Have your say on our Getting to Fair: Advancing Equity - Draft strategy

1. Are there matters we should consider in evolving our Getting to Fair strategy to encompass both individual and system level equity?

A strategy that moves from individual barriers to system-level equity will succeed better if it applies a clear decision rule: improvements to "the system" must be evidenced as improvements to outcomes for real people, across the distribution, in real terms, and ability for the system to continue doing so recursively, or better, in compounding returns of improvement. Aggregate gains that coincide with worsening conditions for identifiable cohorts should be treated as failures in system design that result in unacceptable collateral damage.
If we were to:

1. Translate equity language into enforceable tests. Terms such as "justice", "equity", and "fairness" should require operational meaning at the point of decision. The strategy should specify a small set of repeatable regulatory tests that are applied across price determinations, and compliance and enforcement priorities.
   E.g.: affordability impacts per cohort, reliability of access, debt trajectories, and complaints and dispute outcomes.

2. Treat vulnerability as a factor of the system property. Then the strongest framing in the draft is that vulnerability arises from barriers rather than personal traits.
   Thus, system-level equity should target structural sources of harm, such as:
   - rule complexity;
   - opaque pricing;
   - poor disclosure;
   - landlord-tenant split incentives;
   - digital exclusion; and
   - dispute pathways that systematically advantage the better resourced party.

3. Separate processes from outcomes, and measure the outcomes publicly.
   We may find that inclusive engagement improves inputs, yet equity is demonstrated by outcomes.
   Committing the strategy to baseline measurements and public reporting of some cohort-disaggregated indicators should improve benchmarks, such as those on the topics of:
   - affordability stress;
   - arrears escalation;
   - disconnections and restrictions;
   - hardship entry and completion;
   - complaints;
   - dispute resolution quality;
   - and reliability and quality of service.
   (reported by relevant cohorts and linked to their geography).

4. Map ambition to remit and specify the escalation pathway.
   System-level equity can require levers that sit outside ESC's current powers. The strategy should distinguish what ESC can deliver within existing statutory authority from what requires government reform, set out how ESC will advise government where reform is necessary, and be transparent enough that support may become aware of the present barriers.

Then we may find improvements to our civic system.

2. Do you think the priority themes are the right themes to help achieve our goal?

Broadly yes. Business conduct, system-level responses, and regulatory inclusion are the right themes and cover major levers that shape equity outcomes in essential services.

An overarching theme is missing: Capability and accountability to deliver equitable outcomes.

Equity becomes realised when the system has the capability to measure outcomes, detect inequity early, act effectively, and when it is held accountable for the results. This should be a cross-cutting spine across all themes, including:

1. minimum data and reporting capability for cohort-disaggregated outcomes, with baselines and public tracking;
2. internal ESC capability, and tools to run distributional impact analysis for major reforms and transitions;
3. regulated business capability expectations in hardship, billing, collections, and dispute handling, with performance measures and consequences for repeatable harm;
4. a decision rule that treats "system improvement" as successful only where outcomes improve for affected cohorts in practice; and
5. multi-year outcome commitments to prevent priority drift.

Of the existing themes of Business Conduct, System-level Responses, and Regulatory Inclusion, we may find them stronger and more capable with:

I. Business conduct.
   Setting a higher bar than compliance with minimum rules. Equity failures frequently arise from conduct that is technically permissible, yet predictably harmful at scale. This theme should consider committing to:
   a. clear expectations on fairness in sales, billing, collections, hardship, and dispute handling;
   b. proactive detection of harmful patterns, using complaints, arrears, and dispute data;
   c. enforcement that targets repeatable harm and deterrence, and does not target symbolic actions;

d. a plain statement that “good conduct” means measurable reduction in preventable harm for affected cohorts.

II. System-level responses.
Making this the decision-rule theme. System reforms and transitions frequently shift costs, risks, and access unevenly, and this theme should consider committing to:

a. distributional impact analysis for major changes, before and after implementation;

b. mitigation obligations where a cohort predictably faces higher burden or reduced access;

c. transition safeguards for renters, low-income households, people with disabilities, and digitally excluded consumers;

d. identification of system pathologies that create inequity, including complexity, opaque pricing, and incentives that reward cost-shifting onto the least able to absorb it.

III. Regulatory inclusion.
Treating inclusion as a function of evidence-quality and not a participation metric, (and improving inputs) improves decisions. This theme should consider committing to:

a. sustained resourcing for consumer and community participation where capability gaps exist;

b. data standards that support reporting and analysis (cohort-disaggregated);

c. decision transparency that shows how equity evidence changed the outcome, with reasons published in plain language

3. What can be done to support our regulated sectors embed considerations of justice and equity at both the individual and system level?

To support our regulated sectors embed considerations of justice and equity at both the individual and system level we might first begin with agreed goals.

Embedding justice and equity should begin with a clear level-setting objective: the system and the people within it are 1:1 in importance. Essential services exist to serve people, and system stability exists to sustain that service over time. A reform should therefore be judged successful only where it improves system performance and improves lived outcomes for consumers and users, across cohorts, in real terms.

To support regulated sectors to embed this in practice, ESC can:

1. Publish decision tests and minimum standards that reflect the 1:1 objective. Translate “justice and equity” into a small set of tests used in codes, price outcomes, compliance priorities and enforcement. Make clear that “system improvement” cannot be claimed where identifiable cohorts experience worse affordability, access, reliability, or dispute outcomes.

2. Require cohort-disaggregated measurement with common definitions. Mandate consistent reporting on outcomes that reveal equity performance, including:
- affordability stress;
- arrears escalation;

- disconnection and restriction events;
- hardship entry and completion;
- complaints, dispute outcomes; and
- time-to-resolution.
(with breakdowns by relevant cohorts and geography).

3. Require distributional impact analysis for major changes, with mitigations designed in. Before significant reforms and transitions, require analysis of who bears costs, who receives benefits, and who carries risk. Where a cohort is predictably worse off, ESC can require explicit mitigations, monitoring, and review triggers.

4. Build capability expectations into business operations and assurance. Treat equity as a competence issue:
- staff training;
- decision tools;
- escalation pathways; and
- quality assurance in billing, collections, hardship and disputes.
ESC can require providers to demonstrate that these controls work in practice, and not only on paper.

5. Align incentives and enforcement with outcomes. ESC can use compliance and enforcement to target repeatable patterns of harm. Where cohort outcomes do not improve, ESC can require time-bound remediation with transparent reporting, and can escalate consequences for failure.

4. Is there anything else we should be doing to ensure the success of this strategy?

Yes. Success will likely depend on turning the strategy into a stable operating system for decisions, measurement, and correction.
The following may assist in achieving that goal:

1. Publish a small set of enduring equity-outcome measures (and baselines). Annual priorities are useful, yet success requires multi-year comparability. Establish a core dashboard of cohort-disaggregated measures, publish baselines, and report progress consistently over time.

2. Adopt an explicit decision rule for reforms and transitions. Treat the system and individuals as 1:1 in importance. A change should be considered successful only where system performance improves and lived outcomes improve for affected cohorts, in real terms. Where a cohort is predictably worse off, require mitigations as part of the design, plus review triggers.

3. Create a formal “learn and correct” loop. Require post-implementation reviews for major reforms, publish what worked and what failed, and specify how findings will change future determinations, codes, compliance priorities, and/or enforcement settings.

4. Strengthen data standards and comparability across sectors. Define minimum reporting requirements and consistent metrics so that equity performance is observable and not reliant

on self-selected evidence. Where possible, publish de-identified, aggregated datasets to enable independent scrutiny.

5. Resource participation so inclusion improves evidence quality. If consumer and community input is a pillar, ensure it is supported in practice through funding, accessible engagement formats, and sufficient time for considered responses, so that participation does not become limited to those with spare capacity.
6. Clarify remit and escalation pathways for reforms outside current powers. Identify which equity outcomes can be delivered through ESC decisions and enforcement, and which require government rule changes or legislative reform, with a clear pathway for advice and escalation.

5. What challenges or barriers might make it harder to deliver this strategy?

Several barriers could significantly and materially limit the delivery of the strategy, unless they are addressed explicitly.

1. Outcome ambiguity and definitional drift. If “justice”, “equity”, and “fairness” remain values rather than decision tests, the strategy can generate activity without any measurable improvement, and success can be asserted without any proof.
2. Data limitations and lack of comparability. Cohort-disaggregated outcomes require consistent definitions, minimum reporting standards, and sufficient data quality. Without this, inequity remains partially invisible and disputes about evidence can become permanent.
3. Incentive conflict within for-profit operating models. Where equity actions impose cost and benefits accrue later or to others, businesses face commercial pressure to minimise equity effort unless obligations, monitoring, and enforcement make equitable conduct the lowest-risk operating path.
4. Remit constraints and dependence on policy decisions outside ESC control. Some system-level drivers of inequity will sit outside ESC’s powers, thus requiring government reform, cross-agency coordination, or legislative change. Without clear escalation pathways, these issues will remain acknowledged yet unresolved.
5. Transition complexity and compounding shocks. Decarbonisation, digitisation, cost-of-living pressure, and housing stress can interact and concentrate harm quickly. A strategy that moves too slowly, or relies heavily on consultation cycles, will lag the harm.
6. Capability gaps across the system. Effective equity delivery requires competence in front-line functions (hardship, billing, collections, disputes), and regulatory competence in distributional analysis and enforcement design. Capability gaps can turn equity policy into inconsistent execution.

7. Participation and trust barriers. People most affected by inequity often have the least time and capacity to engage. If inclusion is not resourced and designed for accessibility, input will skew toward the already capable, and trust will remain weak.

6. Please share any other feedback you would like us to consider.

A few final points may strengthen the strategy's credibility and usefulness.

1. Treat equity as a systems discipline with a proof standard. Equity should be approached with the same seriousness as safety or reliability: define the test, measure the baseline, publish the result, and correct when outcomes fail. This helps protect the strategy from becoming values-led, yet outcome-light.
2. Publish a short "equity decision protocol" used across ESC work. A one-page protocol would materially improve consistency. It could include:
    a. the 1:1 principle that system performance and individual outcomes are inseparable, and reforms must improve both in practice;
    b. the minimum set of cohort outcome measures used in determinations and monitoring;
    c. the requirement for distributional impact analysis for major changes, plus mitigations where cohorts are predictably worse off; and/or
    d. the post-implementation review trigger and how findings will change future decisions.
3. Prioritise simplicity and safe defaults. Complexity functions as a regressive barrier. Simple product structures, clear communications, accessible channels, and dispute pathways that do not demand high literacy or persistence will deliver equity gains at scale.
4. Demonstrate how inclusion changes decisions. Publish examples showing how consumer and community evidence altered a determination, code, compliance priority, or enforcement stance. This builds trust and signals that engagement is consequential.
5. Coordinate across regulators and agencies where drivers of inequity sit outside ESC control. Where the binding constraint is outside remit, transparency about the constraint and a clear escalation pathway will prevent repeated recognition without resolution.

Importantly:
A strategy of this kind will face structural drag in a predominantly for-profit environment. Competitive pressure selects for cost shifting and complexity unless the regulator sets clear minimum standards, measures outcomes by cohort, and applies escalating consequences for patterns of preventable harm. Without that incentive alignment, equity risks remaining aspirational.

1. Are there matters we should consider in evolving our Getting to Fair strategy to encompass both individual and system level equity?

Yes, some matters to consider include:

a. Defining the boundary between “individual equity” and “system equity”, and then specifying the interaction.
b. The strategy should state, in plain terms, when an issue will be treated as individual, system, or mixed, and what triggers escalation from one to the other.
c. Adopting a small, stable set of equity outcome measures with cohort segmentation.
d. Measuring and reporting both prevalence and severity, segmented by relevant cohorts and contexts, so progress can be falsified.
e. Making “harm pathways” an organising unit of work. Where, for each essential service context, map how inequity enters the system, how it compounds, and where it concentrates.
f. Link each planned intervention to a specific breakage in a path, and an expected movement in indicators. Target compounding gains on root causes over symptoms, but treat symptoms to remove pain.
g. Clarify the regulators role. System-level equity includes price structures, cost recovery, risk allocation, access terms, and transition/maintenance costs. Consider stating the decision principles that will be applied to achieve the defined goals (Getting to Fair, and Advancing Equity in their literal meanings), and evidence what justifies them.
h. Treat administrative burden and complexity as a vector that can do significant harm. Many inequities arise through friction in forms, documentation, call-centre loops, digital exclusion, and procedural penalties that compound.
System level equity should consider that administrative burden is a system design problem that compounds on consumers/citizens, rather than a capability problem of the individuals.
i. Building an ‘equity gate’ into major and mid-level regulatory decisions and market reforms. Require a documented assessment of distributional impacts, cohort-specific risks, mitigations, and residual harms; and publish the reasoning.
j. Specifying how enforcement will operate across each of individual equity and system equity, and define how compliance priorities and enforcement escalation will be targeted when repeated harms indicate structural misconduct or structural design failure.
k. Making transition risk explicit. Sector transitions create predictable equity hazards, like stranded consumers and new product complexity, or the creation of exclusion classes who cannot access upgrades.
Set out how you will identify emerging harms early and intervene before they scale.
l. The system cannot function well without the individual; the individual cannot function well without the system. Any ratio away from 1:1 is selfish of one side. One cannot equitably benefit the group at the expense of the individual, nor benefit the individual at the expense of the group.

2. Do you think the priority themes are the right themes to help achieve our goal?

If no, are there other themes we should consider? If yes, is there a way we could strengthen or improve the themes? The three priority themes are: 1. Business conduct 2. System-level responses 3. Regulatory inclusion

Yes, I would consider these three themes to be able to achieve the goal, and would add one more: 4. Measurement and Accountability. On each individually:

a. Business Conduct

This theme should explicitly recognise that essential services are markets with low choice and high necessity. In such settings, a purely for-profit objective predictably pulls against equity unless it is tightly bounded by enforceable outcome obligations and market design that prevents value extraction from consumers who cannot practically opt out. Business conduct settings should therefore focus on outcomes rather than intent, and on preventing predictable harm vectors such as complexity, friction, and cost-shifting.

Actions that help strengthen this theme:

I. Defining minimum outcome standards that regulated entities must meet, including for cohorts experiencing persistent barriers
II. Treating administrative burden and harmful complexity as conduct risks where they predictably generate inequitable outcomes
III. Specifying clear escalation pathways when repeated harms show that incentives are overriding equitable service delivery.

b. System-level responses

This theme should be clearly framed as the redesign of defaults, incentives, and structural settings, rather than layering programmes on top of broken defaults. System-level equity is driven by price structures, cost recovery, access terms, and how transitions are managed, including the risk of newly ‘excluded classes’ forming as services modernise.

Actions that help strengthen this theme:

I. Requiring harm-pathway mapping so the Commission can show where inequity enters, compounds, and concentrates
II. Linking each intervention to a defined break in the harm pathway and an expected movement in indicators
III. Adopting an early-warning discipline for transitions, with thresholds that trigger intervention before harms scale.

c. Regulatory inclusion

This theme is essential, and it should be treated as decision quality rather than engagement volume. Inclusion should mean that material decisions demonstrate who is affected, what evidence was used (including lived experience), and how trade-offs were resolved.

Actions that help strengthen this theme:

I. Embedding an “equity gate” into major decisions, requiring documented distributional impacts and mitigations
II. Standardising participation infrastructure and evidence standards so consumer voice is consistently translated into regulatory action
III. Using a universal cohort method to avoid binary segmentation and to improve accuracy and legitimacy across the board.

d. Measurement and Accountability

This theme is a discipline theme that aims to ensure the other three and the strategy itself cannot become a set of well-intended headings that cannot be falsified, compared year-by-year, nor enforced consistently.

This theme can be strengthened by:

I. a small, stable equity scorecard with cohort-segmented reporting (and avoidance of averages that hide distributional harm)
II. baseline publication, annual targets or thresholds, and year-to-year comparability
III. transparent reporting on what changed, what did not, and why, including where interventions underperformed
IV. explicit linkage from measures to regulatory levers (guidance, codes, compliance priorities, enforcement escalation), so accountability is consequential.

3. What can be done to support our regulated sectors embed considerations of justice and equity at both the individual and system level?

To support regulated sectors to embed justice and equity at both the individual and system level, the Commission can shift from encouragement to an operating environment where equity is a routine design constraint, measured and enforced.

a. Make equity an explicit, testable obligation
    I. Publish minimum outcome expectations for essential consumer outcomes (access, affordability, continuity, hardship support quality, complaints resolution), with cohort segmentation so progress is visible.
    II. Translate “justice” into distributional tests that regulated entities must demonstrate: who carries costs, who bears risks, and whether burdens concentrate unfairly in identifiable cohorts.
b. Require equity impact assessment as a standard decision gate
    I. Require regulated entities to apply a consistent equity and justice assessment to material changes: pricing, fee structures, credit and debt pathways, disconnection practices, digital-only transitions, product innovation, and major operational changes.
    II. Expect published reasoning on mitigations and residual harms, so trade-offs are transparent.
c. Regulate complexity and administrative burden as harm vectors

    I. Set clear expectations that essential services providers reduce friction: documentation burden, repeated disclosure, call-centre loops, inaccessible digital processes, and confusing product design.
    II. Treat persistent friction-driven harm as a conduct issue, not a consumer capability issue.
d. Strengthen codes, guidance, and “default pathways” for predictable high-harm contexts
    I. Standardise and audit hardship and payment difficulty pathways, with quality measures that test whether supports are timely, effective, and sustained.
    II. Require robust practice settings for sensitive circumstances, including family violence-related risks and other crisis contexts, where standard processes can compound harm.
e. Use measurement, reporting, and benchmarking to shift incentives
    I. Mandate consistent data provision, including cohort-segmented outcomes, and publish benchmarking so sector leaders and laggards are visible.
    II. Use leading indicators for early harm detection, so intervention occurs before failures scale.
f. Align compliance and enforcement with equity outcomes
    I. Define “never events” and escalation triggers (for example, repeated wrongful disconnection risk, repeat failures in hardship supports, repeat failures to manage sensitive circumstances).
    II. Escalate predictably when patterns indicate structural disregard or incentive-driven harm.
g. Build capability in regulated entities
    I. Require that regulated entities demonstrate internal governance for equity: accountable executive ownership, staff training, and embedded procedures that operationalise the Commission’s expectations.
    II. Encourage shared learning through sector roundtables focused on measurable outcomes and practical redesign, not general discussion.
h. Support place-based engagement where it materially improves outcomes
    I. Where community impacts are place-linked, require engagement through the relevant local and community bodies and ensure the engagement affects design decisions, not just communications.

4. Is there anything else we should be doing to ensure the success of this strategy?

Yes. Success will depend on whether the strategy is treated as a disciplined regulatory programme with durable governance, clear evidence standards, and consequences.

a. Establish a stable governance and delivery architecture
    I. Create a published implementation plan that links yearly priorities to the strategy’s outcomes, with clear ownership, timelines, and decision gates.
    II. Maintain continuity across years so work does not reset with each annual work programme.
b. Publish a small, stable equity scorecard with baselines

    I. Set a minimum set of indicators that remain stable across the strategy period, with baselines published early.
    II. Report cohort-segmented results and distributions, so progress can be evidenced.
c. Tighten the evidence standards for “what counts”
    I. Specify how quantitative data, complaints intelligence, and lived experience evidence will be weighted and combined.
    II. Publish a clear standard for when evidence is sufficient to justify intervention, code changes, or enforcement escalation.
d. Create an early-warning and rapid-response function
    I. Build a mechanism to detect emerging harms from transition, innovation, digitalisation, and business model change before they scale.
    II. Define thresholds that trigger action, including targeted compliance activity, guidance updates, or interim protections.
e. Lock in accountability through consequences
    I. Make explicit how measurement feeds regulatory levers: guidance, codes, licence conditions where applicable, compliance priorities, and enforcement.
    II. Define escalation pathways when poor outcomes persist, so accountability is consequential.
f. Reduce fragmentation across regulators and schemes
    I. Formalise coordination where equity issues span multiple regulators or programmes, so consumers do not face gaps, hand-offs, or contradictory processes.
    II. Where possible, standardise definitions and data fields across schemes to reduce burden and improve comparability.
g. Fund participation and protect consumer voice integrity
    I. Expand paid participation where appropriate and provide practical supports so consumer voice is not dominated by those with time, resources, or institutional familiarity.
    II. Publish what was heard, what changed as a result, and what did not change, with reasons.
h. Treat workforce capability as infrastructure
    I. Build internal capability in distributional analysis, harm pathway mapping, behavioural design, and trauma-informed service impacts.
    II. Ensure capability translates into templates and decision tools that are used routinely.

5. What challenges or barriers might make it harder to deliver this strategy?

Key challenges and barriers that could materially hinder delivery:

a. Aspirational framing without enforceable levers. If equity remains primarily values language, regulated entities will default to commercial incentives and minimum compliance, and outcomes will not shift.

b. Weak measurement and inconsistent data. Without stable indicators, cohort segmentation, and comparable reporting, progress cannot be proven, harms will be masked by averages, and accountability will be soft.

c. Binary or overly coarse segmentation. Treating the community as “Indigenous vs non-Indigenous”, or relying on broad categories that ignore place-based and nation-specific differences, risks poor targeting, legitimacy loss, policy error, division, and the creation of new harms.

d. Administrative complexity and legacy systems. Failure in implementation because provider systems, billing platforms, call-centre processes, and hardship pathways are not designed for low-friction support and rapid adaptation.

e. Transition pressures and product innovation. Modernisation and new business models can create new ‘excluded classes’ faster than regulatory protections are updated.

f. Regulatory fragmentation and hand-offs. Equity issues often span multiple schemes and agencies. Without tight coordination, gaps appear, consumers carry the burden of navigation, and inevitably fall through the cracks.

g. Capacity constraints. Delivering a strategy of this scope requires sustained staff capability, time, and funding, and consistency beyond short political cycles, including the resourcing of consumer participation. Without it, the work programme risks dilution.

h. Industry resistance and compliance gaming. Where equity reforms constrain profit extraction, some entities will push back, delay, or respond with performative compliance unless requirements are precise and enforcement credible.

6. Please share any other feedback you would like us to consider.

a. Equity must be pursued on a consistent, whole-of-community basis. Effective system-level equity requires a universal segmentation method: one population / regulatory framework, many cohorts, with cohort-specific action triggered by evidence of harm, persistent barriers, or failure of generic protections.

   The strategy should explicitly recognise that multiple cohorts may face distinct barriers in essential services, including, without limitation, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities, culturally and linguistically diverse communities and recent migrants, people with disability, older people, young people transitioning to independence, people on low incomes or experiencing housing insecurity, people in rural and remote communities, people affected by family violence, and those with low digital access or capability.

   Where Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander engagement is required, the Commission should adopt a place-based approach, engaging the appropriate nation or Traditional Owner bodies relevant to each issue and location, with clear standing, adequate resourcing, and transparent evidence standards. This should

be implemented within the same rule-set that governs parallel protections for any other cohort, triggered by evidence of persistent harm.

To minimise foreseeable implementation harms, the strategy's First Nations Self-Determination framework should be specified as a governance method with defined decision rights, mapped accountabilities, integrity safeguards against capture, and cohort-comparable measurement. Targeted governance settings should not reduce baseline protections or create inconsistent service standards. Initiatives should operate under explicit review triggers, with modification or withdrawal required where evidence shows harm or underperformance, and with equal civic standing preserved through a single, consistent regulatory framework.

Preserving equal civic standing and regulatory consistency is essential for sustainable, fair, and optimal outcomes for all Victorians.

b. Additionally, I would raise the following considerations:
    I. Publication of a succinct set of governing maxims, and to hold the programme to them. A short list of maxims makes decisions consistent, auditable, and resistant to rhetorical drift.
    II. Adoption of a "signal integrity" commitment. Systems fail when information is distorted. In this context that means: avoid metrics that hide distributional harm, avoid reporting that collapses cohorts into averages, and publish definitions so industry cannot game terms. Make "signal integrity" a stated principle of measurement, reporting, and compliance.
    III. Addition of an explicit anti-extraction and contestability stance for essential services. Markets are structurally prone to value extraction through complexity, friction, and market power. I would suggest the Commission treat these as predictable pathologies and design regulation to preserve contestability, constrain gaming, and prevent durable advantage:disadvantage from loopholes.
    IV. Use an explicit diagnostic-and-levers model. Good governance must specify the test and the response. I would suggest at least every mid and major equity initiative includes: the diagnostic test, the leading indicator, the intervention lever, the escalation rule, and the reversal rule if evidence fails.
    V. Inclusion of a hard "1:1" outcome rule. The system cannot be called healthy if the aggregate looks better while the affected cohorts deteriorate. I would suggest the strategy is required to demonstrate improvement in lived outcomes for cohorts experiencing barriers alongside system integrity outcomes. And to ensure success cannot be claimed through sector-wide averages or narrow proxy measures.
    VI. Implementation of required reversibility and learning loops. I would suggest that the Commission publish what did not work, why it did not work, and what will change next. And that it converts annual reporting into a learning system.
    VII. Finally, I would suggest publishing the reasoning behind material decisions. Without an explicit rationale, future decision-makers cannot understand why an instrument exists or what harms are likely to re-emerge if it is removed.