



Zero Energy Commercial Buildings Consortium (CBC)

Call Notes

May 13, 2010; 2:00-3:00 pm EST

Key Conclusions

- Based on outline, we have 3, potentially 4, sections and we would like to identify member leads for each section. Each of these will be something like 3-4 pages.
- Benchmarking may become a 4th section, independent of performance measurement
- We will need to include a glossary of definitions for the paper.
- B&PA group will need to coordinate with other working groups such as the Workforce Development group and the Financing & Appraisal group.
- Calls in the future will mostly be subgroups reporting on their activity to date and drilling down on some specific questions.

Next Steps

- **Sub-group leaders needed for each section in outline** - directly notify Cliff or Cathy
 - If you are interested, please e-mail Cathy and Cliff directly to nominate yourself
 - **Deadline to nominate will be Friday, May 21.**
- Co-chairs Cathy and Cliff will redraft the outline to reflect discussions
- Answer [online member poll](#):
 - Schedule regular calls
 - Indicate areas for focused participation: Everyone should choose one section to focus their participation in. You can participate in more than one if you wish, but we encourage you to choose a primary group to really focus your time and efforts on.
- Continue to post and reference resources on Google Group
 - ASTM procedures and glossary
 - NEEP's white paper on legal barriers to rating and disclosure
 - Others

Meeting Minutes

Communications: Google Group - <http://groups.google.com/group/ZECBC-BenchmarkingWG>

1. Utilize the resource
2. Share priority content
3. Questions and Suggestions

Co-Chairs emails for direct communication from those willing to Lead a report Section:

Cathy Higgins – higgins@newbuildings.org

Cliff Majersik – cliff@imt.org

All other communications goes through our Google group:

<http://groups.google.com/ZECBC-BenchmarkingWG>

You must be registered through the CBC prior to joining this Google group. If you are not registered, please go to the CBC site (www.zeroenergycbc.org) to do so. To join the Google group, please contact Caroline Keicher (caroline@imt.org).

Review of Draft Outline from March 24 call –See notes below

1. Outline structure: major sections + themes to address
2. Solicit additional core content (notes on outline, below)

DRAFT WG REPORT OUTLINE – TARGET 12 PAGES

Intro

- Background and relevance to net-zero energy buildings
- Broad opportunities and barriers

1. Performance measurement

- In design
 - o Energy modeling
- In operation
 - o Benchmarking
 - Bruce Hunn: presumes data sets of peer buildings. What are our benchmarks? Somewhere in the report, we need to identify major sources of data already out there and what is appropriate.
 - What about benchmarks that is not of peer buildings? Especially important as we get closer to zero to make that the goal.
 - Anthony: Do we move benchmarking under section 2? Maybe measure first and then benchmark after? Create as a separate chapter. In ASTM, these are 2 topics and it could parallel that. Collection of data is different from comparison.
 - Anthony will take a cut at drafting an outline articulating that distinction for the group

- o Metrics & metering

- Peak vs. non-peak, whole building vs. system, etc.
- This includes normalization
- QA/QC – credentialing, qualifications. This is an area where B&PA should coordinate with the Workforce Development group.

2. Performance rating, labeling & disclosure

- Use the word ‘reporting’ instead of ‘disclosure’? Disclosure is controversial; has legal implications and/or clearly define how we are using words like ‘disclosure’
- Carolyn Sarno has a white paper to share from NEEP on legal barriers for labeling, done in partnership with Vermont Law School

- Cliff: Any insight on ASTM process to share with group? Can ASTM share their glossary and rationale for eliminating the word “disclosure?”
- We may want to revisit this and decide between disclosure & reporting.
- We will want to make a glossary for the paper (clear definitions or sections to address important terms – help standardize terminology)
- Impact on markets
 - Anthony: Do we have enough experience to talk about impacts on markets? The time frame is still very early; we can guess impact on the market, have anecdotal data, but nothing definitive (Only 15K of 5 million commercial buildings in the US has performance data; it is important to remember that this small amount might not accurately show the market)
 - May be premature to speak authoritatively, but we also want to plant a flag for later – there will be follow up reports down the road that can follow up on further data collection.
 - Despite early efforts, there are still a lot of results to date from voluntary labeling programs do exist – Australia, EU, LEED, Energy Star.
 - Cathy: We must be very clear regarding estimated/anticipated (versus known) impacts/benefits.
 - Need to differentiate different segments of markets which will be impacted differently (owners, tenants, design community, appraisal, real estate, insurance).
 - Cliff : Focus of report is on the goal in 2030 – forward looking instead of concentrating on what has previously happened – speculations are okay.
- Policy
 - U.S. policies
 - International best practices
 - Leveraging ratings in finance, appraisal & code compliance
- Label components
- Infrastructure

3. Performance Assurance

- Energy audits and commissioning & RCx
 - Rater infrastructure
- Property & facility management
- Continuous feedback/monitoring & verification (benchmarking here also)
 - Persistence – how well do things hold up over time.
 - Retrofit potential—maybe this needs to be removed
 - Sections/bullets on ‘standardization’ and ‘normalization’ within the industry – on terms, definitions, and practices
 - Workforce development (educational & operational training) – operators, modelers, etc. – covered by another working group – we will need to coordinate with them

- Future incentives for meeting labeling requirements – there is a WG working on financing and we might need to coordinate with them on that.

Summary

- Integrating measurement, labeling & assurance (need to break down boundaries)
- Summary list of recommendations to DOE (bullet list from the sections above)
 - Do we want to discuss the confusion in the marketplace that stems from too many labeling programs? This can be a recommendation on the policy level.
 - And what about consolidating and collecting the information from all these programs?

Possible Appendix (not part of the page limit)

- “bike rack” Items that need to be picked up at a later time or need expansion outside of the core report
- References and Resources