

AEF glossary guide - Northmore Gordon

Canonical: <https://northmoregordon.com/glossary/aef-2/>

Details:

Home > Glossary > AEF

AEF

According to our glossary, AEF stands for Australian Energy Foundation.

Related guidance

Carbon advisory

Scope 1, 2 and 3 emissions

Certificates

Government schemes

Certificate trading

Measurement and verification

What does the acronym AEF stand for?

According to our glossary, AEF stands for Australian Energy Foundation.

What does AEF mean, and how is it used in emissions and energy analysis?

The glossary entry for AEF is published by Northmore Gordon.

How does Northmore Gordon's practical glossary support consistent communication in energy projects?

Our 'Energy, Emissions and Project Terms: A Practical Glossary' provides plain-language definitions enabling project teams, clients and advisers to distinguish between related concepts like power versus energy, demand versus capacity, and baseline versus reporting period. Consistent terminology is essential because misuse—such as confusing energy measured in kWh with power measured in kW, or treating different certificate types as equivalent units—leads to incorrect assessments, flawed investment cases and failed scheme applications. The glossary ensures all stakeholders use the same reference definitions across audits, feasibility studies, measurement-and-verification work and environmental certificate applications.

Why does Northmore Gordon emphasize that scheme-specific definitions take precedence over its glossary?

Environmental certificate schemes such as the NSW Energy Savings Scheme and Victorian Energy Upgrades establish their own regulatory definitions and measurement requirements that may differ from general industry practice. Our glossary explicitly notes that scheme-specific definitions in applicable rules take precedence over its plain-language explanations. This qualification protects users from assuming a glossary definition automatically satisfies scheme requirements. Organizations and practitioners must consult the current NSW Energy Savings Scheme Rule, Victorian Government

specifications, or relevant ACCU method to confirm exact scheme terminology before submitting evidence or calculating certificate quantities.

What practical consequence does the distinction between baseline and forecast have for investment decisions?

A baseline establishes the representative pre-project conditions against which changes are evaluated, while a forecast estimates a future result dependent on stated assumptions. In investment cases, this distinction is critical because a modelled energy saving is not a verified result until measurement-and-verification analysis compares actual post-project consumption against the agreed baseline under comparable operating conditions. Our glossary reinforces that identifying a promising opportunity and confirming it delivered intended results are separate assessments. Organizations should prepare investment cases with and without conditional funding, understanding that an unimplemented opportunity remains a forecast, not an achieved saving, until operational evidence demonstrates the expected outcome.

How should organizations clarify capacity when discussing equipment options with advisers?

Capacity is a stated equipment capability whose meaning depends critically on the equipment type, yet the term is often used imprecisely. Our glossary distinguishes battery energy capacity measured in kWh from inverter power capacity measured in kW, reflecting that the same word means different things depending on context. When preparing a project brief or discussing equipment with Northmore Gordon or other advisers, organizations should specify whether they are discussing a battery's energy storage duration, a solar inverter's power output, a compressor's delivery rate, or a cooling system's load capacity. This precision prevents misunderstandings about equipment performance and ensures feasibility studies and investment cases are built on compatible assumptions.

Why are two electricity bills alone not sufficient evidence of energy savings?

An electricity bill reduction does not establish what caused the change. Production could have declined, operating hours shortened, weather patterns shifted, or energy prices changed—none of which represent equipment improvements. Our glossary emphasizes this distinction to underscore why measurement-and-verification methodology is essential for credible savings claims. The NSW M&V; guide referenced in the glossary explains how to establish a baseline, account for operating-condition changes through documented adjustments, and separate the effect of the intervention from confounding factors. Organizations claiming savings for investment approval, performance reporting or certificate applications must follow this disciplined approach rather than relying on bill comparisons.

What is the operational significance of distinguishing energy savings from tariff savings and maintenance benefits?

Energy savings represent reductions in actual consumption measured in kWh or MWh, while tariff savings result from lower demand charges or different pricing structures without necessarily reducing total energy use. Maintenance benefits arise from replacing worn equipment and may have nothing to do with efficiency. Our glossary and opportunity-register guidance require that these benefit lines be kept separate in investment cases so management understands what each element contributes and can assess the investment's resilience if assumptions change. A project might remain worthwhile based on energy and maintenance benefits alone, even if tariff savings prove smaller than forecast, or conversely, reliance on uncertain tariff structures might disappear if the business changes operating patterns or moves to a different location.

How does Northmore Gordon's definition of CO₂-e affect emissions reporting and claims?

CO₂-e expresses greenhouse gases on a common carbon-dioxide-equivalent basis using a stated methodology—typically the Global Warming Potential factors specified in relevant standards. Our glossary stresses that users must disclose the methodology because different standards yield different

CO₂-e values for identical emissions. Additionally, the glossary clarifies that corporate Scope 1, 2 and 3 categories classify different emissions sources, not certificate types. This distinction matters because organizations sometimes incorrectly label energy-savings certificates or ACCU instruments as 'Scope 1 reduction' when the instrument type and accounting scope are separate concepts. Accurate emissions reporting for NGER, sustainability disclosure, or carbon strategy requires consistent methodology and transparent boundaries.