























IPMVP - Benefits

- Defines standard approaches to "measuring" and "savings calculation" to reassure facility owners.
- Legitimizes ESCO projects through international recognition of the payment through the savings.
- Provides guidance on the trade-off between measurement "accuracy" and measurement cost.
- Helps parties to create transparent, repeatable performance contract terms and emission trades regarding savings settlement.
- Provides general, not specific guidance, and a framework under which specific methodologies are created and used.

Introduction 13



Introduction 7

VO.



- Establishes a framework to manage energy for industrial commercial, institutional or governmental facilities, enabling them to:
 - Develop a policy for more efficient use of energy
 - Fix targets and objectives to meet the policy
 - Use data to better understand and make decisions concerning energy use and consumption
 - Measure the results
 - Review the effectiveness of the policy
 - Continually improve energy management.
- Can be implemented individually or integrated with other management system standards.

 FVO

Introduction 15



© Efficiency Valuation Organization













| | The "M" in M&V |
|----------------|--|
| | The M in M&V stands for: <i>Measurement</i> |
| | Not Monitoring |
| Key Concepts 3 | (Monitoring is a separate activity from the determination of savings. It is the process of observing energy use for prediction, cost-control and diagnostic purposes.) |























Two Basic Methods

Whole Facility Method:

Measures all effects in the facility:

- Retrofits AND other changes (intended and unintended)
- Often uses the utility meter
- Adjustments can be complex

Retrofit Isolation Method:

Measures the effect of the retrofit, only

- Savings are unaffected by changes beyond the measurement boundary
- Usually requires a dedicated meter
- Adjustments can be simple

Key Concepts 15



© Efficiency Valuation Organization













| M&V Cost vs. Uncertainty |
|---|
| There is no <i>absolutely</i> correct savings number. There is always some uncertainty. |
| Decide how much uncertainty can you accept or afford. |
| Each owner finds its own balance between reporting uncertainty and cost for each project. |
| Ref: IPMVP Core Concepts 2014, Chapter 7.11 |
| Key Concepts 23 |



Key Concepts 12













Key Concepts 15









Multiple ECM Building Retrofit

Commercial Building in Canada

| Energy Conservation Measures | Simple Payback (years) |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Lighting retrofit | 4.5 |
| Energy efficient motors | 5.6 |
| HVAC modifications | 5.4 |
| Control system | 3.4 |
| Building leakage reduction | 2.1 |
| Training and awareness | 0.5 |
| hort Examples 3 | EVO Traditional and the database |



© Efficiency Valuation Organization

| | Sample Baseli | Optic ne Dat | on C a | |
|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| | | Heating | Gas | |
| | Meter Reading Date | Degree | Consumption | |
| | February 5, 2008 | Days (65F) | mcf | |
| | March 5, 2008 | 650 | 210,692 | |
| | April 7, 2008 | 440 | 208,664 | |
| | May 6, 2008 | 220 | 157,886 | |
| | June 5, 2008 | 150 | 120,793 | |
| | July 7, 2008 | 50 | 116,508 | |
| | August 7, 2008 | 20 | 107,272 | |
| | September 5, 2008 | 14 | 95,411 | |
| | October 6, 2008 | 29 | 126,423 | |
| | November 6, 2008 | 125 | 149,253 | |
| | December 4, 2008 | 275 | 166,202 | |
| | January 6, 2009 | 590 | 221,600 | |
| | February 5, 2009 | 723 | 224,958 | and the second |
| hort Examples E | | 3.286 | 1.905.662 | EVO |







| | | Co | mnut | ation | nc | | | |
|--------------------|-------------|------------------------------------|------------|--|-----------|---------|-------|----------|
| | | CO | mput | ation | 13 | | | |
| | Reporting p | ting period Adju data Intercept | | Adjusted baseline data Intercept Slope | | Savings | | |
| Meter Reading Date | Gata | | (Baseload) | (weather Sensitive) | Total | | Value | |
| | Consumption | HDD Factor | tors | | Gas (mcf) | Price = | | |
| | mcf | (65F/18C) | 111,358 | 173.27 | | | \$ | 6.23 |
| March 6, 2009 | 151,008 | 601 | 111,358 | 104,135 | 215,493 | 64,485 | \$ | 401,87 |
| April 4, 2009 | 122,111 | 420 | 111,358 | ? | ? | ? | ? | |
| May 6, 2009 | 102,694 | 188 | 111,358 | 32,575 | 143,933 | 41,239 | \$ | 257,00 |
| June 5, 2009 | 111,211 | 250 | 111,358 | 43,318 | 154,676 | 43,465 | \$ | 270,87 |
| July 5, 2009 | 80,222 | 41 | 111,358 | 7,104 | 118,462 | 38,240 | \$ | 238,31 |
| August 6, 2009 | 71,023 | 15 | 111,358 | 2,599 | 113,957 | 42,934 | \$ | 267,56 |
| September 8, 2009 | 65,534 | 5 | 111,358 | 866 | 112,224 | 46,690 | \$ | 290,97 |
| October 9, 2009 | 77,354 | 12 | 111,358 | ? | ? | ? | ? | |
| November 4, 2009 | 103,000 | 190 | 111,358 | 32,921 | 144,279 | 41,279 | \$ | 257,25 |
| December 10, 2009 | 115,112 | 300 | 111,358 | 51,981 | 163,339 | 48,227 | \$ | 300,55 |
| January 7, 2010 | 160,002 | 700 | 111,358 | 121,289 | 232,647 | 72,645 | \$ | 452,72 |
| February 4, 2010 | 145,111 | 612 | 111,358 | 106,041 | 217,399 | 72,288 | \$ | 450,49 |
| Total | 1,304,382 | | | | 1,616,409 | 511,492 | \$ | 3,187,62 |











Option D

Advantages & Disadvantages

Advantages:

- Evaluates performance of the entire facility **and** individual ECMs.
- Evaluates performance of individual systems.
- Includes interactive effects amongst ECMs, and between ECMs and the rest of the facility.

Disadvantages:

- Can be expensive and complicated.
- Special skills needed for simulation.
- Hard to calibrate simulation to real energy data.

EVO

Short Examples 15



© Efficiency Valuation Organization





| | Pre-retrofit | Post-retrofit |
|--|--------------|---------------|
| # Samples | 73 | 30 |
| Measured average watts per operating (not burned out) fixture | 193.1 | 102.1 |
| Number of fixtures | 2,000 | 1,950 |

| | | 1 |
|---|--------------|---------------|
| | Pre-retrofit | Post-retrofit |
| Total kW (95% of fixtures operating) | | |
| Lighting load reduction | | kW |
| Monthly energy savings | | kWh/month |














| Sample (Baselin | Dption B e Test |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Averaged over the one mo | onth baseline period test: |
| Mode | Energy Use (kWh/hr) |
| Mill ON (operating) | 135.1 |
| Mill OFF (not operating) | 102.3 |
| Note: Energy use was co | nstant in each mode. |
| Baseline I | Energy = |
| (135.1 * ON hrs) + | (102.3 * OFF hrs) |
| ort Examples 29 | |

| | S a 2009 Rej | ampl porting | e Op g Peri | otion B od Actual [| Data |
|---------------|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| | | Plant | Hours | Actual | |
| | | On | Off | Energy (kWh) | |
| | January | 496 | 248 | 61,005 | |
| | February | 448 | 224 | 52,321 | |
| | March | 496 | 248 | 61,987 | |
| | April | 480 | 240 | 59,921 | |
| | May | 496 | 248 | 60,111 | |
| | June | 480 | 240 | 60,191 | |
| | July | 200 | 544 | 50,345 | |
| | August | 496 | 248 | 62,255 | |
| | September | 480 | 240 | 58,765 | |
| | October | 496 | 248 | 61,178 | |
| | November | 480 | 240 | 59,232 | |
| | December | 150 | 594 | 48,822 | a da sana |
| Short Example | s 30 | | | | EVO |



























Interactive Effects - Example Lighting & Cooling

- The lighting ECM reduces heat gain by 10 kW.
- Reduced heat gain in the facility can reduce the mechanical cooling energy required. It can also increase heating energy in the winter.
- A typical cooling system might see a savings of about 3 kW (from a separate engineering calculation that is not part of this course or IPMVP.)
- So the **Interactive Effect** is **estimated** to be 30% more savings than just the lighting energy (for locations and times when mechanical cooling is used).

M&V Planning 9



© Efficiency Valuation Organization











| | | | 1165 | LAU | inpic |
|--------------|----------|--------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Using th | ie Optio | on C Exa | imple fr | om Mod | ule 3 |
| | | | | | |
| ep 1 – Resta | te Base | eline Ga | s under | Normal | conditions |
| • | | Adjusted Bas | eline Gas (Nori | mal Conditions) | |
| Normal date | Normal | Baseload | Weather Sensitive | Total Normal | |
| | HDD | intercept | slope | Baseline Gas | |
| | | 111 358 | 173,27 | (step 1) | |
| March | 551 | 111 358 | 95 472 | 206 830 | |
| April | 482 | ? | ? | ? | |
| May | 301 | 111 358 | 52 154 | 163 512 | |
| June | 200 | 111 358 | 34 654 | 146 012 | |
| July | 55 | 111 358 | 9 530 | 120 888 | |
| August | 12 | 111 358 | 2 079 | 113 437 | |
| September | 30 | 111 358 | 5 198 | 116 556 | |
| October | 66 | ? | ? | ? | |
| November | 201 | 111 358 | 34 827 | 146 185 | |
| December | 311 | 111 358 | 53 887 | 165 245 | |
| January | 677 | 111 358 | 117 304 | 228 662 | |
| Fobruary | 603 | 111 358 | 104 482 | 215.840 | Marine Company |



| Norm | aliz | zed | Savi | ngs - | - Eva | mnlo |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|------------|--------------|
| Sten 3 – Resta | ate Re | norting | Perior | gas und | | al condition |
| | | Total | Adjuste | d Reporting P | Period Gas | Normalized |
| | | Normal | Intercept | Slope (weather | | Savings |
| Meter Reading Date | Normal HDD | Baseline Gas | (baseload) Fa | sensitive) | Total | Gas (mcf) |
| | | (step 1) | 74,151 | 124.35 | | Gus (mei) |
| March 6, 2009 | 551 | 206,830 | 74,151 | 68,517 | 142,668 | 64,162 |
| April 4, 2009 | 482 | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| May 6, 2009 | 301 | 163,512 | 74,151 | 37,429 | 111,580 | 51,932 |
| June 5, 2009 | 200 | 146,012 | 74,151 | 24,870 | 99,021 | 46,991 |
| July 5, 2009 | 55 | 120,888 | 74,151 | 6,839 | 80,990 | 39,898 |
| August 6, 2009 | 12 | 113,437 | 74,151 | 1,492 | 75,643 | 37,794 |
| September 8, 2009 | 30 | 116,556 | 74,151 | 3,731 | 77,882 | 38,674 |
| October 9, 2009 | 66 | ? | ? | ? | ? | ? |
| November 4, 2009 | 201 | 146,185 | 74,151 | 24,994 | 99,145 | 47,040 |
| December 10, 2009 | 311 | 165,245 | 74,151 | 38,673 | 112,824 | 52,421 |
| January 7, 2010 | 677 | 228,662 | 74,151 | 84,185 | 158,336 | 70,326 |
| February 4, 2010 | 603 | 215,840 | 74,151 | 74,983 | 149,134 | 66,706 |
| V Planning 18 | | | | | | EVO |

| Norma | lized | Savir | ngs · | – EX | am | ple |
|-----------------------|------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| Comp | arison wi | th "Avoide | ed" gas | (Mod | ule 3) | |
| Meter Reading Date | "Avoided" Gas | "Normalized Savings" | Difference in Savings | Actual HDD | , Normal HDD | Difference in HDD |
| March 6, 2009 | 64,485 | 64,162 | 323 | 601 | 551 | 50 |
| April 4, 2009 | ? | ? | ? | 420 | 482 | (62) |
| May 6, 2009 | 41,239 | 51,932 | (10,693) | 188 | 301 | (113) |
| June 5, 2009 | 43,465 | 46,991 | (3,526) | 250 | 200 | 50 |
| July 5, 2009 | 38,240 | 39,898 | (1,658) | 41 | 55 | (14) |
| August 6, 2009 | 42,934 | 37,794 | 5,140 | 15 | 12 | 3 |
| September 8, 2009 | 46,690 | 38,674 | 8,016 | 5 | 30 | (25) |
| October 9, 2009 | ? | ? | ? | 12 | 66 | (54) |
| November 4, 2009 | 41,279 | 47,040 | (5,761) | 190 | 201 | (11) |
| December 10, 2009 | 48,227 | 52,421 | (4,194) | 300 | 311 | (11) |
| January 7, 2010 | 72,645 | 70,326 | 2,319 | 700 | 677 | 23 |
| February 4, 2010 | 72,288 | 66,706 | 5,582 | 612 | 603 | 9 |
| Total | 609,595 | 617,166 | (7,571) | 3,334 | 3,489 | (155) |
| | Including | April + Oct | -1.2% | | | -4.6% |











© Efficiency Valuation Organization

M&V Planning 12

















| Isolation Meter Data Sourc | es |
|--|-----------|
| To isolate a retrofit's energy use from the re the facility, we might measure: amps, watts power factor, chilled water energy, hot wate energy, steam flow or energy, condensate, g volume, operating hours, number of cycles, | er gas |
| Consider: | |
| Accuracy Availability Credibility Cos | t |
| M&V Planning 33 | |



Other Independent Variables or Static Factor Data Sources

For other independent variables or Static Factor, like: production volume, product mix, plant hours, guest room use, sales, store hours, vacancy rate, we must find appropriate formal or informal methods of capturing such data.

Consider:

Accuracy Availability Credibility Cost

M&V Planning 35



© Efficiency Valuation Organization

























Meter Accuracy

- Size the meter for the appropriate range.
- Select a meter for the rates occurring most of the time.
- If accuracy beyond the available meter range is important, use two-stage flow meters: high and low flow elements.
- Watch out for loss of accuracy through 'truncation' by data communication or software translation (8 bit data vs. 16 bit data)
- Use the same meter for 'before' and 'after' readings.

EVO

M&V Planning 49



© Efficiency Valuation Organization

Other Uses for M&V Meters

Concerned about the cost of meters? You may be able to share the M&V meter costs with other purposes such as:

- load analysis for ECM planning;
- process control, optimizing or sending alarms about system or component conditions;

EVO

- sub-billing of tenants;
- allocation of costs to responsible departments;
- confirming utility bills;
- forecasting;
- load profiling for negotiation with a power supplier.

Not all meter costs need to be borne by the M&V.

M&V Planning 51

| | Metering |
|------------------|---|
| Application | Instrument |
| Electricity | True RMS Wattmeter, power meter |
| Illumination | Luxmeter, operating hour logger |
| Occupied hours | Occupancy sensor (Data logger) |
| Rotational speed | Tachometer (contact, stroboscopic, and optic) |
| Air flow | Anemometer |
| Pressure | Digital manometer |
| Temperature | Digital thermometer or Digital data logger |
| Humidity | Digital hygrometer |
| Air quality | Gas analyser: CO2 |
| Combustion | Combustion analyser |
| Process | Data logger – Process signal |
| Liquid Flow | Flowmeter - See next slide |

© Efficiency Valuation Organization





Meter Installation and commissioning

- Always follow manufacturer's instructions (if you can).
- If you need conduit and/or concealment for wires, costs go up significantly. Is this the place for wireless?
- Use labels and seals to protect meters and cabinets against neglect by others, damage and mistreatment.
- Program data loggers for the correct channels.
- Check to hand held instruments.
- "End to end" initial site calibration from measured quantity to computer readout.

M&V Planning 55



© Efficiency Valuation Organization


















































Critical Issues 9



© Efficiency Valuation Organization



| | M&V Design X | M&V Design Y |
|--------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|
| Annual Savings | \$100,000 | \$100,000 |
| Uncertainty | +/- \$25,000 | +/- \$5,000 |
| Annual M&V Cost | \$6,000 | How much would you pay? Why? |













When Do a BLA?

- Change in Static Factors may be:
 - gradual (creeping load growth) or sudden
 - permanent or temporary.
- Monitor Static Factors relative to those recorded in the M&V Plan for the baseline period.
- Do a BLA when a change in Static Factors is recognized or at least annually – while memories are fresh and other possibly necessary data is still available.

• Avoid changes to long past accounting periods. Critical Issues 19



© Efficiency Valuation Organization







| | Ex | am | ple | BI | A - | Par | t 1 | |
|----------|---------|--------|-----------------|-------|------------|----------|---------------|--------|
| | | | | - | _/ \ | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | Number | Wa | ttage | Hou | rs/week | Energy | Diversity | Demand |
| | | Peak | Standby | Peak | Standby | kWh/wk | Factor | kW |
| Old | | | | | | | | |
| CPU | 200 | 200 | 175 | 80 | 88 | 6,280 | 0.80 | 32 |
| Monitor | 200 | 110 | 110 | 130 | 38 | 3,696 | 1.00 | 22 |
| Printer | 75 | 550 | 90 | 130 | 38 | 5,619 | 0.90 | 37 |
| Total | | | | | | 15,595 | | 91 |
| New | | | | | | | | |
| CPU | 300 | 300 | 50 | 80 | 88 | 8,520 | 0.80 | 72 |
| Monitor | 300 | 125 | 15 | 130 | 38 | 5,046 | 1.00 | 38 |
| Printer | 100 | 600 | 25 | 130 | 38 | 7,895 | 0.90 | 54 |
| Total | | | | | | 21,461 | | 164 |
| Increase | | | | | kWh/wk | 5,866 | | 72 |
| | | | | | kWh/mo | 25,400 | | |
| Vell kr | nown fa | cts ar | e bold e | ed. 1 | The res | t are as | sumptic EV | ons. |



| E | Exam | nble | BLA | \ — F | Par | t 3 | |
|-------|-----------|-------------|-----------|----------|------------|----------|------------|
| _ | | - | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Electri | city Consun | nption | Elect | ric Dem | and | |
| | Last | BLA | New | Last | BLA | New | |
| | Baseline | | Baseline | Baseline | | Baseline | |
| Jan | 1,350,000 | 25,400 | 1,375,400 | 3,375 | 72 | 3,447 | |
| Feb | 1,250,000 | 25,400 | 1,275,400 | 3,125 | 72 | 3,197 | |
| Mar | 1,150,000 | 25,400 | 1,175,400 | 2,875 | 72 | 2,947 | |
| Apr | 1,250,000 | 25,400 | 1,275,400 | 3,125 | 72 | 3,197 | |
| May | 1,300,000 | 33,866 | 1,333,866 | 3,250 | 101 | 3,351 | |
| Jun | 1,400,000 | 33,866 | 1,433,866 | 3,500 | 101 | 3,601 | |
| Jul | 1,770,000 | 33,866 | 1,803,866 | 4,425 | 101 | 4,526 | |
| Aug | 1,820,000 | 33,866 | 1,853,866 | 4,550 | 101 | 4,651 | |
| Sep | 1,700,000 | 33,866 | 1,733,866 | 4,250 | 101 | 4,351 | |
| Oct | 1,500,000 | 25,400 | 1,525,400 | 3,750 | 72 | 3,822 | |
| Nov | 1,250,000 | 25,400 | 1,275,400 | 3,125 | 72 | 3,197 | |
| Dec | 1,200,000 | 25,400 | 1,225,400 | 3,000 | 72 | 3,072 | |
| Total | | 347,130 | | | 1,013 | | |
| | | | | | | | helte is a |























| | Example Value Calculation | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Price | Blocks | Adjust | ed Baseline | Repo | orting Period | | |
| | kWh | Price | | 270,000 | | 200,000 | | |
| | 250 | \$ 0.2900 | \$ | 73 | \$ 73 | | | |
| | 9,750 | \$ 0.1510 | \$ | 1,472 | \$ | 1,472 | | |
| | 240,000 | \$ 0.0723 | \$ | 17,352 | \$ | 13,737 | | |
| | Balance \$ 0.0611 | | \$ 1,222 | | \$- | | | |
| | | Total | \$ | 20,119 | \$ | 15,282 | | |
| Savings for the example month are: \$20,119 - \$15,282 = \$4,837 | | | | | | | | |
| or this isolati rice p | s example, on" meter er kWh wh | if the savi (not utilit ich can be | ngs ha y mete e used | id been de er), is ther to value s | etermi e a <i>sir</i> aving | ined at an ngle margin s for all mo EVO | | |

| Price Blocks | | | Ad | j Baseline | Rej | porting Per | Savings | | |
|--------------|------|-----|--------|------------|---------|-------------|---------|----|--------|
| k | Wh | | Price | | 270,000 | | 200,000 | | 70,000 |
| | 250 | \$ | 0.2900 | \$ | 73 | \$ | 73 | \$ | - |
| 9, | 750 | \$ | 0.1510 | \$ | 1,472 | \$ | 1,472 | \$ | - |
| 240,0 | 000 | \$ | 0.0723 | \$ | 17,352 | \$ | 13,737 | \$ | 3,615 |
| Balan | ce | \$ | 0.0611 | \$ | 1,222 | \$ | - | \$ | 1,222 |
| | | 1 | Total | \$ | 20,119 | \$ | 15,282 | \$ | 4,837 |
| Ave | rage | \$/ | kWh | \$ | 0.0745 | \$ | 0.0764 | \$ | 0.0691 |
| Marg | inal | \$/ | kWh | \$ | 0.0611 | \$ | 0.0723 | | ? |

















- If there is a credibility gap arising from the difference in the energy expertise of the parties to a performance contract.
- Energy performance contract terms with an ESCO may (be perceived to) give the two parties divergent interests.
- Requirements of the contract itself (especially in the public sector or as part of a program).
- Requirements of an emission trading program.

VO

Critical Issues 47



© Efficiency Valuation Organization











- Retrofit Isolation techniques (Options A & B) focus on the retrofit.
- Under Option A, field conditions should be **verified** to ensure savings persistence (IPMVP Core Concepts 2014, Chapter 6.2.4)
- Total utility cost may not reflect these savings, due to energy use patterns beyond the boundary of measurement.
- If there is concern about total utility cost:
 - Plan to use Option C, or
 - Set up a means of **verifying** that all other operations are under control.

Critical Issues 53



© Efficiency Valuation Organization



| | Next Topic | | | | | | | |
|---------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1. | Introduction | | | | | | | |
| 2. | Key Concepts | | | | | | | |
| 3. | Short Examples | | | | | | | |
| 4. | M&V Planning | | | | | | | |
| 5. | Critical Issues | | | | | | | |
| 6. | Statistics | | | | | | | |
| 7. | Retrofit Isolation Details | | | | | | | |
| 8. | Option C Details | | | | | | | |
| 9. | Option D Details | | | | | | | |
| 10. | Other M&V applications | | | | | | | |
| 11. | Summary and review of a detailed M&V plan | | | | | | | |
| Critical Issu | ues 56 | | | | | | | |



M&V Fundamentals

& the International Performance Measurement and Verification Protocol

For Energy Managers

M&V Calculations



© Efficiency Valuation Organization

Statistics 1


1.Introduction



© Efficiency Valuation Organization













































Statistics 12

| Linear Reg | gression | - Ex | amp | ole Step | |
|----------------------------|--------------------|----------|---------|--|--|
| Create Linear | | Days | Heating | Gas | |
| | Meter Reading Date | | Degree | Consumption mcf 210'692 208'664 | |
| regression model | February 5, 2008 | | Days | | |
| | March 5, 2008 | 29 33 | 650 | | |
| from Energy | April 7, 2008 | | 440 | | |
| Consumption data: | Iviay 6, 2008 | 29 | 220 | 157 886 | |
| consumption data. | Julie 5, 2008 | 30 | 150 | 120 793 | |
| | August 7, 2008 | 32 | 20 | 107'272 | |
| | September 5, 2008 | 29 | 14 | 95'411 | |
| | October 6, 2008 | 31 | 29 | 126'423 | |
| File: Example Option C.xls | November 6, 2008 | 31 | 125 | 149'253 | |
| | December 4, 2008 | 28 | 275 | 166'202 | |
| | January 6, 2009 | 33 | 590 | 221'600 | |
| | February 5, 2009 | 30 | 723 | 224'958 | |
| | | 366 | 3'286 | 1'905'662 | |
| atistics 25 | | | Ń | | |



[©] Efficiency Valuation Organization





























- The M&V Plan, (IPMVP Core Concepts 2014, Chapter 7.11) should indicate the expected accuracy associated with the measurement, data capture, sampling and data analysis.
 - This assessment should include qualitative and feasible quantitative determination of the *confidence interval* within which one expects the true savings value would be.
 - It is also requested to state the *confidence level*: the probability to have the *true* savings result/measurement within the defined *confidence interval (advanced M&V course).*
- Let us take an example.

Statistics 39



© Efficiency Valuation Organization

Statistics 20





























© Efficiency Valuation Organization

Statistics 27









Next Topic

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Key Concepts
- 3. Short Examples
- 4. M&V Planning
- 5. Critical Issues
- 6. Statistics
- 7. Retrofit Isolation Details
- 8. Option C Details
- 9. Option D Details
- 10. Other M&V applications
- 11. Summary and review of a detailed M&V plan



M&V Fundamentals

& the International Performance Measurement and Verification Protocol

For Energy Managers

Retrofit Isolation Details



© Efficiency Valuation Organization

















| Option B Step 3 (Baseline data) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------------|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|
| Gathered data from several weeks of testing: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tons | 300 | 350 | 400 | 450 | 500 | 550 | 600 | 650 | 700 | 750 | 800 | 850 | 900 | 950 | 1000 |
| Measured kW | 290 | 350 | 400 | 360 | 400 | 390 | 430 | 420 | 570 | 540 | 620 | 600 | 600 | 750 | 750 |
| For later reference: • Total of cooling load data = 9,750 tons • Total of electrical measured average kW data = 7,470 kW | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Retrofit Isolation 11 | | | | | | | RGANIZATION | dalalalalal | | | | | | | |








| Option B Step 6 (Predict) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|--------|--------------|----------|---------|---------------------|
| | | | For | On | e D | ay | | |
| | | New N | Nachine | | Old Machir | ne | | |
| | | Actual Po | st-Retrofit | Predic | ted Electric | ity (kW) | Savings | |
| | | D | ata | Fac | tors | | | |
| | Time | Avg kW | Avg Load | Fixed | Load | Total | kW | |
| | 23-Jul-09 | | Tons | 95 | 0.62 | | | |
| | 6:00 | 500 | 900 | 95 | 558 | 653 | 153 | |
| | 7:00 | 420 | 800 | 95 | 496 | 591 | 171 | |
| | 8:00 | 225 | 300 | | | | ? | |
| | 9:00 | 265 | 400 | 95 | 248 | 343 | 78 | |
| | 10:00 | 310 | 450 | 95 | 279 | 374 | 64 | |
| | 11:00 | 320 | 500 | 95 | 310 | 405 | 85 | |
| | 12:00 | 382 | 600 | 95 | 372 | 467 | 85 | |
| | 13:00 | 435 | 700 | 95 | 434 | 529 | 94 | |
| | 14:00 | 500 | 800 | 95 | 496 | 591 | 91 | |
| | 15:00 | 490 | 800 | 95 | 496 | 591 | 101 | |
| | 16:00 | 520 | 850 | 95 | 527 | 622 | 102 | |
| | 17:00 | 515 | 850 | | | | ? | |
| | 18:00 | 490 | 800 | 95 | 496 | 591 | 101 | |
| | 19:00 | 430 | /00 | 95 | 434 | 529 | 99 | all de la constance |
| | 20:00 | 360 | 600 | 95 | 3/2 | 467 | 107 | |









| Option B Step 9 (Valuing) | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| July 2009 | Units | Marginal Price | Value | | | | | |
| Consumption | 55,240 kWh | \$0.0723 | \$3,994 | | | | | |
| Demand | 99 kW | \$12.57 | <u>\$1,244</u> | | | | | |
| Total | | | \$5,238 | | | | | |
| Note: What is a bet | ter way to ex | press the sa | vings? | | | | | |
| Retrofit Isolation 21 | | | | | | | | |





















| Option A Step 4 (Baseline) | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| T.load Tons | date | time | Establish Mean kW and kW/ton | | | | | |
| 152 | 07.05.06 | 09:30:56 | | | | | | |
| 158 | 07.05.06 | 10:15:10 | in each load range or 'bin'. | | | | | |
| 162 | 09.05.06 | 08:35:20 | The Bin Method is developed from | | | | | |
| 210 | 09.05.06 | 09:45:00 | historical data. Data collection may be | | | | | |
| 205 | 09.05.06 | 09:00:12 | performed using load range bins which | | | | | |
| 232 | 06.06.06 | 11:02:20 | are created by recording all hourly occurrences of closely related load | | | | | |
| 155 | 05.06.06 | 09:20:54 | data. Historical records that fall into a certain range of the load are collected | | | | | |
| 152 | 17.06.06 | 08:40:00 | and then distinguished by the mid- | | | | | |
| 170 | 07.07.06 | 12:00:50 | point of the range. | | | | | |
| 160 | 07.07.06 | 11:45:30 | \mathbf{X} | | | | | |
| 225 ation 32 | 17.07.06 | 10:12:00 | Data extracted from historian for the first 100 T 'bin' (150- 249.99 Tons), 5' samples EVO | | | | | |
| | Op: 152 152 158 162 210 205 232 155 152 155 152 170 160 225 ation 32 | Option 152 07.05.06 152 07.05.06 158 07.05.06 210 09.05.06 205 09.05.06 205 09.05.06 205 05.06.06 155 05.06.06 152 17.06.06 150 07.07.06 205 17.07.06 205 17.07.06 | Coption A St T.load Tons date time 152 07.05.06 09:30:56 158 07.05.06 09:30:50 158 07.05.06 09:30:50 162 09.05.06 08:35:20 210 09.05.06 09:01:12 232 06.06.06 11:02:20 155 05.06.06 09:20:54 152 17.06.06 08:40:00 170 07.07.06 12:00:50 160 07.07.06 11:45:30 225 17.07.06 10:12:00 | | | | | |









| Option A Step 8 (Demand Savings) | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Demand Savi | Demand Savings (for the entire cooling season): | | | | | | | | |
| | Assumed | Computed Demand | | | | | | | |
| | Load | Reduction | | | | | | | |
| May | 500 tons | 135.5 kW | | | | | | | |
| June | 800 tons | 216.8 kW | | | | | | | |
| July | 900 tons | 243.9 kW | | | | | | | |
| Aug | 1000 tons | 271 kW | | | | | | | |
| Sept | 900 tons | 243.9 kW | | | | | | | |
| Oct | 500 tons | 135.5 kW | | | | | | | |
| Total | | 1,246.6 kW-mo | | | | | | | |
| Assume chille | r peak demand c | oincides with the utility | | | | | | | |
| meter time of Retrofit Isolation 37 | peak. | EVO | | | | | | | |













| Next Topic | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1. Introduction | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Key Concepts | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Short Examples | | | | | | | | |
| 4. M&V Planning | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Critical Issues | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Statistics | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Retrofit Isolation Details | | | | | | | | |
| 8. Option C Details | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Option D Details | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Other M&V applications | | | | | | | | |
| 11. Summary and review of a detailed M&V plan Retrofit Isolation 46 | | | | | | | | |













| Option C Step 3 (Baseline Data) | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------|---------|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Let's drill i | nto data of the | previous | s Optio | on C example | | | | | |
| | Meter Reading | Gas | Heating | 1 | | | | | |
| | Date | Consumption | Degree | | | | | | |
| | February 5, 2008 | units | Days | | | | | | |
| | March 5, 2008 | 210,692 | 650 | | | | | | |
| | April 7, 2008 | 208,664 | 440 | | | | | | |
| | May 6, 2008 | 157,886 | 220 | | | | | | |
| | June 5, 2008 | 120,793 | 150 | | | | | | |
| | July 7, 2008 | 116,508 | 50 | | | | | | |
| | August 7, 2008 | 107,272 | 20 | | | | | | |
| | September 5, 2008 | 95,411 | 14 | | | | | | |
| | October 6, 2008 | 126,423 | 29 | | | | | | |
| | November 6, 2008 | 149,253 | 125 | | | | | | |
| | December 4, 2008 | 166,202 | 275 | | | | | | |
| | January 6, 2009 | 221,600 | 590 | | | | | | |
| | February 5, 2009 | 224,958 | 723 | 174 - 1-1 | | | | | |
| | Total | 1,905,662 | 3,286 | EVO | | | | | |
| Option C 7 | | | | Streens Wallands Destruction | | | | | |

Option C 4

Option C 5

Option C Step 6 (Predict)

After retrofit, for each month predict what the baseline gas use <u>would have been</u> under conditions of the current month's weather (i.e. the adjusted baseline).

Procedure:

- 1. Record the weather (HDD)
- 2. Plug HDD into the mathematical model:

Option C 11

Option C Step 8 & 9 (Savings and Valuing)

| | Poporting paris | d data | Adju | sted baselin | Savings | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|--|
| Meter Reading Date | Reporting period data | | Intercept (Baseload) | Slope (Weather Sensitive) | Total | Gas (units) | Value | |
| | Consumption | | Fac | tors | | eus (units) | Price = | |
| | units | поо | 111 358 | 173,27 | | | \$ 6,232 | |
| March 6, 2009 | 151 008 | 601 | 111 358 | 104 135 | 215 493 | 64 485 | \$ 401 871 | |
| April 4, 2009 | 122 111 | 420 | 111 358 | 72 773 | 184 131 | 62 020 | \$ 386 509 | |
| May 6, 2009 | 102 694 | 188 | 111 358 | 32 575 | 143 933 | 41 239 | \$ 257 001 | |
| June 5, 2009 | 111 211 | 250 | 111 358 | 43 318 | 154 676 | 43 465 | \$ 270 874 | |
| July 5, 2009 | 80 222 | 41 | 111 358 | 7 104 | 118 462 | 38 240 | \$ 238 312 | |
| August 6, 2009 | 71 023 | 15 | 111 358 | 2 599 | 113 957 | 42 934 | \$ 267 565 | |
| September 8, 2009 | 65 534 | 5 | 111 358 | 866 | 112 224 | 46 690 | \$ 290 972 | |
| October 9, 2009 | 77 354 | 12 | 111 358 | 2 079 | 113 437 | 36 083 | \$ 224 869 | |
| November 4, 2009 | 103 000 | 190 | 111 358 | 32 921 | 144 279 | 41 279 | \$ 257 251 | |
| December 10, 2009 | 115 112 | 300 | 111 358 | 51 981 | 163 339 | 48 227 | \$ 300 551 | |
| January 7, 2010 | 160 002 | 700 | 111 358 | 121 289 | 232 647 | 72 645 | \$ 452 724 | |
| February 4, 2010 | 145 111 | 612 | 111 358 | 106 041 | 217 399 | 72 288 | \$ 450 499 | |
| Total | 1 304 382 | | | | 1 913 977 | 609 595 | \$ 3 798 998 | |

Option C 9

Next Topic

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Key Concepts
- 3. Short Examples
- 4. M&V Planning
- 5. Critical Issues
- 6. Statistics
- 7. Retrofit Isolation Details
- 8. Option C Details
- 9. Option D Details
- 10. Other M&V applications
- 11. Summary and review of a detailed M&V plan

Option C 20

EVO

Simulation during the design phase

During the design phase, a simulation model is often used to evaluate the building energy consumption

- If the building exists:
 - Build simulation model of baseline equipment and conditions.
 - Develop "what if" models to estimate performance of proposed measures.
 - Select most cost-effective package.
 - Compare proposed to baseline.

These simulations are used to *predict* savings from retrofits before construction.

Option D 5

Option D – Basic Method

If no computer simulation of the building energy use has been performed during the design phase, proceed as follows:

- i. Build a computer simulation model of energy use.
- ii. Gather real energy use data.
- iii. 'Calibrate' the computer model to make it fit the real energy data.
- iv. Run the calibrated model with and without retrofits. Savings are the difference in energy use of the two runs.

Option D 7

© Efficiency Valuation Organization

Option D 4

20267590 Filiplich Bollah Bollah Bollah B

| | | | | | _ | | |
|-----------|--------|-----------|------|---------|---------|---------|----------------|
| Post-retr | ofit p | eriod ac | tual | energy | / dat | :a - fo | or Calibration |
| | | Steam | | Elec | tricity | | |
| | | units | Days | kWh | kW | Days | |
| | Jan | 1,200,000 | 31 | 140,000 | 340 | 31 | |
| | Feb | 1,100,000 | 28 | 120,000 | 350 | 28 | |
| | Mar | 1,000,000 | 31 | 140,000 | 350 | 31 | |
| | Apr | 800,000 | 30 | 150,000 | 380 | 30 | |
| | May | 300,000 | 31 | 160,000 | 450 | 31 | |
| | June | 200,000 | 30 | 170,000 | 570 | 30 | |
| | July | 200,000 | 31 | 190,000 | 650 | 31 | |
| | Aug | 200,000 | 31 | 195,000 | 650 | 31 | |
| | Sept | 400,000 | 30 | 180,000 | 640 | 30 | |
| | Oct | 500,000 | 31 | 160,000 | 600 | 31 | |
| | Nov | 800,000 | 30 | 150,000 | 380 | 30 | |
| | Dec | 1,000,000 | 31 | 120,000 | 320 | 31 | |

Option D Step 5b (Calibrate)

The Normalized Mean Bias Error is calculated as follows:

$$NMBE = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - \hat{y}_i)}{(n-p) \times \bar{y}} \times 100$$

where:

n = number of data points or periods in the baseline period

 $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ = simulation predicted data

 y_i = utility data used for the calibration

 $\bar{\mathbf{v}}$ = arithmetic mean of the sample of *n* observations

Option D 17

© Efficiency Valuation Organization

Option D 9

'2665026109N Sédici chadada da bahada da b

| C E.g. Ste | Option D Step 6 (Savings) E.g. Steam Savings - from comparing two simulations: | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|--|--------------|-------------------|-----------|------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Pre | dicted Steam (uni | ts) | | | | | | |
| | | No Retrofits | With Retrofits | Savings | | | | | | |
| | Jan | 1,400,000 | 1,120,000 | 280,000 | | | | | | |
| | Feb | 1,350,000 | 1,115,000 | 235,000 | | | | | | |
| | Mar | 1,250,000 | 1,060,000 | 190,000 | | | | | | |
| | Apr | 920,000 | 823,000 | 97,000 | | | | | | |
| | May | 360,000 | 305,000 | 55,000 | | | | | | |
| | June | 250,000 | 188,000 | 62,000 | | | | | | |
| | July | 245,000 | 194,000 | 51,000 | | | | | | |
| | Aug | 260,000 | 202,000 | 58,000 | | | | | | |
| | Sept | 455,000 | 402,000 | 53,000 | | | | | | |
| | Oct | 570,000 | 495,000 | 75,000 | | | | | | |
| | Nov | 902,000 | 795,000 | 107,000 | | | | | | |
| | Dec | 1,302,000 | 1,070,000 | 232,000 | EVO. | | | | | |
| Option D 21 | Total | 9,264,000 | 7,769,000 | 1,495,000 | | | | | | |

















Option D 15

Next Topic

- 1. Introduction
- 2. Key Concepts
- 3. Short Examples
- 4. M&V Planning
- 5. Critical Issues
- 6. Statistics
- 7. Retrofit Isolation Details
- 8. Option C Details
- 9. Option D Details
- 10. Other M&V applications
- 11. Summary and review of a detailed M&V plan

Option D 32

2865026199N Béla Falala bala bala bala bala b



M&V Fundamentals

& the International Performance Measurement and Verification Protocol

For Energy Managers

Other M&V Applications Persistence of savings



© Efficiency Valuation Organization











<section-header><list-item><list-item><list-item><list-item></table-row></table-row><table-container>

M&T Benefits

- Significant energy savings (between 5% and 15%)
- Very short payback period (less than 2 years)
- Energy cost management
- Greenhouse gas emission reductions
- Quantification of potential savings
- Promotion of financing options for energy efficiency projects
- Energy savings projections

Other M&V use 9



© Efficiency Valuation Organization



| Next Topic |
|---|
| 1. Introduction |
| 2. Key Concepts |
| 3. Short Examples |
| 4. M&V Planning |
| 5. Critical Issues |
| 6. Statistics |
| 7. Retrofit Isolation Details |
| 8. Option C Details |
| 9. Option D Details |
| 10. Other M&V applications |
| 11. Summary and review of a detailed M&V plan Other M&V use 12 |















| | <u>A</u> | <u>B</u> | <u>C</u> | D |
|---|----------|----------|----------|---|
| Assess retrofits individually | х | x | | x |
| Assess facility only | | | x | х |
| Savings <10% of utility meter's energy | x | x | | x |
| ndustrial | х | x | | х |

| Select | ing | - 2 | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|-----|--|
| | <u>A</u> | <u>B</u> | <u>C</u> | D | |
| Significance of variables is unclear. | | х | х | x | |
| Interactive effects cannot be easily estimated. | | | х | x | |
| Expect many future changes within the measurement boundary (= many BLAs) | х | | | x | |
| Long term assessment | х | | х | | |
| No baseline energy data | | | | x | |
| Summary 9 | | | | EVO | oppassezentzen gelaktezentzen gelaktezentzen |

| Selecting - 3 | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------|----------|---|--|
| | <u>A</u> | <u>B</u> | <u>C</u> | D | |
| Need non-technical people to understand the meaning of savings reports | х | х | x | | |
| Have metering skill and experience | х | х | | | |
| Have simulation skill and experience | | | | x | |
| Have utility bill reading skill | | | х | | |





















