

Appraising the effects of window opening behaviour in an office building in different climates

*Original*

Appraising the effects of window opening behaviour in an office building in different climates / TORABI MOGHADAM, Sara; Soncini, Federica; Fabi, Valentina; Corgnati, STEFANO PAOLO. - ELETTRONICO. - (2015), pp. 51-57. ( 2nd IBPSA-Italy conference Bozen-Bolzano Bozen-Bolzano 4th–6th February 2015).

*Availability:*

This version is available at: 11583/2614684 since: 2020-02-25T14:54:39Z

*Publisher:*

bu, press-Bozen-Bolzano University Press

*Published*

DOI:

*Terms of use:*

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

*Publisher copyright*

(Article begins on next page)

Konferenzbeiträge / Atti / Proceedings

# Building Simulation Applications BSA 2015

2<sup>nd</sup> IBPSA-Italy conference

Bozen-Bolzano, 4<sup>th</sup> January –6<sup>th</sup> February 2015

**Edited by**

**Marco Baratieri, Vincenzo Corrado,  
Andrea Gasparella, Francesco Patuzzi**

**bu,press**

bozen  
bolzano  
university  
press



**unibz**  
—  
Freie Universität Bozen  
Libera Università di Bolzano  
—  
Università Lìdia de Bulsan



Konferenzbeiträge / Atti / Proceedings

# Building Simulation Applications BSA 2015

2<sup>nd</sup> IBPSA-Italy conference  
Bozen-Bolzano, 4<sup>th</sup>–6<sup>th</sup> February 2015

**Edited by**  
**Marco Baratieri, Vincenzo Corrado,**  
**Andrea Gasparella, Francesco Patuzzi**

**bu,press**

bozen  
bolzano  
university  
press

**Scientific committee**

Ian Beausoleil-Morrison, Carleton University, Canada  
Jan Hensen, Technische Universiteit Eindhoven, The Netherlands  
Ardeshir Mahdavi, Technische Universität Wien, Austria  
Athanasios Tzempelikos, Purdue University, USA  
Natale Arcuri, Università della Calabria, Italy  
Paolo Baggio, Università degli Studi di Trento, Italy  
Vincenzo Corrado, Politecnico di Torino, Italy  
Andrea Gasparella, Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Italy  
Livio Mazzarella, Politecnico di Milano, Italy

**Organizing committee**

Paolo Baggio, Università degli Studi di Trento, Italy  
Marco Baratieri, Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Italy  
Francesca Cappelletti, IUAV University of Venice, Italy  
Alfonso Capozzoli, Politecnico di Torino, Italy  
Vincenzo Corrado, Politecnico di Torino, Italy  
Enrico Fabrizio, Politecnico di Torino, Italy  
Andrea Gasparella, Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Italy  
Norbert Klammsteiner, Energytech Ltd., Bozen-Bolzano, Italy  
Marco Noro – Università degli Studi di Padova  
Fabian Ochs, Universität Innsbruck, Austria  
Francesco Patuzzi, Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Italy  
Paola Penna, Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Italy  
Giovanni Pernigotto, Università degli Studi di Padova, Italy  
Alessandro Prada, Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Italy  
Piercarlo Romagnoni, IUAV Università di Venezia, IBPSA, Italy

**Other reviewers and chairmen**

Anna Atzeri, Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Italy  
Adolfo Palombo, Università degli Studi di Napoli, Italy  
Fabio Sicurella, Professional Engineer, Catania, Italy  
Francesco Asdrubali, Università degli Studi di Perugia, Italy  
Luigi Marletta, University of Catania, Italy  
Marco Manzan, University of Trieste, Italy  
Laura Bellia, Università degli Studi di Napoli, Italy  
Jerome Kämpf, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Switzerland  
Ulrich Pont, Technische Universität Wien, Austria

Design: DOC.bz

© 2015 by Bozen-Bolzano University Press

Free University of Bozen-Bolzano

All rights reserved

1<sup>st</sup> edition

[www.unibz.it/universitypress](http://www.unibz.it/universitypress)

ISBN 978-88-6046-074-5

## Preface

In recent years, Building Simulation has been confirmed as the technique based on computer calculation to estimate either the energy or the non-energy performance of buildings, building components and systems, considering in particular its detailed variability in time.

In the past, most of the efforts were put into improving the detail and increasing the reliability of the results and the capability of describing the behavior of the building more realistically. In this respect, validation has been one of the major concerns of the building simulation tool. The main aim of simulation was to understand better the behavior of some specific processes, their interaction and the behavior of the building. Modelling was particularly useful to compensate for missing experimental data and to overcome the impossibility of obtaining enough experimental data or any data at all, due to the complexity of the investigated system, the slow dynamic or long period of time. Starting from very specific aspects or components, BS has progressively included, typically with a modular approach, the whole building or even the urban scale.

In recent years, building simulation has increasingly taken advantage of the tremendous growth in the availability of computational capacity, thanks to new processors, parallel calculation, cloud computing, etc., and has opened new perspectives and uses. The enhancement of the level of detail, the extension of the size and application range of the domain of investigation and the increase in the level of accuracy and generality of the results have all been established as mainstream focal points. In parallel, the diffusion of calculation capacity has awoken the interest of practitioners and professionals in new practical applications.

These trends also characterized the second IBPSA-Italy conference, which took place for the second time at the Free University of Bozen/Bolzano from 4 to 6 February 2015. Almost 100 attendees, 198 authors, 67 presentations, and 4 keynote speakers confirmed not only the interest in building simulation, but also the relevance and coherence of the above

focuses. In particular, four sections were devoted to the detailed modelling of phenomena and components (advanced modelling, solar radiation, energy systems and envelope modelling), three to the integrated and non-energy performance analysis (lighting and user behavior), three to the optimization techniques for high performance buildings and retrofit, and two to the development and validation of new tools.

The participation of authors and delegates from 15 countries, together with the keynote speakers Ardeshir Mahdavi (Vienna University of Technology), Ian Beausoleil-Morrison (Carleton University), Jan Hensen (Eindhoven University of Technology) and Athanasios Tzempelikos (Purdue University), offered the opportunity to discuss issues with an international audience as well as to compare and to enhance the quality of the national research.

The presentation of the first IBPSA Italy Awards for PhD Student Papers demonstrated the commitment towards the growth of a new generation of young researchers who will be able to sustain and diffuse the best use of BS.

The presentation of the first IBPSA Italy Awards for Simulation Assisted Design to distinguished practitioners using building simulation in their business confirmed how seriously the IBPSA takes practical applications of BS.

The presence of the local Engineers and Architects Orders, of the AICARR (the Italian Association of Air conditioning, Heating and Refrigeration), ANDIL (the Italian Association of Clay Brick and Roof Tile Producers) and ASSOVETRO (the Italian Association of Glass and Glazing Systems Producers), together with the institutional support of the Autonomous Province of South Tyrol and of the CasaClima Agency, allows us to be even more confident that the journey undertaken has been, and will continue to be, a great success.

Andrea Gasparella, Free University of Bozen-Bolzano



# Table of Contents

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Preface.....   | V   |
| Common fallacies in representation of occupants in building performance simulation<br><i>Ardeshir Mahdavi</i> .....  | 1   |
| The importance of software's and weather file's choice in dynamic daylight simulations<br><i>Laura Bellia, Alessia Pedace, Francesca Fragiasso</i> .....   | 9   |
| Outdoor Comfort: the ENVI-BUG tool to evaluate PMV values point by point<br><i>Kristian Fabbri, Antonello Di Nunzio, Ernesto Antonini, Andrea Boeri</i> .....  | 17  |
| Aspects of uncertainty in representation of occupants' diversity in building performance simulation<br><i>Ardeshir Mahdavi, Farhang Tahmasebi</i> .....  | 23  |
| Prediction of vertical irradiance on building surfaces: an empirical comparison of two models<br><i>Ehsan Vazifeh, Matthias Schuss, Ardeshir Mahdavi</i> .....   | 27  |
| Improving energy efficiency through the optimization of buildings' operational regime: simulation based case studies<br><i>Farhang Tahmasebi, Mahnameh Taheri, Matthias Schuss, Ardeshir Mahdavi</i> .....         | 33  |
| Performance evaluation towards improved BiPV-Systems – Simulation of BiPV-systems installed on existing building facades using TRNSYS<br><i>Sascha Lindig, David Moser, Stefano Avesani, Roberto Lollini</i> ..... | 41  |
| Appraising the effects of window opening behaviour in an office building in different climates<br><i>Sara Torabi Moghadam, Federica Soncini, Valentina Fabi, Stefano P. Corgnati</i> .....                         | 51  |
| Prediction of the Sound Insulation of Double Leaf Facades with Openings for Natural Ventilation<br><i>Egzon Bajraktari, Josef Lechleitner, Ardeshir Mahdavi</i> .....  | 59  |
| Influence of varying mix proportions on thermal performance of soil-cement blocks<br><i>Balaji N.C, Praseeda K. I., Monto Mani, Venkatarama Reddy B. V.</i> .....  | 67  |
| Achieving High-Performance Building Design in the Tropics through Modelling and Simulation: A case study in Singapore<br><i>Bharath Seshadri, Zhou Jian, Vincent Partenay, Priya Pawar, Adrian Lamano</i> .....    | 75  |
| Modelling, testing and optimization of a MVHR combined with a small-scale speed controlled exhaust air heat pump<br><i>Fabian Ochs, Dietmar Siegele, Georgios Dermentzis, Wolfgang Feist</i> .....                 | 83  |
| BIM and interoperability for energy simulations<br><i>Bernardino Chiaia, Sanaz Davardoust, Anna Osello, Niccolò Aste, Manlio Mazzon</i> .....  | 93  |
| Urban heat island in Padua, Italy: simulation analysis and mitigation strategies<br><i>Luca Battistella, Marco Noro</i> .....  | 99  |
| Multi-zone buildings thermo-hygrometric analysis: a novel dynamic simulation code based on adaptive control<br><i>Annamaria Buonomano, Umberto Montanaro, Adolfo Palombo, Stefania Santini</i> .....               | 109 |
| Energy simulation in early stage building design: simplified models and impact on results<br><i>Marco Picco, Marco Marengo</i> .....   | 119 |
| The Solar Response Factor for the dynamic response of buildings to solar heat gains<br><i>Gianpiero Evola, Luigi Marletta</i> .....  | 127 |
| Comparison of energy simulations for a residential unit: a rapid method for an integrated decision tool<br><i>Alberto Beltrami, Marco Picco, Marco Marengo</i> .....   | 137 |
| Thermal modelling of complex fenestration systems – Comparison of a BSDF-based model with simplified approaches<br><i>Hauer Martin, Geisler-Moroder David, Hiller Marion</i> .....                                 | 147 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| A new climate-based daylight metric for hot climates<br><i>Islam Ayman Mashaly, Yussra Mohamed Rashed, Muhammad Adel, Khaled Nassar</i> .....   | 155 |
| The effect of vegetation on daylight availability<br><i>Islam Ayman Mashaly, Yussra Mohamed Rashed, Muhammad Adel, Khaled Nassar</i> .....  | 163 |
| Solar assisted ground source heat pump performance assessment for residential energy supply in southern European climates<br><i>Natale Arcuri, Francesco Reda, Pasquale Loiacono, Domenico Mazzeo</i> .....                           | 171 |
| Energy consumption of buildings and occupant behavior. An investigation in Mediterranean climatic conditions<br><i>Piero Bevilacqua, Cristina Carpino, Dafni Mora, Marilena De Simone</i> .....                                       | 181 |
| Energy retrofit and conservation of built heritage using multi-objective optimization: demonstration on a medieval building<br><i>Francesca Roberti, Ulrich Filippi Oberegger, Elena Lucchi, Andrea Gasparella</i> .....              | 189 |
| Energy performances of a passive house for Mediterranean climate: a case study<br><i>Cristina Carpino, Piero Bevilacqua, Roberto Bruno, Natale Arcuri</i> .....   | 199 |
| Building simulation based optimization through design of experiments<br><i>Jay Dhariwal, Rangan Banerjee</i> .....  | 207 |
| A verification of CitySim results using the BESTEST and monitored consumption values<br><i>Walter Emmanuel, Kämpf Jérôme</i> .....  | 215 |
| Integrated design and dynamic simulation for a new zero energy building<br><i>Dama Alessandro, Angelotti Adriana, Penso Davide</i> .....  | 223 |
| A parametric approach to design a wooden climatic responsive village in Atacama Desert (Chile)<br><i>Francesco Leccese, Alessandro Mattoccia, Michele Rocca, Rodrigo Rubio, Giacomo Salvadori</i> .....                               | 231 |
| Energy Saving Exploiting Light Availability: A New Method to Evaluate Daylight Contribution<br><i>Claudio Campanile, Francesco Leccese, Michele Rocca, Giacomo Salvadori</i> .....  | 239 |
| Estimation of the water flow rate and energy consumption of a central heating system in an office building using system identification<br><i>Daniele Antonucci, Federico Noris, Ulrich Filippi Oberegger, Andrea Gasparella</i> ..... | 247 |
| Comparison between hourly simulation and bin-method for the seasonal performance evaluation of electric air-source heat pumps for heating<br><i>Claudia Naldi, Matteo Dongellini, Gian Luca Morini, Enzo Zanchini</i> .....           | 255 |
| Cost optimal and net zero energy office buildings solutions using small scale biomass-based cogeneration technologies<br><i>Ayman Mohamed, Ala Hasan, Kai Sirén</i> .....   | 263 |
| Integrated performance simulation of an innovative net zero energy modular building<br><i>Francesco Fantauzzi, Paolo Belardi, Francesco Asdrubali, Samuele Schiavoni, Sara Sambuco</i> .....  | 273 |
| Study of the energy performance of a retrofitting office<br><i>Paolo Valdiserri</i> .....   | 281 |
| Coupling dynamic energy and daylighting simulations for complex fenestration systems<br><i>Giuseppe De Michele, Ulrich Filippi Oberegger, Luca Baglivo</i> .....  | 289 |
| Simulation experiences for the thermal performance improvement of naturally ventilated classroom in the tropics of Costa Rica<br><i>Emily Vargas Soto, Gerardo Saelzer Fuica</i> .....  | 297 |
| A new computational model: G.E.A.R. Graphical Expert Analytical Relations<br><i>Martino Marini, Roberto Baccoli, Costantino Carlo Mastino, Valerio Da Pos, Zoltán Tóth</i> .....  | 305 |
| A new simulation tool for the evaluation of energy performances of green roofs<br><i>Domenico Mazzeo, Piero Bevilacqua, Marilena De Simone, Natale Arcuri</i> .....   | 313 |
| A holistic method for energy renovation of buildings: focus on users' involvement<br><i>Giulia Degan, Carsten Rode, Daniele Vettorato, Marco Castagna</i> .....   | 323 |
| The role of user behavior modeling on the energy performance simulations<br><i>Marco Aldegheri, Alessandro Prada, Paolo Baggio, Michela Chiogna</i> .....   | 331 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Application of Building Simulation to support ISO 50001 Energy Management:<br>Case study of Fiumicino Airport<br><i>Luis M. Blanes, Andrea Costa, Marcus M. Keane</i> .....   | 339 |
| Dynamic simulation and on-site monitoring of a combined solar and pellet system in a low energy house<br><i>Elisa Carlon, Alessandro Prada, Markus Schwarz, Christoph Schmidl,<br/>Marco Baratieri, Andrea Gasparella, Walter Haslinger</i> ..... | 347 |
| A parametric design-based methodology to visualize building performance<br>at the neighborhood scale<br><i>Giuseppe Peronato, Emilie Nault, Francesca Cappelletti, Fabio Peron, Marilyne Andersen</i> .....                                       | 351 |
| Exploring the occupancy behaviour and perception in an office building<br><i>Livia Seres, Ulrich J. Pont, Matthias Schuss, Ardeshir Mahdavi</i> .....   | 359 |
| Window shades: selecting optical properties for visual comfort<br><i>Ying-Chieh Chan, Athanasios Tzempelikos</i> .....  | 367 |
| ProCasaClima 2013: CasaClima building simulation software<br><i>Matteo Rondoni, Ulrich Santa, Ulrich Klammsteiner, Martina Demattio,<br/>Mariadonata Bancher, Alexander Told, Thomas Zelger</i> .....   | 377 |
| Graphic and parametric tools for preliminary design stage of natural ventilation systems<br><i>Margherita Ferrucci, Maurizio Brocato, Fabio Peron, Francesca Cappelletti</i> .....  | 383 |
| Advancement in the development of an Open Source Object Oriented BPSt:<br>development methodology<br><i>Livio Mazzarella, Martina Pasini</i> .....  | 391 |
| A methodology to integrate advanced lighting and thermal analyses for building energy simulation<br><i>Silvia Cammarano, Anna Pellegrino, Valerio R. M. Lo Verso, Chiara Aghemo</i> .....   | 399 |
| BIM-generated data models for EnergyPlus: A comparison of gbXML and IFC Formats<br><i>Ira Ivanova, Kristina Kiesel, Ardeshir Mahdavi</i> .....  | 407 |
| Passive solutions for the optimization of the indoor environmental quality: a case study<br><i>Fabio Sicurella, Perla Colamesta</i> .....   | 415 |
| Modelling of domestic fine particles indoor exposure, its main sources and potential mitigation measures:<br>the case of Beijing<br><i>Sandra Stefanović, Žarko Stevanović</i> .....  | 423 |
| Application of aerogel-based plaster towards thermal retrofit of historical facades:<br>A computational assessment<br><i>Olga Proskurnina, Ulrich J. Pont, Mirosława Kornicki, Ardeshir Mahdavi</i> .....   | 431 |
| Long-term and spatial evaluation of the integrated performance of a window-shade system in an<br>open space office located in Rome<br><i>Anna Maria Atzeri, Francesca Cappelletti, Athanasios Tzempelikos, Andrea Gasparella</i> .....            | 439 |
| Energy cost and discount rate influence on the optimal packages of energy efficiency measures<br><i>Vincenzo Corrado, Ilaria Ballarini, Ilenia Ottati, Simona Paduos</i> .....  | 447 |
| Energy building retrofitting of a multifamily house: a case study<br><i>Chiara Dipasquale, Roberto, Diego Bertesina, Alessandro Bellini</i> .....   | 455 |
| The use of biomass in the building renovation: a cost-optimal perspective analysis<br><i>Enrico De Angelis, Giorgio Pansa, Martina Cereda</i> .....   | 463 |
| Passive cooling strategies in the refurbishment of Mediterranean buildings: simulation analysis of<br>thermal mass and natural ventilation combination<br><i>Filippo Calcerano, Carlotta Cecchini</i> .....                                       | 473 |
| Daylighting optimization for informal settlements in Cairo, Egypt<br><i>Ayman Wagdy, Ahmed Abdelghany, Mohamed Amer Hegazy</i> .....  | 483 |
| CFD vs. lumped models applied to HAM: a comparison between HAM-Tools and Comsol<br><i>Amos Ronzino, Vincenzo Corrado, Maximilian Neusser, Thomas Bednar</i> .....   | 491 |
| Optimizing Window size of South Facades in Tehran City and the Environmental Impacts<br><i>Fazel Khayatian, Seyed Amin Tabatabaei Fard, Maryam Meshkin Kiya</i> .....   | 499 |
| Analysis of energy efficiency measures on envelope and control systems:<br>case study for an existing building<br><i>Giovanni Semprini, Alessandro Gober, Francesca Zandi</i> .....   | 507 |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Robustness of multi-objective optimization of building refurbishment to solar radiation model<br><i>Alessandro Prada, Giovanni Pernigotto, Francesca Cappelletti, Andrea Gasparella</i> .....                                       | 517 |
| The impact of thermal comfort in multi-objective optimization of buildings refurbishment<br><i>Paola Penna, Alessandro Prada, Francesca Cappelletti, Andrea Gasparella</i> .....  | 527 |
| A multi-objective optimization analysis on high-performance buildings connected to district heating-CHP system<br><i>Dario Prando, Alessandro Prada, Fabian Ochs, Andrea Gasparella, Marco Baratieri</i> .....                      | 537 |
| Experimental characterization of the dynamic thermal properties of opaque elements under dynamic periodic solicitation<br><i>Giovanni Pernigotto, Alessandro Prada, Francesco Patuzzi, Marco Baratieri, Andrea Gasparella</i> ..... | 547 |

# Appraising the effects of window opening behaviour in an office building in different climates

**Sara Torabi Moghadam – Energy Department, Polytechnic of Turin, Italy – sara.torabi@polito.it**

**Federica Soncini – Energy Department, Polytechnic of Turin, Italy – federica.soncini@studenti.polito.it**

**Valentina Fabi – Energy Department, Polytechnic of Turin, Italy – valentina.fabi@polito.it**

**Stefano P. Corgnati – Energy Department, Polytechnic of Turin, Italy – stefano.corgnati@polito.it**

## Abstract

There is extensive pressure on sustainable buildings to deliver energy efficiency, but in practice, designs often fail to achieve the expected level of in-use energy consumption. One of the main factors behind this discrepancy between designed and real total energy use in buildings is the window opening behaviour. Towards nearly zero energy building (NZEB), building performance simulation is being increasingly deployed beyond the building design phase.

With the aim to investigate how the climate affects the probabilistic model of window behaviour, the case study is simulated in different locations, i.e. Continental (Turin) and Mediterranean (Athens). Moreover, each simulated model refers to three comfort category heating and cooling set point conditions (Category I, II, III) as defined in Standard EN 15251:2006. Comparing the results, the influence of window behaviour on energy consumption in different climates generates energetically different outcomes. The present study highlights the importance of users' interaction with window control systems in order to design sustainable and energy-efficient office buildings in a more realistic way.

## 1. Introduction

Energy reduction in the built environment is an essential issue; particularly, an improved building design during the early design phase is instrumental in the efforts of reducing energy (Clarke, 2001). Therefore, it is required to understand the factors that influence the energy consumption in a building.

Measured real energy use of buildings demonstrates large differences from predicted ones, even between buildings with the same

functions but located in different climates.

Following the literature, human behaviour can be considered one of the key driving factors in changes in energy consumption; especially it has been shown to have a large impact on heating, cooling, ventilation demand and lighting (Page, 2008). Accordingly, several stochastic models have been expanded to model occupant presence and interaction with the building system. Based on measurements in office rooms without mechanical ventilation, a Markov chain model for actions on windows, with the outside temperature as a driving variable, was propounded by Fritsch et al. (1990). Reinhart et al. (2004) defined occupant presence in lighting software by employing a simplified stochastic model divided into sub-models based on users' arrival and departure. Wang et al. (2005) applied Poisson distributions with the aim to generate daily occupancy profile in a single-occupied office. Mahdavi et al. (2008) inquired the possibilities of identifying general patterns of user control behaviour as a function of indoor and outdoor environmental parameters such as illuminance and irradiance.

Since energy building simulation tools are used to estimate the future performance of the building, dissimilar input parameters may introduce uncertainties. Besides, it is assumed that user behaviour is one of the most important input parameters influencing the results of building energy simulations. Accordingly, it is fundamental deploying a model that considers the randomness of human behaviour through a probabilistic approach with the purpose of predicting the actual energy demand of the building. However, it is difficult to completely identify the influences of

occupant behaviour and activities through simulation owing to users' behaviour diversity and complexity; while most current simulation tools can only imitate behaviour patterns in a strict way, occupants' behaviour is the result of a continuous combination of several factors crossing different disciplines (Fabi et al., 2013) and therefore is still an object of investigation.

Rijal et al. (2007), Haldi and Robinson (2009), Herkel et al. (2008), Yun and Steemers (2008) have been pioneering a method to represent occupant interaction with buildings using stochastic models which later can be used to create window control strategies. The general trend has been to infer the probability of the window state as a function of indoor and outdoor temperature, while other studies have investigated the probability of opening a window (change from one state to another) as a function of indoor temperature (Yun and Steemers, 2008, Yun et al., 2008).

Actually, two important parameters influencing energy consumption in buildings are indoor temperature and air change rate, which are directly linked to the occupant's usage of the window. According to studies conducted by Raja et al. (2001), windows had the biggest effect on indoor climate of all available controls. Consequently, it is crucial to take window opening behaviour into consideration.

In office buildings, fully automatic controlled solutions are becoming progressively more common since they can simultaneously enhance individual comfort and use a reduced amount of energy. However, these systems frequently offer limited user autonomy, since user satisfaction and freedom are strongly connected. Moreover, the ability to control their own indoor environment contributes significantly to their satisfaction and general perception of the indoor climate (Wagner et al., 2007).

With these premises, the current paper investigated how different occupant-related models, assuming a behavioural pattern of window-opening, can affect the energy use of an office building. Precisely, a dynamic numeric simulation application was deployed to compare a model based on a fixed schedule with probabilistic models, at first in a Continental (Torabi Moghadam

et al., 2014) and then in Mediterranean weather, in order to analyse the discrepancy between predicted and simulated energy performance in different climates.

## 2. Simulating Window Behaviour

### 2.1 Case study

An office building with fifteen cellular office spaces was selected as a case study to evaluate the influence of window operation on thermal simulation results. The floor plan of the basic building model was designed in the framework of the Developing Architectural Education in Response to Climate Change program (DARC program, Polito).

The case study building consists of 5 floors (see Figure 1): each of them has a surface area of about 1400 m<sup>2</sup>. As regards the orientation of the building, the two main façades are oriented south-west and north-east. The floor-to-floor height is 3.5 m; hence the building's total height is 19.3 m.

For more exhaustive energy or load calculations in each office room, a more detailed zoning is required. Therefore, each office cell is modelled as a single zone (see Figure 2).

The modelling assumptions for the building use are listed in Table 1. Simulations were carried out for 3 different categories pertaining to the heating and cooling set points of the building's control systems as relevant to the office spaces. These categories are defined in Standard EN 15251:2006 and included in Table 2.



Fig. 1 – 3D model of the office building and modeled zones




Fig. 2 – Building standard floor plan

Table 1 – Modelling assumptions for building use

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Modelling assumptions                             | Offices  |
| Installed lighting power                          | 10 W/m <sup>2</sup>                            |
| Occupancy   | 8:00–18:00                                     |
| Air change rate <sup>(3)</sup>                    | 1 h <sup>-1</sup>                              |
| Equipment (occupied period) / (unoccupied period) | 15 W/m <sup>2</sup> / 5% of total emitted heat |

Table 2 – Standard EN 15251:2006. Recommended temperature ranges for the internal temperatures in office buildings.

| Type of building | Cat | Operative temperatures [°C] |                             | ACH [h <sup>-1</sup> ] |
|------------------|-----|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|
|                  |     | Min. for heating (~1,0 clo) | Max. for cooling (~0,5 clo) |                        |
| Office rooms     | I   | 21                          | 25.5                        | 1                      |
|                  | II  | 20                          | 26                          |                        |
|                  | III | 19                          | 27                          |                        |

## 2.2 Methodology

The main purpose of the research was to understand the influence of the climate on probabilistic windows’ opening and closing behaviour by performing simulations in two different climate zones (Turin and Athens), taking 2012 as a typical meteorological year (TMY). Since many office buildings are provided with a hybrid ventilation system, in the current study, in the probabilistic scenario, every office room was equipped with a combination of mechanical ventilation and operable windows. Furthermore, two dissimilar window controls were compared in order to highlight differences in window behaviour impact on the energy consumption discrepancy, during the design phase. First, the windows were scheduled to be constantly closed and fresh air is supplied exclusively via the mechanical ventilation system (1h<sup>-1</sup>); this kind of

control is called “*deterministic*” by the authors. Secondly, the windows were simulated to be opened in accordance with the stochastic model of Haldi and Robinson (2009) implemented in the simulation tool used in the current study (IDA ICE, 4.21.); authors defined this control type on windows as “*probabilistic*”. Afterward, the case study is simulated in different locations, i.e. Continental (Turin) and Mediterranean (Athens), using the relative weather data, with the aim to investigate how the different climates affect the office building’s energy performance.

For each thermal zone, in every selected climate - Turin and Athens - the algorithm describing users’ interactions with windows was implemented in the dynamic simulation tool. Simulations were run 30 times for three comfort categories (see table 2) setting all fixed inputs and one occupant, to understand the impact of the windows’ behaviour on the investigated performance indicators.

Since most window openings can be associated with the arrival of an occupant in the office, the probabilities of opening and closing windows were separately estimated in three different sub-models representing the situations of occupants’ arrival, departure and during their presence (Herkel et al., 2008). This dynamic method can account for the real adaptive processes of occupants by performing for each of those sub-models a logistic regression which takes into account the most relevant environmental parameters (indoor and outdoor temperature, prior absence duration and rainfall). In the following research an experimental approach into subsequent scenarios has been developed which was based on two steps, where two window controls were defined: firstly the study has treated office energy performance as automatically performed in the design stage of energy dynamic simulation software; secondly, the model that assumes a probabilistic interaction between users and window opening and closing has been built.

The work focuses on the relationship of window opening behaviour, and the model describing the use of shading system is not applied to the reference building.

Table 3 – Regression coefficients of the probability functions of the window submodels. Previous absence, occurrence of rain and next absence are binary variables.

|                      | Physical driving variables |                   |                            |                     |                              |                                 |                        |                       |
|----------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|
|                      | $T_{in}$<br>[°C]           | $T_{out}$<br>[°C] | Previous<br>absence<br>[-] | Rain<br>[-]         | Ongoing<br>presence<br>[min] | $T_{out,daily}$<br>mean<br>[°C] | Next<br>absence<br>[-] |                       |
| Sub models           | a                          | b <sub>Tin</sub>  | b <sub>Tout</sub>          | b <sub>abs_pr</sub> | b <sub>rain</sub>            | b <sub>Tpres</sub>              | b <sub>Tout,dm</sub>   | b <sub>abs_next</sub> |
| Opening at arrival   | -13.7                      | 0.308             | 0.0395                     | 1.826               | -0.43                        | 0                               | 0                      | 0                     |
| Closing at arrival   | 3.95                       | -0.286            | -0.05                      | 0                   | 0                            | 0                               | 0                      | 0                     |
| Intermediate opening | -11.78                     | 0,263             | 0.0394                     | 0                   | -0.336                       | -0.0009                         | 0                      | 0                     |
| Intermediate closing | -4.14                      | 0.026             | -0.0625                    | 0                   | 0                            | 0                               | 0                      | 0                     |
| Opening at departure | -8.72                      | 0                 | 0                          | 0                   | 0                            | 0                               | 0.1352                 | 0.85                  |
| Closing at departure | -8.68                      | 0.222             | -0.0936                    | 0                   | 0                            | 0                               | 0                      | 1.534                 |

### 3. Discussion and results

The subsequent graphs (Figures 4, 5 and 6) provide a summary of simulated air change rate, heating loads and cooling loads for the above mentioned two scenarios (“deterministic” and “probabilistic”). Moreover, table 4 describes the variation of the results by the fluctuating categories of comfort.

Especially, each performance indicator is presented comparing the Turin and Athens climates in order to corroborate the impact of different climates on energy consumption and window opening and to investigate for each control, as well as each simulation set, what influence the climate would have on the fluctuation of the result, due to the changes in behaviour of the window. The investigations were carried out with the main goal of identifying the influence of climate on the alteration in results between the deterministic and probabilistic approach to the building energy simulation.

Great variations in energy consumption emerged from the data elaboration, switching from a deterministic to a probabilistic approach to

window opening (Figure 4, 5 and 6), for both the climate zones. Actually, using a deterministic approach, the windows are always supposed to be closed according to the fixed schedule, while the stochastic model calculates the probability of a window being opened or closed without been driven by physical thresholds.

In particular, in a hybrid ventilated building the energy use increases because of more frequent occupant-window interactions. In other words, if the opportunity to open the window is given, occupants tend to open it more often than expected; accordingly the average values coming from the simulation sets are higher than the hygienic mechanical ventilation of the deterministic model, for both climate zones (i.e. maximum variation in Turin: 230%; maximum variation in Athens: 440%).

Figure 4 shows the change on air change rate moving the simulation to different climates. The warmer climate presents a higher frequency of window opening of 69.5% compared to the colder

climate. Specifically, as it can be seen in Table 4, in Turin the probabilistic model provides air change rate predictions closer to the ones coming from the standard model (i.e. maximum  $ACH_{CatIII_{Turin}} = 4.81 \text{ h}^{-1}$  in summer season), while in Athens the gap between results is more significant (i.e. maximum  $ACH_{CatII_{Athens}} = 6.99 \text{ h}^{-1}$ , during the summer, instead of  $1 \text{ h}^{-1}$  of the hygienic mechanical ventilation). Note that the ACH is calculated by dividing the volumetric flow rate of air with the space volume of the rooms.


As a result, in models using a probabilistic algorithm for the window opening, the higher energy use for heating is in Turin with a discrepancy of 87.8% with respect to Athens (Figure 5). Conversely, the higher energy use for cooling is in Athens with a gap of 57.6% compared to Turin (Figure 6).

The variation of the results is a consequence of the influence of the climate on this probabilistic model. Specifically, the effect of climate on mean values of heating and cooling energy consumption and air change rate are different in the two climate conditions. Simulated models in Athens always show the maximum cooling energy use and air change rate and the lowest heating energy consumption; while in Turin they have the highest energy use for heating in all scenarios and the lowest air change rate and cooling energy consumption.

Once the influence of probabilistic control on energy demand is evaluated, the fluctuation of results within the same set of simulation is analyzed for the entire building using the Coefficient of Variation (CV). In probability theory and statistics, this indicator is a normalized

measure of dispersion of a probability distribution or frequency distribution and it is defined as the ratio of the standard deviation to the mean. Therefore we used it to quantify the sensitivity of the performance indicator respect to changes in simulations. However, it can be seen that the two climate zones have similar values of CV, with the only exception of the air change rate in which Turin is about 40%, while Athens amounts to 25% (Figure 3).

Fig. 3 – CV values for annual heating load, cooling load and air change rate (Scenario II)



Once this analysis of the results is completed, it seems appropriate to ask whether users behave exactly the same way within a building. What if active or passive users will be simulated in Athens and Turin? An interesting development in the current research could be to investigate the influence of different types of users on the predicted energy consumption, in different climate zones.

Table 4 – Fluctuation of the results in the air change rate, heating load and cooling load calculations between different comfort categories

|                                     |                           | Comparison between categories: deterministic VS probabilistic Approach |              |               |              |               |                |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|--|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|
|                                     |                           | CAT I_TURIN  | CAT II_TURIN | CAT III_TURIN | CAT I_ATHENS | CAT II_ATHENS | CAT III_ATHENS |
| Air Change Rate [h <sup>-1</sup> ]  | Scenario I_deterministic  | 1.00   | 1.00         | 1.00          | 1.00         | 1.00          | 1.00           |
|                                     | Scenario II_probabilistic | 3.25   | 3.18         | 3.31          | 5.38         | 5.39          | 5.37           |
| Heating Loads [kWh/m <sup>2</sup> ] | Scenario I_deterministic  | 45.65  | 43.82        | 42.31         | 13.75        | 12.74         | 12.00          |
|                                     | Scenario II_probabilistic | 75.44  | 70.75        | 68.64         | 42.81        | 37.67         | 33.84          |
| Cooling Loads [kWh/m <sup>2</sup> ] | Scenario I_deterministic  | 16.58  | 16.01        | 14.99         | 31.71        | 30.91         | 29.40          |
|                                     | Scenario II_probabilistic | 14.81  | 13.75        | 11.91         | 34.41        | 32.46         | 28.92          |




Fig. 4 – Comparison Air change rate scenarios of Cat II




Fig. 5 – Comparison heating loads' scenarios of Cat II




Fig. 6 – Comparison cooling loads' scenarios of Cat II

#### 4. Conclusion

This paper aimed at highlighting the gap between two approaches of simulation, deterministic (with occupants' schedules fixed and always repeatable) and probabilistic (defined by a stochastic schedule of the building occupants). The huge gap often resulting between the predicted and the actual heating and cooling demands relies on the actions that building occupants perform in the indoor environment. The two approaches to simulate the occupants' activities, in an office building are simulated in different climates, through the

implementation of a behavioural model taken from the literature, in a building energy dynamic simulation tool. Using a stochastic model, the use of the window is not predictable with certainty, but it is linked to the behaviour of the occupants. Accordingly, results show different energy outcomes between different control systems, in different climate locations.

In both climate locations, in winter the heating system has to compensate for the higher heat loss due to a more frequent interaction with windows leading to an increase of heating delivered energy. This discrepancy is particularly more pronounced

in Athens (e.g. from 12.74 to 37.67, that is + 196%), where the users, because of the warmer climate, tend to open the windows more frequently than in Turin (e.g. from 43.82 to 70.75, that is + 61%).

Conversely, in summer, the probabilistic model seems to have a lesser but positive influence, but only in the Continental climate of Turin since operations on windows seem to support the system to cool down the building reducing the expected cooling consumption (e.g. from 16.01 kWh/m<sup>2</sup> to 13.75 kWh/m<sup>2</sup>, with a decrease of 14%, see table 4). The same notion was not valid for Athens (e.g. from 30.91 kWh/m<sup>2</sup> to 32.46 kWh/m<sup>2</sup>, with an increase of 5%, see table 4), probably because of the high temperatures of the Mediterranean weather. As a matter of fact, in warmer climates naturally ventilated buildings tend to become overheated during summer periods and consequently users tend to open windows more frequently. This interaction necessarily leads to an increase in ventilation losses and hence cooling delivered energy.

Based on that, there is a difference in heating and cooling loads of fixed control versus manual, and it is necessary to clarify this discrepancy with further more detailed studies. Further research will identify different types of users (active and passive), analysing how they affect the predicted energy consumption in office buildings.

## References

- Clarke, J.A. 2001. *Energy Simulation in Building Design*, Second Edition, Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.
- Fabi, V. 2013. "Influence of Occupant's Behavior on Indoor Environmental Quality and energy Consumption", doctoral dissertation.
- Fritsch, R., Kohler, A., Nygård-Ferguson, M., Scartezzini, J.L. 1990. "A Stochastic Model of User Behavior Regarding Ventilation." In *Building and Environment* 25, 173-81.
- Haldi, F., Robinson, D. 2009. "Interactions with Window Openings by Office Occupants." In *Building and Environment* 44, 2378-2395.
- Herkel, S., Knapp, U., Pfafferott, J. 2008. "Toward a Model of User Behavior Regarding the Manual Control of Windows in Office Buildings." In *Building and Environment* 43, 588-600.
- Humphreys, M.A., Nicol, J.F. 1998. "Understanding the Adaptive Approach to Thermal Comfort." In *ASHRAE Transactions* 104, 991-1004.
- Mahdavi, A., Mohammadi, A., Kabir, E., Lambeva, L. 2008. "Occupants' Operation of Lighting and Shading Systems in Office Buildings." In *Journal of Building Performance Simulation* 1, 57-65.
- Page, J., Robinson, D., Morel, N., Scartezzini, J.L. 2008. "A Generalized Stochastic Model For The Simulation Of Occupant Presence." In *Energy and Building* 40, 83-98.
- Raja, I.A., Nicol, J.F., McCartney, K.J., Humphreys, M.A. 2001. "Thermal Comfort: Use of Controls in Naturally Ventilated Buildings." In *Energy and Buildings* 33, 235-244.
- Reinhart, C.F. 2004. "Lightswitch-2002: A Model for Manual and Automated Control of Electric Lighting and Blinds." In *Solar Energy* 77, 15-28.
- Rijal, H.B., Tuohy, P., Humphreys, M.A., Nicol, J.F., Samuel, A., Clarke, J. 2007. "Using Results from Field Surveys to Predict the Effect of Opening Windows on Thermal Comfort and Energy Use in Buildings." In *Energy and Buildings* 39, 823-836.
- Wagner, A., Gossauer, E., Moosmann, C., Gropp, Th., Leonhart, R. 2007. "Thermal Comfort at Workplace Occupant Satisfaction – Results of Field Studies in German Low Energy Office Buildings." In *Energy and Buildings* 39, 758-769.
- Wang, W., Zmeureanu, R., Rivard, H. 2005. "Applying Multi-Objective Genetic Algorithms in Green Building Design Optimization." In *Building and Environment* 40, 1512-25.
- Yun, G.Y., Steemers, K. 2008. "Time-Dependent Occupant Behaviour Models of Window Control in Summer." In *Building and Environment* 43, 1471-1482.
- Yun, G.Y., Steemers, K., Baker, N. 2008. "Natural Ventilation in Practice: Linking Façade Design, Thermal Performance, Occupant Perception and Control." In *Building Research & Information* 36, 608-624.

Building Simulation applications (BSA) 2015 was the second IBPSA-Italy conference on building performance simulation to take place at the Free University of Bolzano, from February 4<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> 2015. The main topics dealt with were: detailed modelling of phenomena and components, integrated and non-energy performance analysis, optimization techniques for high performance buildings and retrofit, and development and validation of new tools.

The principal mission of the International Building Performance Simulation Association (IBPSA) is to promote and advance the practice of building performance simulation in order to improve the design, construction, operation and maintenance of new and existing buildings.

IBPSA-Italy is the Italian regional affiliate, a non-profit-making association, which includes researchers, developers and practitioners acting on the topic of building performance simulation. IBPSA-Italy was founded in January 2011 and has now more than 140 members including university professors, researchers, professionals, software developers and students.

**bu,p**

