

Response ID ANON-KJ16-JNR9-Y

Submitted to Consultation Impact Analysis: Condensation mitigation measures
Submitted on 2024-07-01 22:55:24

Privacy Collection Statement

1 Important: Please ensure that you have read and understood the below statements before proceeding

Yes, I have read and understood the privacy collection statement.

2 By making a submission on this consultation you agree to the collection of the information you provide in your submission; and the use and disclosure of the information you provide in your submission as outlined above.

Publish response

Personal Information

3 What is your name?

Name:
Trevor Lee

4 What is your email address?

Email:
trevor.lee@exemplary.com.au

5 What is the name of your organisation?

Organisation:
Exemplary Energy

6 Please select your State or Territory

State or Territory:
ACT

7 Which best describes your industry sector?

Specialist - energy efficiency

If other, please specify:

Condensation mitigation survey questions

8 Do you agree with the assumptions used for estimating the prevalence and occurrence of condensation and mould issues?

No

Please explain your answer and provide any additional information to support your view.:

The analysis does not use the weather and climate data compiled directly from the records of the Bureau of Meteorology to include coincident hourly precipitation data (mostly rainfall) in the simulations of building component performance.

See the peer reviewed publication uploaded with these comments. Dario Tarquini, Trevor Lee, David Ferrari, "Improving Australian Weather and Climate Data Services", Asia Pacific Solar Research Conference, Newcastle, 2022

9 Do you agree with the approach to measuring the costs and benefits of the options including the input assumptions/parameters used in chapter 2 of the report?

Not Answered

Please indicate what alternative parameters / methodology you suggest be considered below.:

10 The cost-benefit analysis covers two scenarios regarding the mitigation of condensation risks in the external walls of residential and residential-like buildings: drained and vented cavity and no cavity. The analysis assumes the proportion of external walls with a drained and vented cavity is 25% and with no cavity is 75%. Is this a reasonable assumption for the proportion of external walls with a drained and vented cavity and with no cavity?

Not Answered

Q10b - The share of drained & vented cavity:

Please provide any evidence/data regarding the proportion of external walls with a drained and vented cavity: :

11 The direct benefits are estimated on the basis of avoided rectification costs. On pages 17-18 of the report, there is a discussion on the costs in relation to the type and extent of damage. Do you agree with the assumption that the cost to rectify damage is proportional to the construction costs in Table 5?

Not Answered

If no, please explain your answer and provide any additional information to support your view.:

12 The indirect benefits from avoided adverse health impacts are the largest driver of the benefits (around 85%). These indirect benefits have been quantified using Population Attributable Fractions (PAF) in combination with Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) and the Value of a Statistical Life Year (VoSLY). Do you agree with these results, particularly those in Table 14 (page 33)?

Not Answered

Please provide any feedback on the results below:

13 In some climate zones (2, 3 and 4), which are warmer (non-tropical) climates, costs associated with proposed changes outweigh benefits, even though the benefits are greater than costs at the national level. Tell us whether we should still consider including the proposed provisions in climate zones 2, 3 and 4?

Not Answered

Please provide information to support your answer below.:

14 Are there any other assumptions or parameters that should be included in the sensitivity or breakeven analysis? This is outlined in chapter 3 (pages 35-40).

Not Answered

Please provide information to support your answer below.:

15 Do you have any other evidence that would make the estimates in the analysis more robust?

Yes

If yes, please provide additional evidence below.:

See my answer to Q8.

Upload file:

APSRC_Improving_Weather_Data_v2.pdf was uploaded