

I would like to bring to your notice the complete lack of attention to detail and slow processing of the home assessment reports by the staff at the Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts.

My opinion is based on the following facts:

When I initially applied for the \$8000 solar rebate I received a reply from the department with my home address incorrect on all pages and this included my address on the envelope. Additional letters of the alphabet were added to my house unit number and to the start of my street name.

The above letter apologised for the delay stating that extensive checking was required to ensure the accuracy of each application.

My house was assessed during November last year for a Greens Loan Application. As time passed I sent the department several emails requesting the Greens loan assessment report. One email I sent included a "request read" attachment, I received no reply.

During my phone requests for the report to be sent to me, it was disclosed that the department had no records of incoming and outgoing correspondence. Insufficient staff numbers were available to answer incoming phone calls, greens loan assessors waited for up to 2 hours on hold to receive assistance for their enquiries. The 1800 number rings out without anyone answering. If anyone else ran a business like this they would end up bankrupt.

During February 2010, my Greens loan assessor also emailed the Greens Loan Team requesting my report be processed and sent to me. It finally arrived in March, over 3 months since the house assessment took place.

I believe the Greens Loan scheme is much like the recent government handouts to construct facilities at the schools around Australia. It is open to abuse as the householder decides how much is allocated to each eligible item. If ten items at your house were eligible, a person could decide to spend 100% of the loan on one item, such as "Install external shading for north facing windows". There is nothing to stop a person building an elaborate \$10,000 pergola over two windows. The item selected by the household could have been the least effective method of reducing the household energy costs on their list. Summing up: it's just another botched scheme run by Peter Garrett.