

Privacy of natural persons

Page 2: Privacy statement

Q1

Yes

I have read and understand the Privacy Statement above.
Please select 'Yes' if you wish to continue

Page 3: Submission information

Q2

What is your name?

Leana Hunt

Q3

Yes, I give consent to my name being published

Do you consent to your name being published with your submission?

Q4

What is your email address? Please note this will not be published with your submission.

Privacy of natural persons

Q5

Organisation

Are you submitting as an individual or on behalf of an organisation?

Page 4: Submitting on behalf of an organisation

Q6

Yes, I am authorised to make a submission on behalf of my organisation

If on behalf of an organisation, we require confirmation you are authorised to make a submission on behalf of this organisation.

Q7

What is your organisation's name? Please note this will be published with your submission.

Habitat for Humanity Northern Region

Q8

Registered charity

Which of these best describes your organisation? Please tick one.

Page 5: Confidentiality

Q9

No, my submission may be published in its entirety

I would like my submission or parts of my submission to be kept confidential

Page 6: Please upload a publishable version of your submission

Q10

Respondent skipped this question

Please provide your reasons and grounds under section 9 of the Official Information Act that you believe apply, for consideration by MBIE.

Q11

Respondent skipped this question

Please provide publishable versions of your submission in both Word and in PDF by uploading them here - clearly labelling both "for publication"

Page 7: SECTIONS OF INTEREST

Q12

**HEALTH OF THE HOME KETE,
KNOWLEDGE AND NAVIGATION KETE**

Which sections would you like to provide feedback on?

Page 8: HEALTH OF THE HOME KETE

Q13

Somewhat

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy HH1?

Q14

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy HH1. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks or limitations associated with this strategy.

As the report notes there are a range of healthy homes-related programmes and initiatives that are all informed by (and seek to help address directly and indirectly) households facing energy hardship and its health and wellbeing impacts. There are those funded by government agencies (Te Whatu Ora/HHI, TPK, MBIE, WKH, etc), those funded by local government (e.g. Auckland Council's To Kaianga Whare), and those such as Curtain Call that are provider-driven and are not directly funded.

Investments to coordinate, strengthen and expand all of these programmes is necessary, enhancing the broader, interconnected wellbeing outcomes that contribute to energy hardship and emissions reductions. Limiting the focus on WKH alone will create unnecessary competition and hierarchies in the sector, particularly in the NGO space who are all delivering the same Kaupapa and undertaking complementary mahi, regardless of the funding agency or policy outcome directives.

Q15

Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to address the challenge explained above? If so, please share these below.

What is required is enhanced, strategic coordination of these programmes through a 'whole of government' approach, so that policy, funding, delivery, monitoring and review is aligned and works to achieve the overarching goal of 'healthy homes' for more people in Aotearoa.

This can be enabled from the combined learnings and wealth of experience held by providers across the Motu, who have been delivering these various healthy-homes and energy hardship-related programmes for many years. At the provider level, we know that all healthy homes-related programmes not just WKH are contributing to the issue of energy hardship, alongside other health and wellbeing impacts. Our combined understanding of these programmes and their interventions - what is working or needed to address issues and effects of energy hardship to achieve healthy homes – is a fundamental starting point that should inform a whole of government, coordinated approach.

A focus on strengthening and expanding a coordinated, wider range of programmes (WKH, HHI, repairs, etc), not only will reach and support more households in need but will enhance the collaborative environment for providers on the ground to work together and leverage our assets, deep community connections and supplier relationships more effectively.

As per KN1 – we contend a provider-led “energy wellbeing sector network”, rather than government-led, would provide knowledge and collaboration necessary to develop this integrated and coordinated approach.

Q16

Yes

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy HH2?

Q17

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy HH2 . For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

This is a key, front-end strategy for housing providers and NGOs working in the energy hardship and healthy homes space that is currently not well-acknowledged, funded or enabled by policy and legislation but needs to be. It is an intervention largely dominated by the private building sector which means those low and medium-income families, who need critical home repairs and maintenance the most, are excluded from support. There is huge demand on but limited capacity among community housing providers, such as Habitat for Humanity.

A large proportion of the households Habitat supports require critical repairs and maintenance support to improve the weathertightness, health and energy usage of their homes. Retro-fitting with draught excluders, insulation, curtains, heat pumps and other interventions, in all these cases help but do not address the root causes of damp, mould, unsafe and energy inefficient homes. Building repair and maintenance work is fundamental to addressing energy hardship but is also critical to achieving the many other healthy homes outcomes that are required. Those in energy hardship are also those who are unable to pay for home repairs – it is a self-reinforcing cycle which needs to be addressed.

Habitat for Humanity's Home Repair Programme receives some funding from Te Puni Kokiri and enables us to support Māori whānau who own their own home with a focus on elderly or those with disabilities who are not able to afford critical repairs. We are one of few non-profit housing providers in the country providing this service.

Habitat works with the whānau to address the most urgent needs of the home against their affordability and undertakes the work. Alongside fixing issues related to weather-tightness, accessibility, heating/cooling, and safety, we provide home maintenance workshops designed to empower whānau to maintain their investment. We have access to an interest free BNZ loan that whānau can utilise to pay back repairs at an affordable rate based on their household income. However, under CCCFA legislation we cannot charge these families for our operational costs to offer the service (nor can they afford it). These costs include the sometimes significant support to complete the application form, financial assessment, quoting, contracting, as well as job sign off.

HRP is a time and resource-consuming process but is proven to work and is cost-effective. Impact Lab's Social Return on Investment report shows our HRP provides a significant social value return ratio of \$1:\$5.50.

The lack of government attention and funding, other than TPK, in this space means that we and other community providers, find it difficult to work with non-Māori households, although we know there is desperate need throughout our communities, particularly Pasifika, disabled and our increasingly ageing population. There is limited access to further philanthropic funding to build provider programme and operational capacity to expand reach and support. Home retrofit programme support/ funding should ensure it is flexible enough to meet individual whānau needs and should focus on making homes eligible for HH1.

Q18

Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to address the challenge explained above? If so, please share these below.

We would like the strategy HH2 to specifically address the imperative of home repair and maintenance, not as a secondary, nice to have but as an imperative, integrated part of the solution.

In our experience, the scale and level, as well as unaffordable cost of repairs that are needed by vulnerable households facing energy hardship and poor health and wellbeing is under-emphasised in the wording of HH2 but is considered in the narrative as a “fundamental component of addressing energy hardship in Aotearoa”. A deliberate multi-sector strategy to collaborate to gather data, undertake research, change policy, legislation and fund programmes dedicated to external and internal home repairs and maintenance is desperately needed.

We strongly encourage home repairs programmes to be prioritized and funded through a whole of government approach that is also coordinated with the various healthy homes programmes, including WKH. This should acknowledge and target the wide range of repair needs and issues faced by both homeowners and landlords/tenants that corresponds with the age, condition and disrepair, particularly older housing stock. There is a spectrum of type and scale of repair from critical and major structural works (such as roofing) to improvement and general maintenance work (such as broken windows, ill-fitting doors). To understand this spectrum and the work and costs involved, it would be beneficial for providers and stakeholders to collaborate in the proposed sector network to scope these and other issues to inform funding and programme expansion.

We believe home repairs is a parallel, sister programme that should be funded separately to a coordinated suite of healthy homes programmes such as WKH and HHI, etc, given the specific building knowledge, electrical, plumbing and compliance regulations and legislation that are involved in this type of work. A separate repairs funding and programme stream must focus upon building provider capacity and capability; one that understands and covers the entire operational costs that providers of repairs programmes such as Habitat face but are not able to recover; and one that looks to sustainably build skills development, training and apprenticeships as part of the programme delivery. There is a need for more certified and skilled tradies and builders, particularly in rural and provincial regions dedicated to work with us as housing providers – this home repairs space would be an ideal training ground for a younger generation.

Again, a provider-led “energy wellbeing sector network” to inform and co-design this funding programme would provide the knowledge in this space (see commentary for KN1).

Q19

Yes

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy HH3?

Q20

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy HH3. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

This is a key strategy. Landlord compliance levels are not well known and anecdotally appear to be low from Habitat's experience delivering HHI. However, in our conversations with landlords, to request consent for HHI interventions, we have only advisory weight and have no 'power' to support landlord compliance with the Healthy Homes Standards. Delays to enforcing the Healthy Homes legislation have removed the urgency for private rentals to attain the standards and there has been less attention and narrative in the media. It would be beneficial if government would fund independent assessments, monitoring and compliance of landlords to meet the standards.

As a HHI provider, we also work with tenants, advising them of landlord obligations and the Healthy Homes standards. Most are aware of the standards but sometimes feel unable or unwilling to address the issue with landlords. In most cases, tenants are time and resource poor to address landlord compliance through the tenancy tribunal. Compliance will be ineffective if the system relies on tenants. There may be a case to be made for compliance and monitoring to be inserted at the tenancy agreement stage – where tenancy agreements (and renewals) identify compliance with the standards and identify issues, timelines and legally-binding agreements for resolution between tenant and landlord. Again, monitoring and compliance need to be managed and signed off by external agencies and not the landlords/property managers themselves.

We note that tenancy management companies, such as Real Estate agencies, are more likely to ensure private rental properties are compliant. There are opportunities to engage them in collaborative discussions in the sector.

Information regarding healthy homes standards and how compliance issues are communicated needs to be considered. This is also an issue with regards to foreign landlords who maintain management of the property, especially for those who are hard to reach.

In addition, available education for landlords and property managers around the benefits to their investments would be beneficial as we need their buy in to not only repair immediate issues around the home, but also maintain the property long term.

In our experience there is a disconnection between companies offering HHS compliance checks. There needs to be some consistency between how properties are being monitored, and re-check times. e.g. Annual HHS Checks required.

Q21

Yes

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy HH4?

Q22

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy HH4. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

We agree that "it is critical to shift the burden of enforcing HHS away from vulnerable tenants and volunteer organisations". However, it should be noted that housing providers are also key advocates and play a significant role in delivering these support services as part of our programme delivery – costs and time and skills that we have to build-in and have to seek additional funding to undertake. For example, many of our community workshops to support healthy homes, energy efficiency education among whanau are key but additional strategies.

Q23

Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to address the challenge explained above? If so, please share these below.

One effective strategy is that community organisations, including churches and Marae, who work directly with households through family and social services supports and are able to communicate and help tenants and households be aware and understand the standards and legislation, as well as their rights and the obligations of landlords.

This is an opportunity to utilise existing grassroots groups to access and provide deeper, ongoing engagement into our communities and households that are difficult to reach, particularly Māori, Pasifika and other ethnic and minority groups. Advocacy and support services for tenants will only be effective if tenant households know their rights and entitlements in the first place. There is a case for these rights and obligations, including energy saving advice, to be succinctly documented in the various ethnic languages for distribution by churches and community groups, as well as financial support for these trusted community organisations to undertake this work (see HH3, HH5, KN4, 5, 6 for further connections regarding this issue).

As above, it would be beneficial if government would fund independent assessments, monitoring and compliance of landlords to meet the standards, as well as financial tax-related incentives for compliance to relieve the burden on tenants and volunteer/ community-based organisations.

Q24

Yes

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy HH5?

Q25

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy HH5. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

Habitat supports consumer choice and energy efficient household appliances should be an option for whānau. Anecdotally, we know many households lack awareness of energy saving appliances or their eligibility to receive means-tested support from MSD.

Of key importance, alongside energy efficient appliances are curtains. These are a basic necessity that would reduce heating and energy costs in general and are arguably of equal importance, bigger bang for the buck – relatively cost-effective strategy, than energy saving appliances. Providers, including Habitat, are recommending that curtains are included in the Healthy Homes standards and legislation as a priority, an intervention that is part of the HHI suite of interventions and in high demand that we struggle to supply due to lack of direct funding and the capacity constraints curtain banks such as Habitat operate are under.

It could be considered whether landlords, as part of HHS compliance processes, be encouraged to provide energy saving devices as part of rental agreements that could be incentivised through financial/ tax pathways.

Q26

Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to address the challenge explained above? If so, please share these below.

Of key importance, alongside energy efficient appliances are curtains. These are a basic necessity that would reduce heating and energy costs in general and are arguably of equal importance, and a relatively cost-effective strategy, than energy saving appliances. Providers are recommending that curtains are included in the HHS legislation as a priority. Such an intervention is already being delivered as part of the HHI programme and should be specifically funded and supported alongside energy efficient appliances.

There should also be alignment with other energy efficiency and healthy home programmes so that the impacts from these interventions are maximised.

Access to energy saving appliances creates downstream issues regarding the cost to households and the environment of removal and recycling for older, unwanted appliances, so this aspect should also be considered.

Q27

Are there any other key challenges and/or corresponding solutions relating to HEALTH OF THE HOME KETE that we have missed? If so, please outline these below.

Curtains are missing and should be included within the interventions for HH1 and HH2 and within the Healthy Homes Standards.

Role of the ecosystem of family, health, and service providers in local communities in accessing and raising awareness of issues, including referral pathways and information/ knowledge/ sharing of household situations. They provide a source of community intelligence and connection alongside housing providers, energy wellbeing networks and specific HHI, WKH providers and their integration into the solutions in this and the Knowledge and Navigation Kete should be considered as part of a collaborative strategy proposed by our submission.

Without a well-resourced and appropriately governed network many of these recommendations will be implemented in silos (within Government, local government and/or the energy sector) and will therefore be at considerable risk of being inefficient or will miss large sections of our communities they were intended to support.

Robust and considered monitoring and evaluation systems need to be aligned with the network and across all kete to ensure actions are having the intended result, and to analyse grouped up data.

Page 9: KNOWLEDGE AND NAVIGATION KETE

Q28

Yes

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy KN1?

Q29

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy KN1. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

Given much of the commentary above, Habitat suggest that such a network is provider-led and funded in ways that do not reinforce reliance on voluntary contributions of providers to participate and play this lead role. Government agencies should be participants and tasked with delivering solutions recommended by the network.

There already exists solid and effective collaboration among providers in the sector. Habitat is a member of the Community Energy Network, comprising 18 key providers who work in regions throughout Aotearoa. CEN members and others contribute our time voluntarily to wider discussions and mahi because it is a valuable and effective resource. Collaboration and coordination exists, it just needs to be strengthened through resourcing. We do not agree that a formal, government-led network would do any better than a community/ provider-led network.

We would recommend the network has the ability to co-ordinate and implement programmes regionally, linked nationally for wider understanding and sharing learnings.

Many community organisations work with Māori and Pacific communities and adhere to Treaty-based and Pasifika delivery models and we operate under the assumption that what is good for Māori and Pasifika is good for the rest of society and our vulnerable households and communities.

Habitat welcomes Māori and Pacific provider leadership and partnership alongside mainstream providers, whether this is through co-networks collaborating or one network working together.

CEN is a positive starting point on which to build, there are high levels of trust, information sharing, shared work programmes (such as consistency in qualitative survey development, data gathering and data sharing), collegiality and mutual support that exists.

Community-led and provider-led networks, when supported effectively by government resources, do a job that government cannot – collective intelligence on mutual kaupapa's and ways of working that work well in our regions and local communities, understanding of the different and often complex variables and nuances that are faced by different households and regions we all work with. Providers need to be resourced with capacity to lead.

Q30

Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to address the challenge explained above? If so, please share these below.

Whilst Habitat agree with the broad agenda of the Network on p37, as noted above, this network should largely lead deliberation on strategies for improved coordination on issues covered in HH1 – HH5 and KN1- KN6 and, where relevant, other strategies outlined in this Panel Discussion Paper. MBIE should fund community providers to lead and would bring together and involve a range of relevant government departments and agencies (TPK, Te Whatu Ora, EECA, MBIE, etc) like the membership of the existing Energy Hardship Reference Panel and the Energy Wellbeing Evaluation Consortium.

Q31

Don't know/not sure

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy KN2?

Q32

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy KN2. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

Having a well-coordinated training system is critical to ensure that all parties delivering training opportunities have access to the same technical grounding. This will ensure whānau have consistent messaging which is reinforced over time.

Q33

Yes

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy KN3?

Q34

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy KN3. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

This is supported and has the potential to add significant value to an area of the energy hardship sector that is currently very poorly resourced. Again, this needs to be well supported by the education strategy so that resources are provided for the most effective and efficient programmes.

Q35

Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to address the challenge explained above? If so, please share these below.

Q36

Yes

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy KN4?

Q37

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy KN4. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

Habitat supports this proposal for an Energy Wellbeing Education Strategy. However, it is important to note that providers will be those with a key role in delivering its outcomes, in particular helping tenants and landlords engage with, understand and act upon the information. As such, providers should be involved to ensure the strategy supports all educational elements of energy hardship and how they relate to or are interrelated with our programme delivery across WKH, HHI, repairs etc. The strategy development should be informed by the integrated and coordinated approach outlined in the previous Kete. Education support is a key part of our programme delivery and is a determinant of success.

Habitat supports this strategy to be developed in collaboration as a codesign process that would be most effectively completed as one of the functions of the Energy Wellbeing Sector Network's work programme.

Q38

Yes

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy KN5?

Q39

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy KN5. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

This could be an outcome of the education strategy. This could also be the portal for providing ongoing analysis and reports that would be possible through a significantly improved and sector wide monitoring and evaluation platform. Could be updated and maintained by the network.

Habitat would also suggest that, whilst online, web-based information is becoming increasingly used as the go-to solution, many vulnerable families either struggle with data connection and device use (particularly older Pasifika and Māori) and do not know this information is available or how to find it. It would be beneficial that such a portal is well-communicated through grassroots community organisations, such as churches and marae. Again, ensuring information is available in as many relevant languages to Māori, Pasifika and other ethnic/ minority groups would be appropriate.

Q40

Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to address the challenge explained above? If so, please share these below.

Q41

Yes

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy KN6?

Q42

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy KN6. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

This has the opportunity to be highly impactful. An important feature of this work is that people and organisations from outside the retail sector are brought in to be part of the group that completes this work. The bills and information do not have to look exactly the same but should contain the same information so whānau (and supporting community groups) can make informed decisions and easily understand the information.

Q43

Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to address the challenge explained above? If so, please share these below.

Q44

Are there any other key challenges and/or corresponding solutions relating to KNOWLEDGE AND NAVIGATION KETE that we have missed? If so, please outline these below.

We should be building on the existing knowledge and expertise of programmes that are working well, and learning from those that have not.

Q45

Respondent skipped this question

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy AC1?

Q46

Respondent skipped this question

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy AC1. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

Q47

Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to address the challenge explained above? If so, please share these below.

Q48

Respondent skipped this question

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy AC2?

Q49

Respondent skipped this question

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy AC2. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

Q50

Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to address the challenge explained above? If so, please share these below.

Q51

Respondent skipped this question

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy AC3?

Q52

Respondent skipped this question

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy AC3. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

Q53

Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to address the challenge explained above? If so, please share these below.

Q54

Respondent skipped this question

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy AC4?

Q55

Respondent skipped this question

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy AC4. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

Q56

Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to address the challenge explained above? If so, please share these below.

Q57

Respondent skipped this question

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy AC5?

Q58

Respondent skipped this question

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy AC5. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

Q59

Respondent skipped this question

Please share your comments on each of the social retailing options listed above. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with these options.

Q60

Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to address the challenge explained above? If so, please share these below.

Q61

Respondent skipped this question

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy AC6?

Q62

Respondent skipped this question

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy AC6. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

Q63

Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to address the challenge explained above? If so, please share these below.

Q64

Respondent skipped this question

Are there any other key challenges and/or corresponding solutions relating to ENERGY ACCESSIBILITY AND CHOICE KETE that we have missed? If so, please outline these below.

Page 11: ENERGY AFFORDABILITY KETE

Q65

Respondent skipped this question

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy AF1?

Q66

Respondent skipped this question

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy AF1. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

Q67

Respondent skipped this question

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy AF2?

Q68

Respondent skipped this question

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy AF2. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

Q69

Respondent skipped this question

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy AF3?

Q70

Respondent skipped this question

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy AF3. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

Q71

Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to address the challenge explained above? If so, please share these below.

Q72

Respondent skipped this question

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy AF4?

Q73

Respondent skipped this question

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy AF4. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

Q74

Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to address the challenge explained above? If so, please share these below.

Q75

Respondent skipped this question

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy AF5?

Q76

Respondent skipped this question

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy AF5. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

Q77

Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to address the challenge explained above? If so, please share these below.

Q78

Respondent skipped this question

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy AF6?

Q79

Respondent skipped this question

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy AF6. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

Q80

Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to address the challenge explained above? If so, please share these below.

Q81

Respondent skipped this question

Are there any other key challenges and/or corresponding solutions relating to the ENERGY AFFORDABILITY KETE that we have missed? If so, please outline these below.

Page 12: CONSUMER PROTECTION KETE

Q82

Respondent skipped this question

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy CP1?

Q83

Respondent skipped this question

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy CP1. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

Q84

Respondent skipped this question

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy CP2?

Q85

Respondent skipped this question

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy CP2. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

Q86

Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to address the challenge explained above? If so, please share these below.

Q87

Respondent skipped this question

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy CP3?

Q88 Respondent skipped this question

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy CP3. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

Q89 Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to address the challenge explained above? If so, please share these below.

Q90 Respondent skipped this question

Do you broadly support the proposed strategy CP4?

Q91 Respondent skipped this question

Please share your comments on the proposed strategy CP4. For example, you could include your thoughts on any benefits, costs, risks, limitations associated with this strategy.

Q92 Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any alternative suggestions on how to address the challenge explained above? If so, please share these below.

Q93 Respondent skipped this question

Are there any other key challenges and/or corresponding solutions relating to the CONSUMER PROTECTION KETE that we have missed? If so, please outline these below.

Page 13: Are there any other sections you would like to respond to?

Q94 No, I would like to continue onto the final questions

Please tick yes if you would like to go back and respond to any further sections

Page 14: Supporting Environment

Q95

Do you have any comments on the Supporting Environment section? Please share these below.

Agree the Energy Wellbeing Evaluation Consortium is a positive example of a collaborative forum. The Community Energy Network is another good example and are participants of the EWEC, this would benefit from a more formalised role and funding. Getting the right data and insights is critical and need to be measured over time. Support collaborative service models and leadership and coordination sections.

Page 15: Any other thoughts or comments

Q96

Respondent skipped this question

Do you have any other thoughts or comments you would like to make on the Expert Panel's Discussion Paper? If so, please share these below.
