

	Question 1		Question 2		Comments
	Yes	No	(a)	(b)	
1 Primary	✓			✓	We are keen to take responsibility for our own carbon reduction as we are an energy efficient school
2 Primary	✓			✓	The site at our School is very complicated with 5 users. The school must not pay the costs for the rest of the site. How will this be achieved?
3 Primary		✓	✓		It is not clear on whether the starting point is fixed for all schools based on type or whether this is about improvement to the existing CO2 emissions. If it is fixed this is potentially unfair as building structure, insulation, type and age of heating all have an impact on the CO2 emissions. Is this only considering CO2 emissions for the physical building or the total CO2 for the entity of the school?
4 Primary		✓	✓		We strongly feel that individual charging of schools is an unfair way of gathering CRC costs because; Schools with older buildings will be unfairly penalised as they will have poorer insulation and less efficient heating/lighting systems; Schools that have already reduced carbon use (like us) will receive no credit for our actions taken over the last two years; There is little LA support to help us analyse our carbon usage and to make further savings. eg ongoing support for the Energy Saving Dashboard
5 Primary	✓			✓	Although currently as a school we would probably benefit more financially by ticking 'No' to question (1), as our school is old, heating inefficient, therefore carbon emissions greater than some more modern schools, we believe schools will be more committed to reducing their emissions if directly accountable for same. This, in turn, will reduce overall costs to the LA, which should hopefully benefit everyone.
6 Primary	✓		✓		If schools have to pay directly from their budget, it will make them more likely to monitor consumption and work to reduce usage
7 Secondary		✓		✓	The whole scheme is flawed. There is no incentive to reduce financial liability.
8 Secondary (Academy)	✓		✓		I think Academies would have to be invoiced but if another cheaper payment method could be introduced I would be in favour of it – anything to keep costs down.
9 Secondary (Academy)		✓	✓		While we are taking all steps to reduce our energy consumption and save our carbon footprint eg with solar panels, this is a very old school with disproportionately high energy costs because: there is no double glazing in much of the school, there is minimal thermal insulation in the older roofs, there are only 316 students for a school that can accommodate 535, The impact on the school of the preferred option will therefore be disproportionately large.
10 Secondary	✓			✓	We would appreciate being a part of any discussion and/or consultation that will result in energy savings. We would, for example, very much appreciate assistance with the installation of PV's and other such technology that will reduce consumption and potentially generate an income stream for the School. Being within a deficit budget makes such an investment extremely difficult to achieve despite its merits.
11 Secondary		✓		✓	There are two reasons for our stated views. Firstly, there is a lack of transparency about the way in which the burden of this levy is being distributed on all schools (including those who are applying for, or who have received academy status). Secondly, there is a significant difference in the energy efficiency of schools owing to the location and quality of build and age of schools. Clearly this gives rise to potential inequities where the thermo efficiency of some schools supports the inefficiency of others.