** - To what extent do you agree or disagree that houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) which don't already fall under the (Minimum Energy Efficiency Standards) MEES should do so when a room is rented out?*

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Neither agree nor disagree
Agree
Strongly agree

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.*

***Question 18** - To what extent do you agree or disagree that there should be a transitional period of 24 months to allow HMO landlords to obtain a valid EPC and comply with MEES regulations?*

Strongly disagree Disagree
Neither agree nor disagree Agree
Strongly agree

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.*

***Question 19** - To what extent do you agree or disagree with requiring short-term rental properties to have a valid EPC at the point of being let?*

Strongly disagree Disagree
Neither agree nor disagree Agree
Strongly agree

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.*

***Question 20** - To what extent do you agree or disagree with requiring short-term rental properties to have a valid EPC irrespective of who is responsible for meeting the energy costs?*

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Neither agree nor disagree
Agree
Strongly agree

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.*

***Question 21*** *- To what extent do you agree or disagree that we should remove the exemption for landlords from obtaining an EPC for buildings officially protected as part of a designated environment or because of their architectural or historical merit?*

~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
~~Neither agree nor disagree~~
Agree
~~Strongly agree~~
~~If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.~~

We agree, but this needs to come with a review of the assumptions used in HEM and associated guidance for existing buildings (e.g. U-values, thermal mass), to ensure the properties of heritage buildings can be suitably represented. Incorporating in-use measurements would help here - see Q11.

***Question 22*** *- How useful do you find Display Energy Certificates (DECs) for understanding and improving a building's energy performance?*

~~Not at all useful~~
~~Somewhat not useful~~
~~Neither not useful or useful~~
Somewhat useful
~~Very useful~~

***Question 23*** *- Are there any limitations or challenges with the current DEC approach that reduce its effectiveness?*
*Please provide evidence where possible.*

Improvements to DEC could be made to the methodology, including:

- To better take account of intensity of use
- To update the scale
- To better align with other reporting mechanisms (and therefore reduce the burden on users. This is already the case with ESOS but alignment could be sought with other mechanisms e.g. SECR, CSRD, IFRS. This is a common feedback from across the commercial sector.

However, the real limitation and challenge to the effectiveness of DEC is what is made of it i.e. currently, almost nothing: they cannot on their own drive action:

- The system is badly enforced, with DECs often out of date, or not prominently displayed. This prevents the original intent i.e. raising awareness among the public, and in turn raising demand for more public buildings which use energy (and public money) more efficiently
- As far as CIBSE are aware, they are not linked to policies or incentives for improvement.

The statement "*no firm proposals have been developed for the design of an operational rating*" (Technical Annex, page 29) is highly surprising and disappointing: whether to be included on an EPC or separate, proposals were developed by government, in collaboration with industry, over 2020-1, and subsequently consulted upon. We strongly recommend referring to that consultation and to the CIBSE submission (and that of others): https://www.cibse.org/policy-insight/consultations/closed-consultations/ . The consultation, and CIBSE response, made a number of recommendations for operational ratings to commercial buildings as well as DECs; considering both together is important, as properties can change hands between the public and commercial sectors. Industry invested a significant amount of time and efforts, working with BEIS (at the time), and there is, almost 4 years later, no response to the consultation.

Further industry-led developments since then, should make the improvement of DECs and implementation of commercial operational ratings, even more straightforward, if they built on the previous consultation:

- the commercial sector has continued to adopt the NABERS rating system;
- there are further market demands (e.g. financial system regulations, voluntary systems such as GRESB) to report actual energy and carbon emissions;

- the development of the National Building Database should provide a full picture of energy performance across the stock, including its distribution, which would usefully inform any rating scale
- the UK Net Zero Carbon Buildings Standard and associated stock model have developed, for the large majority of building sectors, a current average energy use intensity, and a limit energy use intensity developed to be compatible with the UK energy carbon budgets. This limit could very much inform the end point of the scale e.g. high ratings could be aligned with the NZCBS levels CIBSE would be very happy to have the opportunity to discuss this with MHCLG and, if appropriate, DESNZ.
- In the domestic sector, tentative proposals were also made in the FHS consultation and CIBSE response to it: https://www.cibse.org/policy-insight/consultations/closed-consultations/the-future-homes-and-buildings-standards/ .

***Question 24*** *- What alternative approaches, if any, could drive energy performance improvements more effectively than DECs for public sector buildings?*

*Please provide evidence where possible.*

See response to Q23: there needs to be better enforcement of the current DEC regime, as well as incentives and requirements for improvements, and coordination with the approach to operational ratings in the non-public sector, to create demand for low energy buildings. We also recommend that the scope if expanded to all public buildings, not just those "frequently visited by the public": it is not just about raising awareness among the public, but also about awareness among owners, occupiers and managers of public buildings, for efficient use of energy and public funds.

***Question 25*** *- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed changes to the validity periods for DECs and DEC recommendation reports?*

~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
~~Neither agree nor disagree~~
Agree
~~Strongly agree~~

***Question 26 -*** *What would be an appropriate validity period in years for these DEC and DEC recommendation reports? Please select a validity period for each option.*
**DEC 1000m2 and under**

1 year
2 years
3 years
4 years
5 years
6 years
7 years
More than 7 years Don't know

**DEC recommendation report 1000m2 and under**
1 year
2 years
3 years
4 years
5 years
6 years
7 years
More than 7 years
Don't know

**DEC recommendation report over 1000m2**

1 year
2 years
3 years
4 years
5 years
6 years
7 years
More than 7 years Don't know

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.*

***Question 27** - There is a proposal to provide an exception in the regulations for certificates that have been marked as cancelled or not for issue to be removed from the Energy Performance of Buildings (EPB) Register after 2 years.*

*To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal?*

~~Strongly disagree~~
Disagree
~~Neither agree nor disagree Agree~~
~~Strongly agree~~

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.*

It is not clear what is considered "cancelled": if this is, for example, marked by an assessor as erroneous, then the proposal is acceptable. However, it is important to keep out of date certificates on the record, as this provides a valuable source of information, for research and for policy monitoring, on issues such as the evolution of the building stock, the evolution of data entries (e.g. indicating works have been carried out, or that assessors disagree with the previous input, which could indicate issues with data quality, assessor training etc).

***Question 28** - To what extent do you agree or disagree with the approach to remove the option to opt-out EPCs from the EPB Register public address search?*

~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
~~Neither agree nor disagree~~
Agree
~~Strongly agree~~

***Question 29** - To what extent do you agree or disagree with retaining the option to opt-out EPC address level content from the Open Data?*
~~Strongly disagree~~
Disagree
~~Neither agree nor disagree~~
~~Agree~~
~~Strongly agree~~

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.*

We do not know the rationale for differentiating the approach from the Open Data register, to that in the public address search.

***Question 30** – There is a proposal to remove the general prohibition on sharing data gathered under the EPB Regulations and replace it with a Secretary of State discretion about when, how and with whom to share the data.*
*To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal?*

~~Strongly disagree~~

~~Disagree~~
~~Neither agree nor disagree~~
Agree
~~Strongly agree~~

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.*

The rationale for accepting or refusing data sharing should be made clear through principles, not be purely left to the SoS's discretion.

Options should be considered to limit reliance on SoS approval, as this could prove prohibitive and cumbersome and, in effect, continue to limit data sharing. A list of applications should be published where it can be assumed that data sharing is acceptable, and a list where data sharing would not be allowed. This would leave a reduced list of case-by-case decisions by the SoS.

***Question 31** - To what extent do you agree or disagree that data gathered in previous EPC assessments should be available for use in future EPC calculations for a dwelling?*

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Neither agree nor disagree
Agree
Strongly agree

***Question 32** - What are your views on the approach to using existing data, while balancing accuracy and practicality?*

Previous data must be available, to reduce the burden of assessments and, in turn, improve the quality of assessments. This should come with a requirement for assessors to review 1) whether any works have been carried out since, and 2) review and confirm or modify the previous assessment, whether or not works have been carried out.

See also response to Q11 on actual measurements (e.g. HTCs) which could be used as inputs.

This should be part of a wider strategy for building passports and digitalisation, and wider plans for better quality of EPCs – see Q35.

***Question 33** - To what extent do you agree or disagree that Accreditation Schemes should be given more responsibility for overseeing the training of energy assessors?*

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Neither agree nor disagree
Agree
Strongly agree

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.*

CIBSE Certification have submitted views through PEPA.

***Question 34** - Do you have suggestions for other actions which could be taken to improve the accuracy and quality of energy assessments, or to help identify fraud in EPC assessments?*

There is significant evidence that in the UK, and especially in the domestic sector, EPCs are seen as of limited value, with costs driven down and therefore leading to limited scope for assessors to carry out suitable assessments and providing valuable recommendations. While this is the case to some extent in many EU countries, the problem seems particularly acute in the UK (see for example 2024 CIBSE Symposium paper "*EPC calculation methodologies across Europe and accommodating new performance indicators*", by Mahsa Sayfikar, Heriot-Watt University, which we would be happy to

provide on request). CIBSE Certification have submitted views through PEPA. In addition, CIBSE suggestions include:

- Better training of assessors – possibly with oversight of the Accreditation Schemes and/or Government. The training should include more “mock” situations, and better training on fabric and services.
- Digitalisation, to allow access to previous data (see responses to previous questions on this point): this should not preclude a review and confirmation or update by the assessors, but would encourage more investment in a proper assessment in the first place, and subsequent focus on only the required changes and verifications.
- Increased audits
- Better use of in-use testing
- A review of the use of default inputs: these are understood to be useful for existing buildings where accurate information on, say, the building fabric, can be difficult to obtain, but with better training and the use of new testing techniques, it should be possible to reduce the use of default inputs.

***Question 35*** *- To what extent do you agree or disagree with these proposals to improve compliance?*

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Neither agree nor disagree
Agree
Strongly agree

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning or other ways to improve compliance and provide any evidence to support your view.*

***Question 36*** *- To what extent do you agree or disagree that penalties should be increased?*

Strongly disagree
Disagree
Neither agree nor disagree
Agree
Strongly agree

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.*

***Question 37*** *- If penalties were to increase, how much should current penalties increase by?*

Don’t know
No increase
Inflation adjusted increase Doubling
Other
*If you wish, please explain your reasoning or other ways to improve compliance and provide any evidence to support your view.*

***Question 38*** *- When should penalties be imposed for non-compliance with Energy Performance of Buildings Regulations (EPBR) requirements?*

Don’t know
At 6 months (no increase)
At 12 months
At 18 months
Following more than 18 months

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.*

***Question 39*** *- What are your views on changing the current allocation of responsibilities for enforcing Energy Performance of Buildings Regulations (EPBR)?*

We do not have strong views about this, other than: whoever ends up responsible, needs to be provided with suitable resources and training. We have received recommendations that, as EPCs are used in various policies, including MEES, enforcement should be coordinated and, ideally, carried out by the same body.

***Question 40*** *- There is a proposal for a new penalty charge fine amount of £800 for non- compliance with the requirement to have an ACIR for systems with an effective rated output over 12kW.*

To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal?
~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
Neither agree nor disagree
~~Agree~~
~~Strongly agree~~

*If you wish, please explain your reasoning and provide any evidence to support your view.*

While we support the need to enforce compliance, care must be taken not to discourage the installation of heat pump systems, therefore an incremental approach should be taken, alongside an awareness campaign among users and supply chains.

***Question 41*** *- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to redesign the structure of ACIRs?*

~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
Neither agree nor disagree
~~Agree~~
~~Strongly agree~~

***Question 42*** *- What should be included in a redesigned report?*

It is not clear from the proposals whether refrigerant type and charge, as well as information relevant to likely leak or other reasons for emissions (e.g. recent re-charge and maintenance) would continue to be included in the ACIR – they must.
There is not an “any other comment” question in the consultation, so we include this note here as it relates to ACIRs: the ACIRs are available through property search on the register, but not in bulk through the Open Data site (while EPCs and DECs are). They should be, as they have a lot of value to industry, policy-makers and researchers. There are few sources of information, for example, about refrigerants and likely leaks and associated emissions, so the ACIRs could contribute to filling that information gap.

***Question 43*** *- To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to add a cost metric in the assessment methodology for ACIRs?*

~~Strongly disagree~~
~~Disagree~~
Neither agree nor disagree
~~Agree~~
~~Strongly agree~~

***Question 44*** *- If you agree to including a cost metric, what would be the most suitable data on air conditioning system output to use in the calculation and how could it be obtained? Please comment both on data quality, suitability and likely availability.*

***Question 45*** *- If you agree to including a cost metric, what would be the most suitable data on electricity prices to use in the calculation? Please comment both on data quality, suitability and likely availability.*

***Question 46*** *- Please let us know if you have any evidence on the rate of voluntary implementation of recommendations made in EPCs.*

We are not aware of such evidence - maybe this is no bad thing in the current state of EPC recommendations reports, since based on a UCL study, not a single EPC recommends changing from a boiler to a heat pump... What CIBSE do have is repeated feedback from industry that recommendations are not relevant, or considered detrimental and not implemented. We recommend this is addressed as part of wider plans for Building Passports, where recommendations would be the result of more substantial and better informed assessments of both the existing building, and the occupant's needs and plans.

***Question 47*** *- Please let us know if you have any comments on the regulatory or equalities impact assessments presented alongside this consultation, in particular, are there any impacts on groups with protected characteristics that we have not identified in the equalities impact assessment?*

***Question 48*** *- Please let us know if you have any comments on the impact assessment in general, including any evidence you have on the impact of these proposed reforms.*