#### RHI Evaluation Data Annex: Applicant Survey



The tables in this document present data from the RHI applicant survey referred to in the *RHI Evaluation First Integrated Report*. Some tables have not been included where they present a risk of disclosing the identity of survey respondents.

For more information on the methodology, see the *RHI Evaluation First Integrated Report: Technical Report.* 

Legend	
Unweighted base size lower than 50 responses	[x]
No responses	-
Less than 0.5% response	+

Industry sector by single vs multiple applicant (industry sector by BAC1)					
Base: All respondents with valid		Applicant survey			
	Single applicant	Multiple	e applicant	Total	
	%		%	%	
Agriculture	18		3	23	
Industrial	10		10	10	
Commercial & leisure	64		40	57	
Public	8		14	10	
Total	100		100	100	
Unweighted base	487		133	620	

Industry sector by respondent's role within organisation (industry sector by BAC3)						
Base: All respondents w	ith valid da	nta			Applicant	survey
	Owner	Executive/ Senior Management	Ma Ma Su	Middle nagement/ Line nagement/ upervisory	Individual Contributor/ Non- Management	Total
	%	%		%	%	%
Agriculture	28	15		10	[16]	23
Industrial	10	12		8	[14]	10
Commercial & leisure	60	53		41	[59]	57
Public	2	20		41	[11]	10
Total	100	100		100	[100]	100
Unweighted base	418	122		56	24	620

#### Technology type by number of employees in organisation (technology type by BAC9)

Base: All respondents with valid data		Applicant	survey		
	Fewer than 10	10 - 49	50 – 249	More than 250	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Other	+	2	2	-	1
Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP)	4	3	[6]	[7]	4
Solar Thermal	3	3	[10]	[17]	4
Solid Biomass Boiler	93	92	[82]	[76]	91
Unweighted bases	426	110	40	41	620

# Government Office Region by single vs. multiple applicant (Government Office Region by BAC1

Base: All respondents with valid data		Ар	olicant survey
	Single applicant	Multiple applicant	Total
	%	%	%
East	8	4	7
East Midlands	7	7	7
London and South East	11	3	9
North East	3	6	4
North West	8	11	9
Scotland	16	21	17
South East	10	2	8
South West	20	18	19
Wales	6	9	6
West Midlands	11	9	11
Yorkshire and the Humber	9	13	10
Unweighted bases	487	133	620

#### On/off gas grid by single vs. multiple applicant (On/off gas grid by BAC1)

Base: All respondents with valid data		Ар	olicant survey
	Single applicant	Multiple applicant	Total
	%	%	%
Off gas grid	74	71	73
On gas grid	26	29	27
Unweighted bases	487	133	620

Number of RHI installations applied for (BAC1)	
Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey
	%
1	70
2	14

3	5
4	3
5	1
6	2
7	1
8	2
9	+
10	+
11	+
12	+
16	+
23	+
50	+
80	+
100	+
Total	100
Unweighted base	620

Whether plans to apply for any other RHTs by number of RHI installations (BAC2 by BAC1)						
Base: All respondents with valid data Applicant survey						
	1	2	3-5	More than 6	Total	
	%	%	%	%	%	
Yes	24	39	[45]	[75]	32	
No	75	60	[55]	[25]	67	
Don't know	1	1	-	-	1	
Unweighted bases	487	60	43	30	620	

Respondent's level of responsibility by industry sector (BAC3 by industry sector)					
Base: All respondents with va	lid data			Applica	nt survey
	Agriculture	Industrial	Commercial & Leisure	Public	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Owner	81	[65]	72	17	68
Executive/Senior Management	12	[22]	17	38	18
Middle Management/Line Management/Supervisory	4	[8]	7	41	10
Individual Contributor/Non- Management	3	[5]	4	4	4
Unweighted bases	120	49	396	55	620

Respondent's department by number of employees (BAC4 by BAC9)

Base: if not 'owner' to BAC3	Applicar	nt survey		
	Fewer than 50	50 - 249	More than 250	Total
	%	%	%	%
Accounting or Finance	16	[14]	[5]	13
Administration or Management	54	[39]	[30]	46
Sales, marketing or communications	2	[3]	-	2
Operations, including estates, logistics and engineering	21	[40]	[61]	33
Other:	7	[3]	[5]	6
Unweighted bases	131	30	41	202

Role of organisation (BAC5)	
Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey
	%
Selected less than 5 answer options	26
Selected all 5 answer options	74
Total	100
Unweighted base	620

Role of organisation by single vs multiple applicant (BAC5 by BAC1)							
Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey						
	Single applicant	Multiple applicant	Total				
	%	%	%				
RHI applicant	93	95	93				
Owner of the RHT installation	88	83	87				
Recipient of the heat produced by the RHT	94	82	90				
Operator of the RHT installation	93	87	91				
Meter data provider	94	91	94				
Other	1	+	+				
Unweighted bases	487	133	620				

Number of employees in organisation by industry sector (BAC9 by industry sector)							
Base: All respondents with v		Applica	nt survey				
	Agriculture	Industrial	Commercial & Leisure	Commercial & Leisure Public			
	%	%	%	%	%		
Fewer than 10	80	[44]	75	19	68		
10 - 49	14	[38]	15	29	18		
50 - 249	4	[10]	5	18	6		
More than 250	3	[8]	5	35	7		
Don't know	-	-	1	-	+		
Unweighted bases	120	49	396	55	620		

Number of emplo	vees in organisati	on hy single vs	multiple applic	ant (BAC9 by BAC1)
runnoor or ompio	yees in organisati	on by single vo		

Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey				
	Single applicant	Multiple applicant	Total		
	%	%	%		
Fewer than 10	71	60	68		
10 - 49	18	19	18		
50 - 249	6	7	6		
More than 250	5	14	7		
Don't know	1	+	+		
Unweighted bases	487	133	620		

#### Number of employees in organisation by respondent's level of responsibility (BAC9 by BAC3)

Base: All respondents with valid data					Applican	t survey
	Owner	Executive/ Senior Management	Middle Management/ Line Management/ Supervisory		Individual Contributor/ Non- Management	Total
	%	%		%	%	%
Fewer than 10	83	42		14	[45]	68
10 - 49	13	35		26	[10]	18
50 - 249	3	12		16	[15]	6
More than 250	-	11		43	[30]	7
Don't know	1	-		-	-	+
Unweighted bases	418	122		56	24	620

## Government scheme that applies to organisation by whether claim feed-in tariff (BAC10 by BAC11)

Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey		
	Yes	No	Total
	%	%	%
Climate Change Agreements	10	3	6
The CRC Energy Efficiency Scheme, formerly the Carbon Reduction Commitment	11	5	8
The EU Emissions Trading Scheme	1	1	1
The Climate Change Levy	25	17	21
The Renewables Obligation	8	5	7
Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reporting	6	1	3
None of the above	65	76	71
Don't know	3	1	2
Unweighted bases	293	321	620

#### Whether claim feed in tariff by single vs multiple applicant (BAC11 by BAC1)

Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey			
	Single applicant	Multiple applicant	Total	
	%	%	%	
Yes	43	61	48	
No	56	39	51	
Don't know	1	+	1	
Unweighted bases	487	133	620	

Installation heating use (BAC14)	
Base: All respondents except Bio-Methane	Applicant survey
	%
Space heating	91
Water heating	83
Process heating or cooling	7
Don't know	+
Unweighted bases	619

## Whether RHT installed is new build or retro-fit by technology type (BAC15 by technology type)

Base: All respondents with valid data			Applicant	t survey	
	Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP)	Solar Thermal		Solid Biomass Boiler	Total
	%		%	%	%
New building	51		[13]	21	22
Retro-fit	49		[87]	78	77
Don't know	-		-	+	+
Unweighted bases	50		31	531	620

Lead time (in months) between decision to install and installation of RHT (	(PRO1)
Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey
	%
0	+
1	4
2	12
3	16
4	12
5	5
6	19
7	2

8	4
9	3
10	2
11	+
12	10
13	+
14	+
15	+
18	3
20	+
24	3
30	+
32	+
36	2
48	1
60	+
Don't know	4
Total	100
Unweighted base	620

Lead time (in months) between decision to install and installation of RHT by industry sector (PRO1 by industry sector)								
Base: All respondents with valid data [excludes Don't know] Applicant survey								
	Agriculture	Industrial	Comm & Le	Commercial & Leisure Public				
Mean	6.2	[6.0]		7.4 [11.4]				
Unweighted bases	120	46		381	48	595		

Lead time (in months) between decision to install and installation of RHT by number of employees (PRO1 by BAC9)						
Base: All respondents with valid data [excludes Don't know] Applicant survey						
	Fewer than 10	10 - 49	50 - 249	Mo	ore than 250	Total
Mean	7	7	[7]		[12]	7
Unweighted bases	416	105	38		33	595

Lead time (in months) between decision to install and installation of RHT by technology type (PRO1 by technology type)						
Base: All respondents with valid data [excludes Don't know] Applicant survey						
	Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP)	Solar Thermal	Solid	Biomass Boiler	Total	

Mean	[10.5]	[7.3]	7.2	7.3
Unweighted bases	45	30	512	595

Whether RHT was a replacement or expansion of previous heating capacity (PRO3)					
Base: Retro fit only	Applicant survey				
	%				
Replacement ONLY	64				
Expansion ONLY	12				
Replacement & Expansion	20				
Don't know	3				
Total	100				
Unweighted bases	480				

Reason old system replaced (combined responses) (PRO4)	
Base: Retro-fits that replaced their old system ['Replacement' to question PRO3]	Applicant survey
	%
Financial	71
CSR/ Environment	19
Replacement/ old system wasn't functioning properly	22
Organisational	43
Wider context	12
None	4
Unweighted bases	408

# Whether replaced old system for financial reasons (combined responses) by whether on or off gas grid (PRO4 by gas on or off )

Base: Retro-fits that replaced their old system question PRO3]	Þ	Applicant survey		
	Off Gas	0	n Gas	Total
	%		%	%
Financial reason not chosen	26		37	29
Financial reason chosen	74		63	71
Unweighted bases	307		99	406

Reason old system replaced by type of old system (PRO4 by PRO5)								
Base: Retro-fits that replaced their old system ['Replacement' to question PRO3]						Ap	plicant s	survey
	Gas	Oil	Electric	Direct	Other	Bio	Multi	Tot

	boiler	boiler	heating	combus tion of fossil fuels	and Don't know	mass	- code d	al
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
The old system broke down	10	12	[14]	[10]	[7]	[32]	8	13
It was part of a capital replacement programme	39	25	[15]	[33]	[18]	[13]	23	25
Environmental regulations	8	15	[3]	[13]	[16]	[3]	20	12
Corporate social responsibility program or for reputational reasons	19	14	[29]	[16]	[8]	[8]	16	15
Recommendation from an energy audit or assessment	11	8	-	[16]	-	[5]	13	8
Provide an income stream by taking advantage of the RHI	50	39	[38]	[58]	[68]	[38]	43	43
Financial risks associated with the old system	35	53	[60]	[20]	[27]	[35]	39	45
Other reasons	10	3	[9]	-	[6]	[10]	4	5
Don't know	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	+
Environmental reasons	2	4	-	[5]	[8]	[4]	8	4
Old system wasn't functioning as expected	5	6	[13]	[14]	[17]	[9]	22	9
Financial opportunity related to new system	5	6	[4]	[22]	-	[3]	3	6
Unweighted bases	59	195	24	14	10	44	60	406

Reason old system replaced by commissioning date (PRO4 by commissioning date)						
Base: Retro-fits that replaced their old system ['Replacement' to question PRO3]					Applicant	survey
	Up through 27 Nov 2011	Nov 2011 - 27 May 2012	28 May 2012 - 27 Nov 2012	28 Nov 2012 - 27 May 2013	28 May 2013 onwards	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%
The old system broke down	8	23	6	10	17	13

It was part of a capital replacement programme	12	9	27	36	27	25
Environmental regulations	11	20	11	8	14	12
Corporate social						
responsibility program or	11	19	13	19	14	15
for reputational reasons						
Recommendation from an						
energy audit or	7	7	4	12	10	8
assessment						
Provide an income stream						
by taking advantage of the	37	36	41	40	51	43
RHI						
Financial risks associated	45	/1	45	/1	40	45
with the old system	40	- T I	40	41	43	40
Other reasons	9	4	10	7	1	5
Don't know	1	-	-	-	-	+
Environmental reasons	5	2	6	3	4	4
Old system wasn't	0	0	0	7	10	0
functioning as expected	0	9	9	/	10	9
Financial opportunity	10	2	11	2	1	6
related to new system	10	Z	11	ు	4	0
Unweighted bases	58	52	65	103	128	406

### Reason old system replaced by whether respondent would have installed any new heating installation without the RHI (PRO4 by PRO23)

Base: Retro-fits that replaced their old PRO3]	Applicant survey		
	Yes, would have installed without the RHI	No, would not have installed without the RHI	Total
	%	%	%
The old system broke down	17	8	13
It was part of a capital replacement programme	26	25	25
Environmental regulations	13	12	12
Corporate social responsibility program or for reputational reasons	15	16	15
Recommendation from an energy audit or assessment	7	10	8
Provide an income stream by taking advantage of the RHI	40	46	43
Financial risks associated with the old system	44	46	45
Other reasons	5	5	5
Don't know	-	-	+
Environmental reasons	4	4	4
Old system wasn't functioning as expected	11	7	9
Financial opportunity related to new system	6	4	6
Unweighted bases	216	182	406

Type of old system (PRO5)	
Base: Retro fit and replacement only	Applicant survey
	%
Gas boiler	20
Oil boiler	59
Electric heating	14
Direct combustion of fossil fuels	6
Other	3
Don't know	+
Biomass	14
Unweighted bases	408

Factors involved when choosing technology type by commissioning date (PRO7 by commissioning date)							
Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey						
	Up through 27 Nov 2011	28 Nov 2011 - 27 Nov 2012	28 Nov 2012 onwards	Total			
	%	%	%	%			
Familiarity with the technology	39	49	44	45			
Ability to 'plug in' to current heating system	62	60	73	68			
Physical constraints	40	37	36	37			
Availability of feedstock	69	70	71	71			
Requirement for both heating and cooling	2	3	1	2			
The financial return from the RHI tariff	66	87	94	87			
Cost of the equipment and installation	71	69	72	71			
Running costs	85	88	88	88			
Stability of government policy	54	63	68	64			
The RHI application process	37	48	46	46			
Environmental considerations	80	91	89	88			
Proximity to the gas grid	18	28	17	21			
Other	4	+	1	1			
Don't know	5	-	1	1			
Unweighted bases	99	188	333	620			

Factors involved when choosing technology type by commiss commissioning date)	ioning date (PRO7 by
Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey

	Up through 27 Nov 2011	28 Nov 2011 - 27 May 2012	28 May 2012 - 27 Nov 2012	28 Nov 2012 - 27 May 2013	28 May 2013 onwards	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Familiarity with the technology	39	45	52	47	41	45
Ability to 'plug in' to current heating system	62	62	59	67	78	68
Physical constraints	40	42	34	32	40	37
Availability of feedstock	69	67	72	68	73	71
Requirement for both heating and cooling	2	5	2	1	1	2
The financial return from the RHI tariff	66	88	87	93	94	87
Cost of the equipment and installation	71	69	68	65	78	71
Running costs	85	92	85	87	89	88
Stability of government policy	54	58	66	69	67	64
The RHI application process	37	44	50	41	51	46
Environmental considerations	80	92	91	88	90	88
Proximity to the gas grid	18	30	26	17	18	21
Other	4	-	1	2	-	1
Don't know	5	-	-	1	1	1
Unweighted bases	99	76	112	158	175	620

### Most important factor when choosing technology type by number of employees in organisation (PRO8 by BAC9)

Base: if not 'don't know' to question PRO7 or PRO8					Applicant survey	
	Fewer than 10	10 - 49	50 - 249	More than 250	Total	
	%	%	%	%	%	
Familiarity with the technology	3	1	-	[4]	3	
Ability to 'plug in' to current heating system	4	3	[3]	-	3	
Physical constraints	1	-	-	-	+	
Availability of feedstock	16	16	[7]	[4]	15	
Requirement for both heating and cooling	+	-	-	-	+	
The financial return from the RHI tariff	39	43	[50]	[38]	40	
Cost of the equipment and installation	2	5	[6]	[7]	3	
Running costs	19	22	[22]	[3]	18	
Stability of government policy	2	2	[1]	-	2	
The RHI application process	+	1	-	-	+	
Environmental considerations	14	8	[10]	[40]	15	
Proximity to the gas grid	+	-	-	-	+	
Other	+	-	-	[4]	+	
Unweighted bases	416	108	39	35	601	

Most important factor when choosing technology type by whether replaced old system for financial reasons (combined responses) (PRO8 by PRO4)

Base: if not 'don't know' to question PRO7 or	PRO8	ŀ	Applicant survey
	Financial reason not chosen	Financial reason chosen	Total
	%	%	%
Familiarity with the technology	2	2	3
Ability to 'plug in' to current heating system	2	4	3
Physical constraints	1	1	+
Availability of feedstock	16	13	15
Requirement for both heating and cooling	-	-	+
The financial return from the RHI tariff	29	45	40
Cost of the equipment and installation	2	4	3
Running costs	17	21	18
Stability of government policy	2	2	2
The RHI application process	-	1	+
Environmental considerations	29	9	15
Proximity to the gas grid	-	-	+
Other:	+	+	+
Unweighted bases	116	279	601

Most important factor when choosing technology type by industry sector (PRO8 by industry sector)

Base: if not 'don't know' to question PR07 or PR08 Applicant					survey	
			Com	mercial		
	Agriculture	Industrial	&	Leisure	Public	Total
	%	%		%	%	%
Familiarity with the technology	1	[8]		3	-	3
Ability to 'plug in' to current heating system	6	[2]		3	-	3
Physical constraints	-	-		1	-	+
Availability of feedstock	22	[22]		12	4	15
Requirement for both heating and cooling	-	-		+	-	+
The financial return from the RHI tariff	41	[43]		40	35	40
Cost of the equipment and installation	2	[7]		2	6	3
Running costs	21	[11]		20	13	18
Stability of government policy	1	[2]		1	6	2
The RHI application process	-	[1]		+	-	+
Environmental considerations	7	[2]		17	35	15
Proximity to the gas grid	-	-		+	-	+
Other	-	[2]		+	-	+
Unweighted bases	119	46		386	50	601

Most important factor when choosing technology type by commissioning date (PRO8 by commissioning date)

Base: if not 'don't know' to question PR07 or PR08 Applica				olicant survey	
	Up through 27 Nov 2011	23 201 Nov	8 Nov 1 - 27 2012	28 Nov 2012 onwards	Total
	%		%	%	%
Familiarity with the technology	2		3	3	3
Ability to 'plug in' to current heating system	3		1	4	3
Physical constraints	-		1	-	+
Availability of feedstock	23		13	13	15
Requirement for both heating and cooling	-		-	+	+
The financial return from the RHI tariff	21		41	45	40
Cost of the equipment and installation	3		1	4	3
Running costs	22		15	20	18
Stability of government policy	1		2	1	2
The RHI application process	-		1	+	+
Environmental considerations	24		20	9	15
Proximity to the gas grid	-		1	-	+
Other	2		1	-	+
Unweighted bases	92		185	324	601

Most important factor when choosing technology type by commissioning date (PRO8 by commissioning date)

Base: if not 'don't know' to question PR07 or PR08					Applicant	survey
	Up through 27 Nov 2011	28 Nov 2011 - 27 May 2012	28 May 2012 - 27 Nov 2012	28 Nov 2012 - 27 May 2013	28 May 2013 onwards	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Familiarity with the technology	2	-	4	3	2	3
Ability to 'plug in' to current heating system	3	1	1	4	5	3
Physical constraints	-	1	2	-	-	+
Availability of feedstock	23	17	11	15	12	15
Requirement for both heating and cooling	-	-	-	+	-	+
The financial return from the RHI tariff	21	32	46	42	47	40
Cost of the equipment and installation	3	2	1	3	5	3
Running costs	22	17	13	20	20	18
Stability of government policy	1	1	3	1	2	2
The RHI application process	-	2	+	+	-	+
Environmental considerations	24	26	17	12	7	15
Proximity to the gas grid	-	2	-	-	-	+
Other	2	-	1	-	-	+

Unweighted bases	92	75	110	153	171	601

Most important factor when choosing technology type by technology type (PRO8 by technology type)							
Base: if not 'don't know' to que		Applicant s	urvey				
	Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP)	Solar Thermal	Total				
	%	%	%	%			
Familiarity with the technology	-	[5]	3	3			
Ability to 'plug in' to current heating system	-	[4]	3	3			
Physical constraints	[3]	-	+	+			
Availability of feedstock	[3]	[10]	15	15			
Requirement for both heating and cooling	[2]	-	-	+			
The financial return from the RHI tariff	[28]	[36]	41	40			
Cost of the equipment and installation	[1]	[2]	3	3			
Running costs	[32]	[10]	18	18			
Stability of government policy	[2]	-	2	2			
The RHI application process	[2]	-	+	+			
Environmental considerations	[19]	[32]	14	15			
Proximity to the gas grid	[4]	-	-	+			
Other	[5]	-	+	+			
Unweighted bases	49	30	514	601			

Decision and a set of a				$t_{1} = - (DDOO)$	 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Reconnenic	nna-installation H	ncertainties n			((1)) $(1)$ $(1)$
1 Copondento					
			, <u> </u>		

Base: All respondents with valid data			Applicant survey			
	Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP)	Solar Thermal	Solid Biomass Boiler	Total		
	%	%	%	%		
The suitability of RHTs for your requirements	30	[27]	31	31		
Whether systems or procedures would need to change	13	[11]	25	24		
The performance of RHTs, in terms of heat output	38	[56]	44	44		
The reliability of RHTs	41	[48]	50	49		
How to fix a broken RHT	32	[27]	40	39		
The availability of installers or maintenance people in your area	28	[19]	36	35		
The availability of feedstocks for RHTs	-	-	27	24		
The availability of a market for digestate	-	-	-	+		
Other	1	[4]	1	1		

None	36	[32]	27	27
Don't know	4	[4]	1	1
RHI approval / payments	5	-	1	1
Unweighted bases	50	31	531	620

Source of finance (PRO12)	
Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey
	%
Your own finances or balance sheet	77
Grant	3
External Private Equity	2
Bank loan specific to RHT	9
General bank loan	12
Asset Finance Package	3
Dedicated Energy Supply Company (ESCo)	+
Other	3
Don't know	1
Prefer not to say	+
Carbon Trust or Energy Saving Trust	1
Unweighted bases	620

Number of sources of financing for RHT (PRO12)	
Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey
	%
1	90
2	8
3	1
Total	100
Unweighted bases	620

Whether used own finances only to finance RHT (PRO12)	
Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey
	%
No	31
Yes	69
Total	100
Unweighted bases	620

Type of finance respondent initially wanted to use (PRO14)	
Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey
	%
The same one(s) you used	91
Your own finances or balance sheet	+
Grant	3
Bank loan specific to RHT	1
General bank loan	2
Asset Finance Package	1
Other	1
Don't know	1
Prefer not to say	+
Unweighted bases	620

Note: If respondents did not select 'Don't know', 'Prefer not to say' or 'The same one(s) you used', they were able to give more than one response to this question and therefore the sum of the percentages may be greater than 100

Reason couldn't use finance initially wanted (PRO15)	
Base: All respondents except 'The same one(s) used' or 'Don't know' or 'Prefer not to say' to PRO14	Applicant survey
	%
Finance/grant wasn't available/did not exist	[23]
Didn't meet criteria for funding	[4]
Project wasn't considered viable/suitable	[5]
Lenders not willing to lend for RHT	[8]
Terms/rates not competitive	[6]
Financed it ourselves	[3]
Process to complicated/long-winded	[6]
Grant/loan would have impacted on RHI	[8]
Lenders not convinced by RHI (returns etc.)	[10]
Other	[22]
Prefer not to say	[12]
Unweighted bases	45

Whether respondent would have installed any new heating installation wit (PRO23)	hout the RHI
Base: Retro fit only or Don't know to BAC15	Applicant survey
	%
Yes, would have installed without the RHI	51
No, would not have installed without the RHI	47
Don't know	2
Total	100

Unweighted bases	484
------------------	-----

#### Whether respondent would have changed the commissioning date of their new heating installation without the RHI (PRO26)

Base: Yes to PRO23 or New build	Applicant survey
	%
Yes, would have changed commissioning date	31
No, would not have changed commissioning date	66
Don't know	3
Total	100
Unweighted bases	388

Commissioned earlier or later without RHI (PRO27)	
Base: Yes to PRO26	Applicant survey
	%
Earlier	31
Later	69
Total	100
Unweighted bases	117

#### Affect of banding or tiering on installation size by how decision about size of installation was made (PRO28 by PRO30)

Base: Biomass, GSHP, WSHP,	biogas onl	V		Applicant	survey
	On our own	A receiv advice fr our insta	fter ring rom Iller	After receiving advice from someone else	Total
	%		%	%	%
Tiering affected our choice	22		10	13	13
Banding affected our choice	31		13	18	17
Neither affected our choice	62		82	78	77
Don't know	-		1	-	1
Unweighted bases	96		395	92	588

#### Affect of banding or tiering on installation size by installation capacity (PRO28 by installation capacity)

Base: Biomass, GSHP, WSHP, Biogas only	Applicant survey		
	190-199 kW Biomass	Other	Total
	%	%	%
Tiering affected our choice	28	10	13
Banding affected our choice	52	11	17
Neither affected our choice	40	84	77

Don't know	-	1	1
Unweighted bases	73	510	583

Ease of process of installation by technology type (PRO31 by technology type)					
Base: All respondents wit		Applicant	t survey		
	Ground Source Heat Pump	Source Solar Solid Biomass at Pump Thermal Boiler			
	%	%	%	%	
Very easy	27	[20]	15	16	
Fairly easy	30	[48]	48	47	
Neither easy nor difficult	13	[18]	12	12	
Fairly or very difficult	29	[11]	24	24	
Don't know	1	[4]	1	1	
Unweighted bases	50	31	531	620	

#### Ease of process of installation by industry sector (PRO31 by industry sector)

Base: All respondents with valid		Applica	nt survey		
	Agriculture	Industrial	Commercial & Leisure	Public	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Very easy	20	[11]	14	22	16
Fairly easy	45	[54]	49	33	47
Neither easy nor difficult	13	[16]	11	10	12
Fairly or very difficult	23	[17]	25	31	24
Don't know	-	[3]	1	3	1
Unweighted bases	120	49	396	55	620

Ease of process of installation compared to expectations (PRO32)	
Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey
	%
Much easier	8
A little easier	13
Neither easier nor more difficult	50
A little more difficult	20
Much more difficult	7
Don't know	1
Total	100
Unweighted bases	620

Problems encountered during the installation process by technology type (PRO33 by technology type)					
Base: All respondents with valid da	ata			Applicant	survey
	Ground Source		Solar	Solid Biomass	Total

	Heat Pump (GSHP)	Thermal	Boiler	
	%	%	%	%
Getting suitable advice	10	[30]	18	18
Finding a suitable installer	16	[22]	17	17
Finding a building services/systems designer	-	[2]	8	7
Getting the equipment commissioned	11	[9]	15	15
Unexpected costs	27	[41]	32	32
Delays in installation process	25	[34]	34	33
Any other problems	1	[13]	3	4
No problems with the installation process	53	[42]	42	42
Don't know	1	[4]	1	1
Problems with installer	1	-	2	2
Unweighted bases	50	31	531	620

#### Problems during installation by commissioning date (PRO33 by commissioning date)

Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey				
	Up through 27 Nov 2011	28 Nov 2011 - 27 Nov 2012	28 Nov 2012 onwards	Total	
	%	%	%	%	
Getting suitable advice	17	17	20	18	
Finding a suitable installer	16	18	16	17	
Finding a building services/systems designer	8	9	6	7	
Getting the equipment commissioned	16	15	15	15	
Unexpected costs	34	31	32	32	
Delays in installation process	24	28	39	33	
Any other problems	5	3	4	4	
No problems with the installation process	47	47	38	42	
Don't know	5	+	+	1	
Problems with installer	2	3	1	2	
Unweighted bases	99	188	333	620	

Problems during installation by commissioning date (PRO33 by commissioning date)						
Base: All respondents with valid data				Applica	ant survey	
	Up through 27 Nov 2011	28 Nov 2011 - 27 May 2012	28 May 2012 - 27 Nov 2012	28 Nov 2012 - 27 May 2013	28 May 2013 onwards	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Getting suitable advice	17	18	16	20	19	18

Finding a suitable installer	16	18	19	15	17	17
Finding a building services/systems designer	8	3	13	6	7	8
Getting the equipment commissioned	16	14	15	12	17	15
Unexpected costs	34	28	34	34	30	32
Delays in installation process	24	18	33	38	41	33
Any other problems	5	3	3	5	3	4
No problems with the installation process	47	50	45	41	36	42
Don't know	5	+	-	1	-	1
Problems with installer	2	1	4	1	1	2
Unweighted bases	99	76	112	158	175	620

#### How RHT manufacturer was chosen by technology type (PRO34 by technology type)

Base: All respondents with valid data				Applicant	survey
	Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP)	und leat Sola HP) Therma		Solid Biomass Boiler	Total
	%		%	%	%
Base it on your own research before selecting an installer	39		[22]	47	45
Use the manufacturer recommended by your installer	46		[57]	38	39
Use the manufacturer recommended by someone other than your installer	12		[13]	11	11
Use other methods to find a manufacturer	-		[4]	2	2
Don't know	2		[4]	2	2
Unweighted bases	50		31	531	620

### Would you recommend manufacturer to others by technology type (PRO36 by technology type)

Base: All respondents with valid data					Applicant survey
	Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP)	S The	Solar rmal	Solid Biomass Boiler	Total
	%		%	%	%
Yes	94		[77]	89	89
No	6		-	7	7
Don't know	-		23	4	4
Unweighted bases	50		31	531	620

Where found installer (PRO37)	
Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey

	%
Through a web search or similar	23
At an event	9
A recommendation from someone else	50
Other	2
Don't know	3
A recommendation from the manufacturer / the manufacturer installed it themselves	2
From previous project(s), experience or knowledge	8
Installed it myself / ourselves	2
Through tendering process	2
Total	100
Unweighted bases	620

Would you recommend installer to others by technology type (PRO38 by technology type)						
Base: All respondents with valid			Applicant survey			
	Ground Source Heat Pump Solar (GSHP) Thermal		Solid Biomass Boiler	Total		
	%	%	%	%		
Yes	79	[67]	82	81		
No	18	[32]	16	16		
Don't know	3	[1]	2	2		
Unweighted bases	50	31	531	620		

# Time taken to complete RHI application in full-time equivalent days by technology type (RHI1 by technology type)

Base: All respondents with valid data					Applicant survey
	Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP)	Solar Thermal		Solid Biomass Boiler	Total
	%		%	%	%
0-4 days	24		[26]	35	34
5-9 days	13		[19]	17	17
10-14 days	16		[2]	9	9
15 days or longer	43		[50]	19	22
Don't know	5		[4]	20	19
Unweighted bases	50		31	531	620

Time taken to complete RHI application in full-time equivalent days by single vs multiple applicant (RHI1 by BAC1)				
Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey			
	Single applicant	Multiple applicant	Total	

	%	%	%
0-4 days	36	29	34
5-9 days	16	18	17
10-14 days	9	11	9
15 days or longer	20	24	22
Don't know	19	18	19
Unweighted bases	487	133	620

### Time taken to complete RHI application in full-time equivalent days by original application submission date (RHI1 by submission date)

Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey					
	Up through 27 Nov 2012	28 Nov 2012 - 27 Nov 2013	28 Nov 2013 onwards	Total		
	%	%	%	%		
0-4 days	30	35	[49]	34		
5-9 days	15	17	[17]	17		
10-14 days	13	8	[7]	9		
15 days or longer	27	19	[13]	22		
Don't know	15	21	[15]	19		
Unweighted bases	196	381	43	620		

#### Time taken to complete RHI application in full-time equivalent days by original application submission date (RHI1 by submission date)

Base: All respondents with valid data						Applicant	survey
	Up through 27 May 2012	28 May 2012 - 27 Nov 2012	28 Nov 2012 - 27 May 2013	28 May 2013 – 23 Sept 2013	24 Sept 2013 – 27 Nov 2013	28 Nov 2013 onwards	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
0-4 days	21	35	34	40	22	[49]	34
5-9 days	19	12	21	15	15	[17]	17
10-14 days	11	14	9	6	12	[7]	9
15 days or longer	33	24	16	20	25	[13]	22
Don't know	15	15	20	19	26	[15]	19
Unweighted bases	85	111	151	158	72	43	620

# Time taken to complete RHI application in full-time equivalent days by industry sector (RHI1 by industry sector)

Base: All respondents with valid data					Applica	nt survey
	Agriculture	ture Industrial Commerce		nmercial Leisure	Public	Total
	%	%		%	%	%
0-4 days	28	[35]		38	24	34

5-9 days	13	[12]	18	25	17
10-14 days	11	[7]	10	6	9
15 days or longer	16	[25]	20	40	22
Don't know	32	[21]	15	6	19
Unweighted bases	120	49	396	55	620

### Time taken to complete RHI application in full-time equivalent days by number of employees in organisation (RHI1 by BAC9)

Base: All respondents with valid data					Applic	cant survey
	Fewer than 10	10 - 49	<b>50</b> ·	- 249	More than 250	Total
	%	%		%	%	%
0-4 days	37	27		[25]	[32]	34
5-9 days	15	18		[28]	[18]	17
10-14 days	7	12		[30]	[8]	9
15 days or longer	19	25		[13]	[41]	22
Don't know	22	18		[3]	[2]	19
Unweighted bases	426	110		40	41	620

## Time taken to complete RHI application in full-time equivalent days by whether application took too long to complete (RHI1 by RHI3)

Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey			
	Not chosen	Chosen	Total	
	%	%	%	
0-4 days	41	20	34	
5-9 days	18	20	17	
10-14 days	10	14	9	
15 days or longer	15	40	22	
Don't know	15	6	19	
Unweighted bases	117	235	620	

Whether had problems completing application by industry sector (RHI2 by industry sector)							
Base: All respondents with valid		Applica	nt survey				
	Agriculture	Industrial	Commercial & Leisure	Public	Total		
	%	%	%	%	%		
Yes	48	[39]	58	62	54		
No	41	[43]	37	36	39		
Don't know	11	[17]	5	2	7		
Unweighted bases	120	49	396	55	620		

Whether had problems completing application by single vs. multiple applicant (RHI2 by BAC1)

Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey				
	Single applicant	Multiple applicant	Total		
	%	%	%		
Yes	56	49	54		
No	36	44	39		
Don't know	8	7	7		
Unweighted bases	487	133	620		

## Whether had problems completing the application by technology type (RHI2 by technology type)

Base: All respondents with valid data				Applicant	survey
	Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP)	ې The	Solar ermal	Solid Biomass Boiler	Total
	%		%	%	%
Yes	88		[81]	51	54
No	10		[16]	41	39
Don't know	1		[3]	8	7
Unweighted bases	50		31	531	620

### Whether had problems completing the application by original application submission date (RHI2 by submission date)

Base: All respondents with	valid data	Applicant survey			
	Up through 27 Nov 2012	28 Nov 2012 - 27 Nov 2013	Total		
	%	%	%	%	
Yes	63	48	[67]	54	
No	31	43	[33]	39	
Don't know	6	9	-	7	
Unweighted bases	196	381	43	620	

Whether had problems completing the application by original application submission date (RHI2 by submission date)							
Base: All respondents v	vith valid da	nta				Applicant	survey
	Up through 27 May 2012	28 May 2012 - 27 Nov 2012	28 Nov 2012 - 27 May 2013	28 May 2013 – 23 Sept 2013	24 Sept 2013 – 27 Nov 2013	28 Nov 2013 onwards	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Yes	73	56	47	45	57	[67]	54
No	25	35	44	47	33	[33]	39
Don't know	2	9	9	8	11	-	7
Unweighted bases	85	111	151	158	72	43	620

submissior	n date)						
Base: 'Yes' to question RHI2 Applicant survey							
	Up through 27 Nov 2012	28 Nov 2012 - 27 Nov 2013	28 Nov 2013 onwards	Total			
	%	%	%	%			
The application questions were not appropriate for my installation	39	28	[24]	32			
It was not clear what information I needed to provide	78	66	[59]	70			
Official guidance on the RHI was overly complex	63	63	[55]	62			
I found it difficult to find and supply all the information required about my installation	63	59	[55]	60			
I had technical problems, such as with uploading supporting information	53	44	[46]	47			
The application form was returned to us by Ofgem	57	63	[64]	61			
The application took too long to complete	68	67	[44]	66			
Other	5	8	[12]	7			
Don't know	3	2	-	2			
Ofgem - contact and advice unclear or difficult	3	-	-	1			
Problems with fulfilling metering requirements	4	1	-	2			
The website was difficult to use / not user-friendly	1	1	[6]	1			
Unweighted bases	132	190	30	352			

#### Type of problem completing the application by original application submission date (RHI3 by

Type of problem completing the application by original application submission date (RHI3 by submission date)							
Base: 'Yes' to question	RHI2.					Applicant	survey
	Up throug h 27 May 2012	28 May 2012 - 27 Nov 2012	28 Nov 2012 - 27 May 2013	28 May 2013 – 23 Sept 2013	24 Sept 2013 – 27 Nov 2013	28 Nov 2013 onward s	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
The application questions were not appropriate for my installation	36	42	26	36	[17]	[24]	32
It was not clear what information I needed	77	79	67	59	[75]	[59]	70

to provide							
Official guidance on the RHI was overly complex	68	58	56	67	[68]	[55]	62
I found it difficult to find and supply all the information required about my installation	64	61	56	59	[66]	[55]	60
I had technical problems, such as with uploading supporting information	46	59	41	44	[48]	[46]	47
The application form was returned to us by Ofgem	58	56	59	59	[75]	[64]	61
The application took too long to complete	75	61	64	66	[77]	[44]	66
Other	4	5	13	6	[5]	[12]	7
Don't know	3	2	1	1	[5]	-	2
Ofgem - contact and advice unclear or difficult	4	1	-	-	-	-	1
Problems with fulfilling metering requirements	7	2	-	4	-	-	2
The website was difficult to use / not user-friendly	1	1	3	-	-	[6]	1
Unweighted bases	66	66	75	73	42	30	352

-			بط مرمائه ممال مرمر			
	voe of proplem	completing a			/ 1/08 (КНІЗ (	ν τεςηποιοάν τνοει
	ypo or problom	oomproung d		, coorniology		y coorniology cypo,

Base: 'Yes' to question RHI2.			Applicant	survey
	Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP)	Sola Therma	Solid Biomass Boiler	Total
	%	%	%	%
The application questions were not appropriate for my installation	[40]	47	30	32
It was not clear what information I needed to provide	[79]	[87	68	70
Official guidance on the RHI was overly complex	[63]	[65	62	62
I found it difficult to find and supply all the information required about my installation	[85]	[84	57	60
I had technical problems, such as with uploading supporting information	[31]	[57	48	47
The application form was returned to us by Ofgem	[62]	[88]	59	61
The application took too long to complete	[73]	[84	64	66
Other	[4]	[31	6	7
Don't know	-		· 2	2
Ofgem - contact and advice unclear or difficult	[7]		· 1	1

Problems with fulfilling metering	-	-	3	2		
requirements						
The website was difficult to use / not user-	[3]	-	1	1		
friendly						
Unweighted bases	43	26	278	352		
Note: Reproved to were able to give more than any regression to this question and therefore the sum of the						

Why application form returned to customer by technology type (RHI4 by technology type)						
Base: 'The application form was returned to a RHI3	Applicar	nt survey				
	Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP)	Solar Thermal	Solid Biomass Boiler	Total		
	%	%	%	%		
Problems with meters or metering arrangements	48	[54]	45	46		
Problems with correct authorisation letters or verification of the company	25	[49]	30	31		
Problems with the type of premise	13	[17]	11	12		
Problems with details of the installation, such as heat use, emission certificate, description, capacity or commissioning date.	69	[64]	61	62		
Problems with heat loss assessments	21	[28]	23	24		
Problems with the accuracy of the submitted schematic	40	[57]	27	31		
Problems related to other heating plants or systems, including those replaced	5	[18]	17	16		
Other	9	[18]	9	10		
Don't know	-	-	5	4		
Unweighted bases	30	21	163	217		

Why application form returned to customer by technology type (RHI4 by technology type)						
Base: 'The application form was returned to RHI3	Applicant survey					
	Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP) and Solar Thermal	Solid Biomass Boiler	Total			
	%	%	%			
Problems with meters or metering arrangements	51	45	46			
Problems with correct authorisation letters or verification of the company	38	30	31			
Problems with the type of premise	15	11	12			
Problems with details of the installation, such as heat use, emission certificate, description, capacity or commissioning	66	61	62			

date.			
Problems with heat loss assessments	25	23	24
Problems with the accuracy of the submitted schematic	49	27	31
Problems related to other heating plants or systems, including those replaced	12	17	16
Other	14	9	10
Don't know	-	5	4
Unweighted bases	51	163	217

#### Difficulty of collecting regular meter readings by technology type (RHI6 by technology type)

Base: accredited applications only		Applicant survey			
	Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP) and Solar Thermal		Solid Biomass Boiler	Total	
		%	%	%	
Very easy		27	37	37	
Fairly easy		25	40	39	
Neither easy nor difficult		10	7	7	
Fairly or very difficult		25	7	9	
Don't know		1	1	1	
Don't know, as the installation hasn't been accredited very long		11	7	7	
Unweighted bases		61	481	547	

Any problems collecting and submitting meter data (RHI7)				
Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey			
	%			
Yes	23			
No	73			
Don't know	5			
Total	100			
Unweighted bases	620			

Problems collecting and submitting meter data (RHI8)	
Base: Yes to RHI7	Applicant survey
	%
A small window available for taking readings	13
A small window available for submitting readings	14
The resource required to read the meter on time	11
The capability required to read the meter on time	13
We didn't know where to find the meter	1

We didn't know how to read the meter	4
We didn't know how to do the calculation	38
Fault with meter	12
Missed reading (including first reading)	6
Mistakes made while submitting readings	2
Problems submitting readings	18
None	5
Unweighted bases	147

Whether respondent had to provide estimated data at any point (RHI9)	
Base: Accredited applicants only	Applicant survey
	%
Yes	11
No	87
Don't know	2
Total	100
Unweighted bases	547

Reason had to provide estimated data (RHI10)	
Base: Yes to RHI9	Applicant survey
	%
Fault with the metering equipment	38
The meter wasn't installed correctly	12
Could not access the meter to read it	4
Delayed taking your meter reading	44
Because of other reasons	11
Missed first reading	14
Unweighted bases	63

Overall satisfaction with meter data system by technology type (RHI11 by technology type)						
Base: accredited applications only		Applicant	survey			
	Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP)	Solar Thermal	Solid Biomass Boiler	Total		
	%	%	%	%		
Very satisfied	[31]	[39]	37	37		
Fairly satisfied	[15]	[7]	39	37		
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	[26]	[20]	12	13		
Fairly or very dissatisfied	[23]	[27]	7	8		

Don't know, as the installation hasn't been operational for very long	[5]	[6]	4	5
Don't know	-	-	1	1
Unweighted bases	38	23	481	547

#### Overall satisfaction with meter data system by single vs. multiple applicant (RHI11 by BAC1)

Base: accredited applications only	Applicant survey			
	Single Multiple applicant applicant		Total	
	%	%	%	
Very satisfied	40	31	37	
Fairly satisfied	36	40	37	
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	11	17	13	
Fairly dissatisfied	5	5	5	
Very dissatisfied	2	4	3	
Don't know, as the installation hasn't been operational for very long	5	3	5	
Don't know	1	-	1	
Unweighted bases	434	113	547	

#### Overall satisfaction with meter data system by number of employees in organisation (RHI11 by BAC9)

Base: accredited applications only				Applica	nt survey
	Fewer than 10 10 - 49		50 - 249	More than 250	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Very satisfied	37	36	[40]	[37]	37
Fairly satisfied	38	34	[46]	[24]	37
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	12	18	[9]	[14]	13
Fairly or very dissatisfied	8	6	[1]	[23]	8
Don't know, as the installation hasn't been operational for very long	5	5	[4]	[3]	5
Don't know	1	1	-	-	1
Unweighted bases	387	93	35	29	547

#### Overall satisfaction with meter data system by industry sector (RHI11 by industry sector)

Base: accredited applications only				Applic	ant survey	
			Cor	nmercial		
	Agriculture	Industrial	8	Leisure	Public	Total
	%	%		%	%	%
Very or fairly satisfied	72	[80]		74	[79]	74
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	14	[15]		13	[7]	13
Fairly or very dissatisfied	11	[2]		7	[14]	8

Don't know, as the installation hasn't been operational for very long	4	[2]	6	-	5
Don't know	-	[2]	1	-	1
Unweighted bases	107	42	352	46	547

#### Whether experienced problems receiving RHI payments (RHI13A/RHI13B)

Base: Applicants eligible to receive payments [Yes or Don't know to RHI12 or 'We have experienced problems' or Don't know to RHI13B]		
	%	
No	90	
Yes	10	
Total	100	
Unweighted base	464	

Problems with receiving RHI Payment (RHI14)	
Base: Yes to RHI9	Applicant survey
	%
Not able to submit meter data	18
Received an under payment	8
Submitted meter data but they were not accepted by Ofgem	30
Other	17
Delays in receiving payments	20
Only recently accredited	13
Unweighted bases	53

Experience of the requirement to complete an annual declaration (RHI1	5)
Base: Accredited applicants who have had to submit an annual declaration [accredited applicants who did not answer 'Don't know as have not had to submit an annual declaration yet' to RHI15]	Applicant survey
	%
Very easy	36
Fairly easy	42
Neither easy nor difficult	11
Fairly difficult	3
Very difficult	1
Don't know	7
Total	100
Unweighted bases	324

Overall satisfaction with RHT b	v industry sector	(OPF1 b	v industry	(sector)
	y maastry sector		y maasa y	000001

Base: All responde	nts with valid da	ata		Applicant su		
			Con	nmercial		
	Agriculture	Industrial	&	Leisure	Public	Total
	%	%		%	%	%
Very or fairly satisfied	92	[91]		90	79	90
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3	[3]		4	5	4
Fairly or very dissatisfied	4	[6]		4	15	6
Don't know, as the installation hasn't been operational for very long	-	-		2	1	1
Unweighted bases	120	49		396	55	620

#### Overall satisfaction with RHT by technology type (OPE1 by technology type)

Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey			
	Ground Source Heat Solar Pump (GSHP) Thermal		Solid Biomass Boiler	Total
	%	%	%	%
Very or fairly satisfied	93	[64]	91	90
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	1	[5]	4	4
Fairly dissatisfied	-	[20]	4	4
Very dissatisfied	2	[6]	1	1
Don't know, as the installation hasn't been operational for very long	4	[4]	1	1
Unweighted bases	50	31	531	620

#### Overall satisfaction with RHT by number of employees in organisation (OPE1 by BAC9)

Base: All respondents with valid data					Applicar	nt survey
	Fewer than 10	10 - 49	9	50 - 249	More than 250	Total
	%	%	6	%	%	%
Very satisfied	55	47	7	[52]	[29]	51
Fairly satisfied	36	4(	C	[34]	[57]	38
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	3	Ę	5	[6]	[4]	4
Fairly or very dissatisfied	4	7	7	[4]	[3]	4
Don't know, as the installation hasn't been operational for very long	1	,	1	[2]	[6]	1
Don't know	1		-	[1]	[2]	1

Unweighted bases	426	110	40	41	620
------------------	-----	-----	----	----	-----

Overall satisfaction with RHT compared with expectation (OPE2)	
Base: All respondents except Don't know or 'Don't know as the installation has hasn't been operational for very long' to OPE1	Applicant survey
	%
Much better	16
A little better	26
Neither better nor worse	43
A little worse	12
Much worse	3
Don't know	+
Total	100
Unweighted bases	612

#### Satisfaction with ease of operation of RHT by technology type (OPE3 by technology type)

Base: All respondents with valid data		Applicant survey				
	ູ Pເ	Ground Source Heat Imp (GSHP)	Solar Thermal	Solid Biomass Boiler	Total	
		%	%	%	%	
Very or fairly satisfied		95	[74]	86	86	
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied		2	[5]	9	8	
Fairly or very dissatisfied		2	[18]	5	5	
Don't know		-	[4]	+	+	
Unweighted bases		50	31	531	620	

How heat is being deployed (OPE6)	
Base: Ground source heat pump or water source heat pump only	Applicant survey
	%
Underfloor Heating	82
Radiators	43
Other	6
Unweighted base	54

Extent to which RHT meets heating needs by technology ty	ype (OPE7 by technology type)
Base: Not Bio-methane	Applicant survey

	Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP)	Solar Thermal	Solid Biomass Boiler	Total
	%	%	%	%
All or most of the time	96	[57]	96	95
Some or none of the time	4	[43]	3	5
Don't know, as the installation hasn't been operational for very long	-	-	+	+
Don't know	-	-	+	+
Unweighted bases	50	31	531	619

Why RHT does not meet heating needs all of the time (OPE8)	
Base: All respondents except 'All the time', Don't know or 'Don't know as the installation hasn't been operational for very long' to OPE7	Applicant survey
	%
It is not reliable	22
It can't generate sufficient heat	50
It is too expensive	3
It is difficult to control	16
It is not responsive enough	14
Any other reasons	3
Don't know	1
Choose to use alternative system	2
Because of user input required	2
None	4
Unweighted bases	192

Frequency alternative system used by technology type (OPE10 by technology type)					
Base: if yes to question ope9			Applicant	survey	
Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP) T		Solar Thermal	Solid Biomass Boiler	Total	
	%	%	%	%	
Daily or weekly	[5]	[71]	11	15	
Monthly	[3]	-	8	7	
Seasonally	[32]	[19]	21	22	
Almost never	[58]	[10]	59	56	
Don't know, as the installation hasn't been operational for very long	-	-	+	+	
Don't know	[3]	-	1	1	
Unweighted bases	22	29	306	362	

## Whether adjustments made to the operation of biomass system to take account of the two tiers for the RHI payment (OPE12)

Base: Biomass only	Applicant survey
	%
Yes	3
No	32
Don't know, as the installation hasn't been operational for very long	2
Don't know	3
Total	100
Unweighted base	531

Ways in which adjustments to operation of biomass system made (OPE	13)
Base: Biomass only and yes to OPE12	Applicant survey
	%
Only run the biomass plant when receiving the first tier payment	[53]
Sometimes switch to an alternative heat supply when receiving the second tier payment	[8]
Other	[26]
Don't know	[13]
Total	[100]
Unweighted base	15

Reliability of RHT by technology type (OPE14 by technology type)						
Base: All respondents with valid data Applicant survey						
	Se Pui	Ground ource Heat mp (GSHP)	Solar Thermal	Solid Biomass Boiler	Total	
		%	%	%	%	
Very reliable		76	[41]	53	54	
Fairly reliable		18	[46]	39	38	
Neither reliable nor unreliable		2	[3]	3	3	
Fairly unreliable		1	[5]	2	2	
Very unreliable		2	-	1	1	
Don't know, as the installation hasn't been operational for very long		-	-	2	2	
Don't know		-	[5]	-	+	
Unweighted bases		50	31	531	620	

Reliability of RHT by technology type (OP	E14 by technology type)
Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey

	Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP)	Solar Thermal	Solid Biomass Boiler	Total
	%	%	%	%
Very or fairly reliable	95	[87]	92	92
Neither reliable nor unreliable	2	[3]	3	3
Fairly unreliable	1	[5]	2	2
Very unreliable	2	-	1	1
Don't know, as the installation hasn't been operational for very long	-	-	2	2
Don't know	-	[5]	-	+
Unweighted bases	50	31	531	620

Changes to reliability of RHT over time (OPE15)	
Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey
	%
Getting better	26
Getting worse	1
Not changing	68
Don't know, as the installation hasn't been operational for very long	4
Don't know	1
Total	100
Unweighted base	620

### Maintenance requirement for RHT vs expectations by technology type (OPE16 by technology type)

Base: All respon	dents with valid data			Applicant	survey
		Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP)	Solar Thermal	Solid Biomass Boiler	Total
		%	%	%	%
Requires signific than expected	antly less maintenance	7	[15]	3	4
Requires slightly less maintenance than expected		18	[4]	9	9
Is about the sam	e as expected	67	[60]	56	57
Requires slightly maintenance that	or significantly more an expected	2	[16]	28	27
Don't know, as the operational for version of the second s	he installation hasn't been ery long	1	[1]	3	3
Don't know		5	[4]	+	1
Unweighted base	es	50	31	531	620

How many times external help sought due to poor performance over lifetime of RHT by technology type (OPE19 by technology type)

Base: All respondents with valid of	Applicant	t survey		
	Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP)	Solar Thermal	Solid Biomass Boiler	Total
	%	%	%	%
Never	54	[65]	40	41
1-2 times	24	[25]	31	30
3-5 times	16	[6]	16	16
More than 5 times	6	-	13	13
Don't know	-	[4]	+	+
Unweighted bases	50	31	531	620

# How many times external help sought due to poor performance, over lifetime of RHT by technology type (OPE19 by technology type)

Base: All respondents with valid data		Applicant survey			
	Ground Source Heat Pump (GSHP) and Solar Thermal		Solid Biomass Boiler	Total	
		%	%	%	
Never		59	40	41	
1-2 times		24	31	30	
3-5 times		11	16	16	
More than 5 times		3	13	13	
Don't know		2	+	+	
Unweighted bases		81	531	620	

Length of warranty (in months) for RHT (OPE22)	
Base: All respondents with a warranty with valid data	Applicant survey
	%
5	+
12	37
18	+
24	24
30	+
36	13
48	+
60	17
84	1
120	+
144	+
180	2
240	10
300	+

432	+
Total	100
Unweighted base	425

Overall satisfaction with customer service since installing RHT (OPE23)	
Base: All respondents with valid scores	Applicant survey
	%
Very satisfied	44
Fairly satisfied	35
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	11
Fairly dissatisfied	6
Very dissatisfied	4
Don't know	1
Total	100
Unweighted base	620

Form in which fuel enters boiler (OPE24)	
Base: Biomass only	Applicant survey
	%
Pellets	43
Chips	32
Logs	22
Off-cuts	3
Sawdust	1
Wood waste	8
Arboricultural arisings	1
Other	1
Straw	5
Unweighted base	531
Note: Descendents were able to sive more than one response to this sweeting and therefore	de a secona set de s

#### How fuel is sourced by industry sector (OPE25 by industry sector)

Base: Biomass onl	Applic	ant survey			
	Agriculture	Industrial	Commercial & Leisure	Public	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Buy it	61	[59]	75	[87]	71
Acquire it for free or produce it yourself	52	[56]	37	[13]	41
Unweighted	114	44	335	38	531

bases					
Note: Respondents wer	e able to give more	than one response	e to this question and the	refore the sum of	ihe
percentages may be gre	eater than 100				

How fuel is sourced by industry sector (OPE25 by industry sector)						
Base: Biomass only	Applicant survey					
	Agriculture	Non- Agriculture	Total			
	%	%	%			
Buy it only	48	63	59			
Source it for free only	39	26	29			
Buy & Source for free	13	11	12			
Unweighted bases	114	417	531			

How fuel is sourced by industry sector (OPE25 by industry sector)						
Base: Biomass only	Applicant survey					
	Non-public sector	Public	Total			
	%	%	%			
Buy it only	57	[87]	59			
Source it for free only	31	[13]	29			
Buy & Source for free	13	-	12			
Unweighted bases	493	38	531			

How fuel is sourced by installation capacity (OPE25 by installation capacity)						
Base: Biomass only Applicant survey						
	200 kW or greater	Total				
	%	%	%	%	%	
Buy it only	78	54	58	46	59	
Source it for free only	14	28	33	42	29	
Buy & Source for free	7	18	9	11	12	
Unweighted bases	106	169	188	68	531	

Source of purchased fuel by industry sector	(OPE26A by industry sector)
---	-----------------------------

Base: Biomass only	Applic	ant survey			
	Agriculture	Industrial	Commercial & Leisure	Public	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
A dedicated fuel broker or merchant	72	[56]	71	[94]	72
Boiler provider or a service company	15	[19]	8	[3]	10

A producer, such as a forestry manager or saw- mill	31	[33]	26	[5]	25
Other	-	-	+	-	+
Don't know	2	-	+	[3]	1
Unweighted bases	67	26	250	34	377

Source of free fuel (OPE26B)	
Base: Biomass only and 'acquire it for free' to OPE25	Applicant survey
	%
Produce it yourselves, such as from own forestry, woodlands or saw-mill	76
Gather it yourselves, such as forestry residues	27
Acquire it free from elsewhere, for example a saw-mill	15
Other	5
Don't know	+
Unweighted base	216

Whether has a supply contract (OPE30)	
Base: Biomass only with purchased fuel ['Buy it' to OPE25]	Applicant survey
	%
Yes	19
No	79
Don't know	2
Total	100
Unweighted base	377

Length of supply contract (OPE31)	
Base: Biomass only with purchased fuel and a supply contract ['Buy it' to OPE25 and Yes to OPE30]	Applicant survey
	%
0-1 month	7
2-6 months	6
1-2 years	57
Longer than 2 years	30
Total	100
Unweighted base	66

Cost of biomass fuel per tonne, including transport by now fuel is sourced (OPE32 by OPE25)						
Base: Biomass only with purchased fuel ['Buy	Applicant survey					
	Buy & Source for Buy it only free		Total			
	%	%	%			
Less than £50 per tonne	7	39	12			
£50-£99 per tonne	15	26	17			
£100-£149 per tonne	10	12	10			
£150-£199 per tonne	19	3	17			
£200-£249 per tonne	30	9	27			
£250 or more per tonne	4	4	4			
Prefer not to say	15	7	14			
Unweighted bases	315	62	377			

Cost of biomass fuel per tonne, including transport by whether has a supply contract (OPE32 by OPE30)

Base: Biomass only with pur	Applicant survey		
	Yes	No	Total
	%	%	%
Less than £50 per tonne	3	15	12
£50-£99 per tonne	17	16	17
£100-£149 per tonne	12	10	10
£150-£199 per tonne	21	16	17
£200-£249 per tonne	20	29	27
£250 or more per tonne	-	5	4
Prefer not to say	27	9	14
Unweighted bases	66	304	377

Cost of biomass fuel per tonne, including transport by whether purchases fuel from a dedicated fuel broker or merchant (OPE32 by OPE26A)

Base: Biomass only with purchased fuel ['Buy it' to OPE25]			Applicant survey	
	Not chosen	sen Chosen		Total
	%		%	%
Less than £50 per tonne	32		5	12
£50-£99 per tonne	29		12	17
£100 or more per tonne	27		69	58
Prefer not to say	12		14	14
Unweighted bases	103		274	377

Cost of biomass fuel per tonne, including transport by whether chose to purchase fuel from a producer, such as a forestry manager or saw-mill (OPE32 by OPE26A)				
Base: Biomass only with purchased fuel ['Buy it' to OPE25] Applicant survey				
	Not chosen	C	hosen	Total

	%	%	%
Less than £50 per tonne	3	39	12
£50-£99 per tonne	13	28	17
£100 or more per tonne	70	20	58
Prefer not to say	14	13	14
Unweighted bases	282	95	377

# Cost of biomass fuel per tonne, including transport by industry sector (OPE32 by industry sector)

Base: Biomass only with purchased fuel only OPE25], excluding 'prefer not to say' to OPE3	A	Applicant survey		
	Agriculture	Agric	Non- culture	Total
	%		%	%
Less than £50 per tonne	16		6	8
£50-£99 per tonne	25		15	17
£100 or more per tonne	59		79	75
Unweighted bases	50		221	271

Cost of biomass fuel per tonne, including transport by form of fuel (OPE32 by OPE24)					
Base: Biomass onl <u></u> OPE25]	Applic	ant survey			
	Pellets	Chips	Logs	Other	Total
	%	%	%	%	%
Less than £50 per tonne	1	8	[44]	[48]	7
£50-£99 per tonne	3	41	[38]	[14]	15
£100 or more per tonne	82	32	[15]	[26]	63
Prefer not to say	15	19	[3]	[13]	15
Unweighted bases	208	74	19	14	315

Benefits of renewable heating system (OPE33)	
Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey
	%
Space requirements	30
ability to both heat and cool	1
Availability of feedstock	64
Cost of the installation	34
Reliability of the installation	68
Ease of operation of the installation	67
Ability to 'plug in' to current heating system	70

The amount of heat it generates	82
Responsiveness of the installation	58
Environmental considerations	31
Running costs, in terms of fuel or energy	88
Maintenance costs	56
The amount of income it generates under the RHI	87
Other	1
None	1
Don't know	1
Unweighted base	620

Whether respondent would recommend RHT to others (OPE34)	
Base: All respondents with valid data	Applicant survey
	%
Yes	93
No	5
Don't know	1
Total	100
Unweighted base	620

Reasons for not recommending RHT to others (OPE35)	
Base: All respondents who would not recommend RHT [No to OPE34]	Applicant survey
	%
Availability of feedstock	[5]
Cost of the installation	[21]
Reliability of the installation	[30]
Ease of operation of the installation	[12]
Ability to 'plug in' to current heating system	[10]
The amount of heat it generates	[11]
Responsiveness of the installation	[10]
Environmental considerations	[2]
Running costs, in terms of fuel or energy	[7]
Maintenance costs	[10]
The amount of income it generates under the RHI	[21]
Other	[32]
Unweighted base	34