

Dear Green Loans Senate Committee,

I am a person who has submitted a contact to DEWHA, and not as yet un-contracted. I would like to submit the following points for your consideration:

THE ONLY FAIR WAY TO PROCEED: A letter from a Certified, non-Contracted Assessor

The situation that has developed with the “Green Loans” Program is totally unfair, to the thousands of would- be Green Loans Assessors, here are the reasons why:

The Government had courted people to enter into a business, as a Green Loans Assessor, setting out conditions to be fulfilled before the Government would enter into a Contract, these included, a Certificate of training by a Registered Training Organization (RTO), a Police Criminal History Certificate, a Ten Million Dollar Public Liability Insurance Certificate, a Two or Five Million Personal Indemnity Insurance Certificate, hold an ABN or ACN, and Certification by ABSA with a HO number. Thousands of “would- be assessors” have systematically fulfilled each of these requirements, at their own expense; at no time was it ever intimated that the Government would not grant a Contract to those who fulfilled the requirements, in fact the opposite was true, the RTO’s, ABSA and the Green Loans website held this out as a foregone conclusion.

It clearly said on the Green Loans website that the Government has not limited the number of Assessors, and under the heading **ASSESSOR ACCREDITATION & REGISTRATION** that “Accredited Assessors will be”: “Contracted to the Australian Government to provide the service;” Clearly, The Government should grant all accredited assessors a contract on the basis of the statements made, and the costs involved in attaining such accreditation and the fulfilling of all requirements imposed by the Government to receive a contract.

Will there be enough work to go around? That is not the Governments problem, as every Contracted Assessor and the Un-contracted Assessors that have submitted a Contract, have signed that they acknowledge that the Government does not guarantee work, under clause “3.2 No guarantee of work”, it said

“The Assessor acknowledges that there is no guarantee or assurance:

Of any particular volume of business under this Contract or the Program; or That the Assessor will receive any bookings to undertake any Assessments.” This however is not a “No guarantee of Contract” clause, but simply meant that the Government would not guarantee any number of bookings (through the Government booking system) and so it was up to the assessor to generate their own bookings. Will there be enough work to go around? Time will tell, none the less all have agreed to this, so the only fair way to proceed is to award contracts to all Assessors who have jumped through all the requirement hoops that the Government has put before them.

Why should the 5,000 limit on assessors be imposed on the Scheme as an after- thought, in an ill-conceived knee-jerk reaction to mounting pressure, after all thousands of people have spent their time and money and resources in being Certified as Accredited Assessors, it’s simply not fair to drop us into the vortex of bungling, mismanagement and mental anguish after months of being in the system and hope we will happily go down the reject Shute quietly, never to be seen or heard from again. Yes, we deserve a Contract and this is the only fair way to proceed.

Additionally, the Government should realize what a wonderful resource it has in reducing GHG emissions....the Approx. 10,000 trained people who are willing to get out there and make a positive difference in helping householders to reduce their carbon footprint, it was my aim to be an educator (not just an assessor), and to leave householders with a photocopied resource of four websites, for them to do some “homework” so that this would reinforce the purpose of our visit and get them to continue thinking about their environmental impact and how to improve. Having Ten Thousand Positive Voices sounding this message of education and enthusing people to cut their CHG emissions into the future, will at least have twice the impact of 5,000, thus helping the Government achieve its GHG emissions and green power targets by 2020. Like many living near rainforests, who develop a “slash and burn” policy”, the Government needs to realize what a wonderful resource it has, and what future potential lays within the 10,000 people who are willing to make a difference now, and who, may well have, ideas and ways to expand the sustainability industry well into the future with limited Government funding, instead of a “slash and burn” policy. We do not deserve to get slashed and burned, we deserve a Contract and this is the only fair way to proceed. So please consider this plea with due diligence.

,