

# NSW Energy Saving Scheme

Response to 2018-2019 Rule Change Consultation  
Paper

August 2019

## Executive Summary

Emerald Planet (EP) welcomes the opportunity to respond to this Consultation Paper on the ESS 2018-2019 Rule Change. As a committed long standing supplier of product into ESS and other state energy efficiency programs, EP feels the consultation process is a valuable part of ensuring the scheme maintains its integrity and incentivises genuine energy savings for home and businesses.

This document summarises our response to the questions posed in the Consultation Paper.

Question	EP Response
Question 1: Do you agree with the proposed transitional arrangement? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.	Yes, the proposed transition plan is inline with the process of previous Rule reviews and allows sufficient time for feedback and planning from industry.
Question 2: Is this approximate three-month timeframe sufficient for preparing your business to be ready to comply with the new ESS rule? If not, what timeframe do you deem necessary?	Yes, we feel this transition period is sufficient for us to plan.
Question 3: Can you foresee any particular part of the new ESS Rule for which it will be difficult to get 'business-ready' within the proposed timeframe?	No, not based on the current information
Question 4: Do you agree with the proposed changes to Table A26? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.	We can't see any negative impact from this change.
Question 5: Do you agree with the proposed changes to Section 5.4(i)(ii)? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.	EP cannot offer feedback on this change, as it is not part of the scheme we participate in
Question 6: Do you perceive any significant impacts, either positive or	As above

negative, associated with increasing the ESS cap on generating systems from 5MW to 30MW?	
Question 7: Do you agree with the proposed updates to Equation 1 in Clause 6.5? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.	We have no feedback on this change
Question 8: Do you agree with the proposed updates to Clause 6.8? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.	EP cannot offer feedback on this change, as it is not part of the scheme we participate in
Question 9: Do you agree with the proposed changes to Clause 7A.1? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.	EP cannot offer feedback on this change, as it is not part of the scheme we participate in
Question 10: Do you agree with the proposed changes to Measurement Procedures of the PIAM&V method? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.	EP cannot offer feedback on this change, as it is not part of the scheme we participate in
Question 11: Do you have any specific concerns in relation to the cut-off date of 17 February 2020?	EP cannot offer feedback on this change, as it is not part of the scheme we participate in
Question 13: Do you agree with the proposed changes to Clause 7A.16 of the PIAM&V method? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.	EP cannot offer feedback on this change, as it is not part of the scheme we participate in
Question 14: Do you agree with the proposed changes to the NABERS baseline method? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.	EP cannot offer feedback on this change, as it is not part of the scheme we participate in
Question 15: Would this change shift the market to the sale of these high efficiency appliances over appliances of a lower energy efficiency? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.	Whilst this is not a space EP operates in, in principle we would think that raising the efficiency benchmark for eligibility of appliances under SONA would encourage retailers to promote

	these appliances and would be a good thing for the program.
Question 16: Is the link between sales data and proposed changes to the grouping of appliances appropriate?	Again, this is not an area of expertise for us, but yes we would feel sales data is the best metric to measure the success of the SONA activity.
Question 17: Do you agree with the proposal to amend Activity Definition B5 to include refrigerators with more than two doors? Please provide reasoning	EP cannot offer feedback on this change, as it is not part of the scheme we participate in
Question 18: Do you agree with the proposed amendments to the space type and space type classifications? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.	EP agrees with the changes and in keeping consistency with the BCA code.
Question 19: Given the scope of these changes, is it your understanding that the three-month transitional period for being 'business-ready' is sufficient?	We don't see any issue with the transition period.
Question 20: Do you agree with the proposed change to the definition of maintained emergency lighting? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.	EP agrees with keeping the ESS consistent with AS/NZS 2293.1:2018 and therefore sees no problem in aligning the definition of Maintained Emergency lighting with the standard.
Question 21: Does the proposed change provide for all relevant qualified contractors to undertake the lighting upgrade works? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.	Yes, this should cover all relevant qualified installers for lighting
Question 22: Does the proposed change provide for all relevant qualified contractors to undertake the lighting upgrade works? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.	As above

<p>Question 23: Do you have any comments on proposed Activity Definition E13?</p>	<p>The inclusion of T5 tubes and adaptor kits in HEER is a welcome opportunity to deliver a much more robust, superior lighting outcome for a large number of end users.</p> <p>The parameters of the upgrade LED luminaire however, need to be addressed in order for this activity to be viable. As it stands (highest incentive coming from 3,500lm and &lt;30W), these photometrics are too bright for the replacement of ageing T5 incumbent lighting. The existing HEER requirements for replacement LEDs for T8 tubes, which are brighter than T5 tubes, are only 3000lm and &lt;25W,</p> <p>The photometric requirements for T5 replacement should not exceed the T8 requirement, if anything could be lowered in line with the expected light output of the existing T5 fittings - for example those T5 fittings with louvres to reduce glare. For example 2,500lm and 21W.</p>
<p>Question 24: How likely are you to use the proposed Activity Definition E13? Why/why not?</p>	<p>EP would be prepared to develop suitable product for E13, should the photometric requirements be changed to be more in line with realistic requirements for T5 replacement.</p>
<p>Question 25: Do you agree with the proposed definition as opposed to the current definition of the Implementation Date for HEER activities? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.</p>	<p>We can't see this change having any material impact on the ACPs and installers within HEER.</p>
<p>Question 26: Do you anticipate that this change would present any difficulties with being nominated and generating ESCs for a particular work program?</p>	<p>As above</p>

Question 27: Do you agree with combining lamp only magnetic and electronic transformers into a single category? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.	This would be a welcome change and would simplify the compliance requirements of MR16 lamps in HEER. The activity has traditionally been slow, despite the market opportunity, largely due to installer resistance and cost against the burden of compliance in this activity. Previous steps have been taken to reduce complexity, such as the easing of transformer compatibility testing on manufacturers and photograph requirements of installers, which have both been welcome.
Question 28: Would this change result in reduced administrative costs for your business?	This won't impact on EP's administrative costs, however we expect it would impact on cost and complexity for ACPs and installers in HEER.
Question 29: Do you agree with aligning the terminologies used in Schedule E? If not, please provide supporting evidence to justify your response.	No problem here
Question 30: Do you agree with the use of the 3-star rating, as defined within the 2019 Refrigerated Cabinets Determination, as a baseline for determining energy efficient status? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.	EP cannot offer feedback on this change, as it is not part of the scheme we participate in
Question 31: Do you agree with the proposed changes to Activity Definition F1? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.	EP cannot offer feedback on this change, as it is not part of the scheme we participate in
Question 32: Do you agree with the proposed changes to Activity Definition F4? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.	EP cannot offer feedback on this change, as it is not part of the scheme we participate in

Question 33: Do you agree that the removal of “and accepted by the Scheme Administrator” would make the activity easier to use? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.	EP cannot offer feedback on this change, as it is not part of the scheme we participate in
Question 34: Do you agree with updating and aligning this Activity Definition in line with the updates to the GEMS Determination 2018? Please provide reasoning supporting your response.	EP cannot offer feedback on this change, as it is not part of the scheme we participate in

## Changes to the Illumination Power Density (IPD) requirements under the National Construction Code (NCC) 2019 Part J6

The changes to IPD aim to increase restrictions on the power allowed for lighting in each space type from the existing 2016 NCC. Additional adjustment factors apply, with the intention of increasing well being and comfort, in addition to energy efficiency of lighting. They include:

- CCT
- CRI
- Control devices, such as sensors or dimmers

These changes will apply from 1<sup>st</sup> May 2020, or on a voluntary basis since 1<sup>st</sup> May 2019. Depending on space type, the changes range from roughly 14% to 85% reduction.

EP is a strong supporter of the alignment of ESS with standards aimed at increasing the quality and function of the lighting products involved and the quality of lighting outcome for the energy savers.

We must also consider however, how the requirements of these standards balance with the incentive for energy savers to upgrade to LED lighting, in particular the impact of the new IPD requirements on typical retrofit installs. ESS is based on retrofit installations and care needs to be taken to ensure the incentive provided to energy savers is sufficient to drive energy saving activities which may not otherwise occur.

The increased restrictions in allowable power for lighting in the 2019 NCC mean that some retrofit scenarios will likely be problematic, for example:

- T-bar office environments: if de-lamping is required to conform to the 2019 NCC, new ceiling tiles need to be procured to cover the holes of existing fittings. This adds cost and complexity to otherwise straightforward, cost-effective retrofits.
  - Many older offices have fittings spaced at intervals suited to older fluorescent tubes, (eg every second tile across, even every tile lengthways), which will be non-compliant using the new NCC code and require de-lamping
- Incentive is given in the 2019 NCC to lower CCT, particularly <4500K for the stated purpose of wellbeing. Market demand clearly demonstrates a preference for higher CCT in many commercial installations, for example 5000K and 5700K in offices. A push towards lower CCT will likely be met with resistance in the market.



- Equally, incentive is given to the presence of motion sensors on fittings, to further enhance energy savings. While sensors play an important role in some space types such as warehouses and car parks, care needs to be taken in applying sensors in office spaces. Poorly functioning sensors, usually prevalent when manufacturers are under price pressure to keep costs down, can deliver poor user experience - for example, low sensitivity to movement, non-configurable sensor parameters such as hold time being too short.
- High CRI >90 is another incentivised feature in the 2019 code, which is a possibility, but adds to product cost and limits fitting efficacy.
- Storage space types have an aggressive IPD requirement, reduced by up to 85% on the 2016 level.

Whilst we are an advocate for good rigor and high product standards within ESS, there is scope for concern in the new NCC requirements which we feel will adversely impact on the incentives for retrofit installs. We would be keen to understand DPIE's position on the new NCC requirements.

EP would be happy to provide further detail or clarification on any of the above information should this be required. Please contact Alex Pawsey on [alex@emeraldplanet.com.au](mailto:alex@emeraldplanet.com.au) or 0404 871 898.

Regards,

Alex Pawsey

General Manager  
Emerald Planet  
[alex@emeraldplanet.com.au](mailto:alex@emeraldplanet.com.au)  
02 9466 6071  
0404 871 898