

Reply form

| | |
|--|--|
| Name: | RACHEL BROWN (CEO) |
| Email address: | rachel@sustainable.org.nz |
| Organisation: | SUSTAINABLE BUSINESS NETWORK (SBN) |
| Please identify your sector: | |
| What are your views on the objective of this proposal? Do you agree or disagree with it? Why? | SBN strongly supports the objective for EECA to have more flexibility in the allocation of funding so that activities can focus on areas that will have the greatest impact, such as transport (i.e. support a wider range of activities that encourage, promote and support energy efficiency, energy conservation and the use of renewable sources of energy for climate change mitigation). |
| What do you think is the appropriate balance between ‘administrative simplicity/transparency’ and the ‘causer or beneficiary pays’ and ‘rationality’ criteria? Should more weight be given to one over the others? | All criteria are important, but our view is that causer pays and beneficiary pays are most important. |
| Which option do you think provides the best balance? | OPTION 3A |
| What is your preferred option? | OPTION 3A |
| Why do you consider this the best option? | It meets the objective most strongly, and also is strongly aligned with the ‘causer pays’ and ‘beneficiary pays’ principles, because it recovers costs from the vast majority of the energy users. |
| Of the options you do not prefer, what issues or reasons do you think are most important for us to consider? | Other options either do not meet the objective as strongly, and/or have weaker causer and beneficiary pays attributes. |
| Are there other options for providing transparency in the use of levy money (besides requiring annual consultation and reporting)? | No specific comments – additional review and reporting would improve transparency. |