

Hi ESS,

After today's Stakeholder Engagement, I'd just like to provide some additional feedback, as someone who operates within the ESS daily and is really supportive of your efforts to improve engagement. I hope these comments are helpful for you.

1. The newly developed website is very good. I can almost always find what I am looking for, and it is very helpful to have the "Current document" filter so that only the most relevant versions of documents show in searches.
2. The Draft Engagement Charter is a good initiative, but a little lacking in any real detail. Would this document benefit from some more SMART measures? Define the period of time that enquiries will be responded to? Or perhaps qualify what "*make it easy to engage with us*" actually means?
3. I understand IPART would receive many enquiries, and I can imagine they range from trivial to very urgent. Perhaps in the Engagement Charter IPART could define a Prioritisation Matrix given a particular classification system? E.g. enquiries relating to active Audits, imminent forfeit/compliance issues or accreditation applications are high priority and will be responded to within 2 weeks, while enquiries relating to more general matters or asking for IPART to make a ruling on a given requirement/definition could define a 3-4 week response. This would help guide ACPs expectations around response times.
4. Perhaps IPART could consider introducing a ticketing system into your email enquiries inbox, so that all enquiries receive an automated "We have received your response" email? I have often sent email enquiries to ESS_Compliance and not had a response for over 8 weeks, and then only after following up twice. It is hard to know whether our enquiries are actually being acted on or whether they have been lost. Also, if a particular enquiry does require legal review or higher decision making, would it be possible to advise that so we know you're at least working on it?
5. In instances where an ACP asks IPART a specific / technical question and IPART is able to provide a detailed response, can these responses be made to the wider ACP community, so everyone is on the same page? Perhaps through the Newsletter or by publishing regular FAQs?
6. I've previously sent feedback to IPART regarding improving usability of some of IPART's excel templates, specifically the List of Sites template which is locked and not able to use filters or add extra headings to the file. I'd also like to add similar comments regarding the Commercial Lighting Evidence Pack file. This file contains around 15 pages of documents ACPs must use for CL jobs, and yet this file is locked with password protection. The cells are not selectable or able to be copied. This means if we are to build these documents into our online tools, we are forced to literally re-type each word manually rather than using simple copy paste or being able to edit and format the template. Is it necessary for template documents to be locked if they don't contain any formulas? Or can the protection at least allow cells to be selected and text copied? Surely IPART understands we do not use the protected excel file for our jobs as we combine them into our online systems for ease of access, updates and completion.
7. Duplicate address checks within the ESS Portal – I am not sure if IPART are aware but currently almost every site now returns a duplicate address error when lodging CL and HEERs sites. See attached Duplicate Address report as an example. In the past when getting a duplicate warning we would go and investigate and obtain confirmation from the customer they have not created the ESCs with another ACP. But the sheer number of duplicates now days indicates it is an issue with the registry (shop or unit numbers don't seem to register as different addresses). It suggests this check is outdated and irrelevant to compliance activities given there is no additional information provided to the ACP (when was the previous claim lodged, by whom and what for?) and there is no repercussion from simply ignoring the check and seemingly no follow up by auditors. Is there scope to either improve or remove this check?