

# Practical Experiences in Applying Savings M&V

#### By

#### Pierre Baillargeon P.Eng.

#### Vice President, Econoler International, Canada Certified Measuvement & Verification professional (CMVP)

September 25, 2006

# Program

# 10:00-10:25 Introduction and Presentation of EVO10:25-11:00 Overview of IPMVP11:00-11:30 How to apply IPMVP's Options

#### Break

11:45-13:00 Project examples and Calculations14:00-15:00 Q&A and Conclusion





# Introduction and Presentation of EVO

# Introduction

### **Your Trainer:**

#### Pierre Baillargeon p.eng.

- Professional Engineer (Energy Engineer)
- Vice President of Econoler International
- Certified Measurement and Verification
   Professional (CMVP) from the association of energy engineers



# Introduction

#### Why Measure and Verify?

- Accurately assess energy savings for a project
- Reduce uncertainties to reasonable levels
- Allocate risks to the appropriate parties
- Monitor equipment performance
- Find additional savings, avoid savings deterioration
- Improve operations and maintenance (O&M)
- Verify cost savings guarantee is met
- Account for variances from energy budget
- Educate facility users
- Identify cash flow for financiers



# Introduction

- M&V is an evolving science, although common practices exist
- These practices are documented in several guidelines, including
  - The International Performance Measurement & Verification Protocol, (IPMVP Volumes I, II and III)
  - U.S. FEMP M&V Guidelines: Measurement and Verification for Federal Energy Projects Version 2.2 (2000)
  - ASHRAE Guideline 14: Measurement of Energy and Demand Savings (2002)



# EVO

#### Efficiency Value Organization (EVO) www.efficiencyvaluation.org

- The home of IPMVP
- Formed in 2004, formerly IPMVP Inc, a non-profit U.S. based corporation
- Provides tools to help energy efficiency projects be valued on the same basis as new energy supply projects



# EVO

#### • EVO Vision

A global marketplace that correctly values the efficient use of natural resources and utilizes end-use efficiency options as a viable alternative to supply options

#### • EVO Mission

To develop and promote the use of standardized protocols, methods and tools to quantify and manage the performance risks and benefits associated with end-use energy efficiency, renewable energy, and water efficiency business transactions





- Protocols
  - Industry Standards
- Training, Certification
  - In partnership with many organisations

|   | <b>-</b>                       |
|---|--------------------------------|
|   | Seminars                       |
|   |                                |
| T & VERIFICATION: A   | APPLYING THE IPMVP             |
|   |                                |
|   | STONAL PERPO.                  |
|   | 11111 and 11111                |
|   | A 111111                       |
| 050.00  | 0 2 1.                         |
|   | *                              |
| Add to Cart   |                                |
|   |                                |
| register you to take the CMVP exam. To<br>tion, CLICK HERE. | o complet                      |
|   | NT & VERIFICATION: A<br>050.00 |

- Building Community, Promoting Efficiency
  - USGBC US Green Building Council LEED
  - Metering International
  - Power Measurement Webinars
  - APEC IEEFP
  - Coming soon EVO subscriber services





# Overview of the International Performance Measurement & Verification Protocol (IPMVP)

# **IPMVP - Overview**

- Created by an international committee to standardize the M&V approaches for owners and financiers of multiple ESCO projects
- Developed and managed by EVO Inc.

available free

www.ipmvp.org



# **IPMVP - Overview**

- IPMVP presents a **framework** and **defines terms** needed in determining energy savings after implementation of a project.
- IPMVP specifies the contents of the **M&V Plan** that must be prepared for each specific project.
- IPMVP allows flexibility in creating M&V Plans for individual projects, while adhering to the principles of accuracy, transparency and repeatability.



# **IPMVP - Benefits**

- Defines standard approaches to "measuring" "savings," to reassure facility owners.
- Legitimizes ESCO projects though international recognition of their "cash register."
- Enables logical discussion of the trade-off between measurement "accuracy" and measurement cost.
- Helps parties to create transparent, repeatable performance contract terms regarding savings settlement.
- Updates the definition of the state of the M&V art through constant evolution.



# **IPMVP – Other Characteristics**

- Translated into more than 10 languages over the last five years
- First published in 1996, and updated periodically (update released may 2007)
- Broad international support and adoption
- The only world standard



# **IPMVP**

### **IPMVP does NOT cover in detail:**

- Design of meter and instrumentation systems
- Cost estimating of M&V activities



# **IPMVP - Documents**

- IPMVP Vol. I Concepts and Options for Determining Energy and Water Savings.
- IPMVP Vol. II Concepts and Practices for Improved Indoor Environmental Quality
- IPMVP Vol. III Applications
  - Concepts and Options for Determining Energy Savings in New Construction
  - Concepts and Practices for Determining Energy Savings in Renewable Energy Technologies Applications



# **IPMVP Key Concepts**

#### IPMVP stands for:

# International Performance *Measurement* & <u>Verification Protocol</u>

So what do we *measure*?



### **IPMVP Key Concepts** Measure?

- Savings are the absence of energy use.
- We can *not* measure what we do not have.
- We do *not* 'measure' savings!
- We *do* measure energy use.
- We *analyze* measured energy use to **determine** savings.



**IPMVP Key Concepts** More than Measurement

#### The Basic IPMVP Savings Equation:

### Savings = Baseline period Energy - Reporting period energy +/- Adjustments



### **IPMVP Key Concepts** Adjustments

• An example of why we need Adjustments:

An energy retrofit was performed but plant *production is lower* this year than last. How much of the raw 'savings' were due to the retrofit and not the production change?

- To identify the retrofit's effect we must adjust for unrelated changes so we have an "apples to apples" comparison.
- We adjust ("normalize") baseline and reporting period energy use data to a common set of conditions.



# **M&V Requires 2 Types of Meters**



### **IPMVP Key Concepts** "Cost Avoidance" not "Savings"

- Accountants only use meters and bills to report *Cost Savings*.
- Energy users usually wish to know how much their bills <u>would have been</u> if there had been no energy efficiency action. M&V engineers report such Cost Avoidance by making adjustments.
  - The extent of these adjustments depends on how much you are measuring.





### The Whole Facility Method:

Measures all effects in the facility:

- Retrofits AND other changes (intended and **un**intended)
- Often uses the utility meter

### **The Retrofit Isolation Method:**

Measures only the retrofitted system

- Unaffected by other changes
- Ignores interactive effects beyond the boundary
- Usually needs a new meter



#### Decide what you are concerned about

If you want to assess a particular retrofit:

• use the <u>Retrofit Isolation</u> Method.

If you want to manage your total energy use:

• use the <u>Whole Facility</u> Method.



### **Terminology:**

- Retrofit Isolation Option A or B
- Whole Facility Option C or D

Two flavours of each – to allow flexibility for various situations



**IPMVP Key Concepts** Retrofit Isolation

Select Option A over B based on responsibilities:

A – <u>Retrofit Isolation – key parameters</u> <u>measurement</u>

Allows measurement of just the parameter of performance concern, estimate the other.

B – <u>Retrofit Isolation – All parameters</u> <u>measurement</u>



# **IPMVP Key Concepts**

#### Retrofit Isolation

|                              | Option A                  | Option B    |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| Baseline measurement         | 400 kW                    | 200,000 kWh |
| Reporting period measurement | 300 kW                    | 150,000 kWh |
| Estimated operating hours    | 500 hrs                   |             |
| Avoided Energy               | 100 x 500 =<br>50,000 kWh | 50,000 kWh  |

- A measure only <u>part of</u> the energy computation, for example:
  a contractor is only responsible for a load reduction (or only responsible for a reduction in operating hours, but not both)
- B measure <u>all</u> factors governing energy use, for example:
  - a contractor is responsible for controls which optimize both load and operating hours.

### **IPMVP Key Concepts** Retrofit Isolation

Option A (Retrofit Isolation – Key parameters measurement) allows a possible reduction in measurement cost, but introduces some inaccuracy.

All parties must accept the inaccuracy associated with the estimate.

The choice between A and B allows flexibility to suite the situation.



**IPMVP Key Concepts** Whole Facility?

Select Option C over D based on availability of data.

#### C – Whole Building

Need both baseline period and reporting period data

#### D – Calibrated Simulation

When there is no meter in the baseline (or no building), baseline data can be manufactured under controlled circumstances. We will <u>not</u> discuss this option further.

### **IPMVP Key Concepts** Whole Facility - Example

• Baseline Electricity Bill

July 1999

• Reporting per. Electricity Bill

July 2001

Gross difference

- Adjustment for meter reading period length and weather
- Avoided Energy =

800,000 kWh

600,000 kWh 200,000 kWh

+<u>100,000 kWh</u> 300,000 kWh



# **IPMVP – Summary of Options**

- The IPMVP has four M&V methodologies: Options A, B, C, and D
- The options are generic M&V approaches for energy and water saving projects.
- Four options provide a range of approaches to determining energy cost avoidance, depending on the characteristics of the ECMs being implemented, and balancing accuracy in reporting with the cost of conducting M&V.





# How to Apply IPMVP's Options in Practical Ways

Regardless of the Option followed, similar steps are taken to "measure & verify" "savings:"

- Step 1: Gather the baseline data (energy and operating conditions).
- Step 2: Develop a Project Specific M&V Plan.
- Step 3: Verify the proper equipment/systems were installed and are performing to specification. Calibrate meters.
- Step 4: Gather reporting period measured data and compute Cost Avoidance as defined in the M&V Plan.



#### **Step 1 Gather Baseline Information**

- Set the <u>measurement boundary</u> to determine what to monitor, and for how long. Consider factors such as the complexity of the ECM, stability of the baseline data, variability of equipment loads and operating hours, and impacts beyond the boundary.
- Gather physical information within the measurement boundary (equipment inventory and operations, occupancy, energy/demand data, control strategies, and so on). This is part of a normal energy audit.



#### **Step 1 Gather Baseline Information** (continued)

Baseline information is needed to **adjust** for any changes that may occur during the performance period so we can make an "Apples to Apples" comparison.







#### **Step 1 Gather Baseline Information** (continued)

In almost all cases, after the ECM has been installed, you cannot go back and re-evaluate the baseline. It no longer exists!

It is very important to properly define and document all baseline conditions before the measure is implemented.



#### Step 2 Develop Project Specific M&V Plan

The project specific M&V plan includes project-wide items as well as details for each ECM, including:

- Details of baseline conditions and data collected
- All assumptions and sources of data
- What will be verified
- Who will conduct the various M&V activities
- Schedule for all M&V activities
- Analysis of baseline information
- Cost avoidance calculation method to be used

#### Step 2 Develop M&V Plan (continued)

- Utility rates and how changes in rates are accommodated
- Expected M&V cost and accuracy
- Responsibilities for reporting facility changes
- Content and format of all M&V reports
- Nature of any expected "baseline adjustments"



# **Step 3: Verify the proper equipment/ systems were installed and are performing to specification.**

- After commissioning, the post-installation activities specified in the M&V Plan are implemented.
- Verification methods may include surveys, inspections, spot measurements, and short-term metering.
- The results of the commissioning and M&V activities are presented in a *Post-Installation M&V Report*



#### **Step 4: Compute Cost Avoidance**

- Monitor the facility (within the measurement boundary) to identify any changes from baseline conditions.
- Gather all data, as defined in the M&V Plan.
- Make all routine or special adjustments needed, as defined in the M&V Plan.
- Compute Cost Avoidance and report, as defined in the M&V Plan.



# **M&V Options - Practical Issues**

### **Key Variables for M&V Cost Management:**

- Meter quality
- Number of independent variables to be monitored
- Frequency of measurement and reporting
- Length of the reporting period
- Sampling, if a lot of equipment to measure
- Other uses of meter information to share costs



### **M&V Options - Practical Issues** M&V Cost vs Uncertainty

#### How much Accuracy do you want – or can you afford?

#### There is no *absolutely* correct savings number.



### **M&V Options - Practical Issues** The Law of Diminishing Returns

Spend more on M&V for improved accuracy?



ATION ORGAN

### **M&V Options - Practical Issues** Limits to M&V Cost



Complexity of the process



### **M&V Options - Practical Issues** How Much M&V Is Enough?

Total cost to determine savings should normally be less than 10% of the savings.



### M&V Options - Practical Issues Performance Contracts

- In performance contracts, risks are allocated between the ESCO, Owner and Financier.
- M&V is critical to the success of a contract:
  - maximizes the savings and the persistence of savings over the contract term
  - verifies what savings were achieved and acts as the cash register for the exchange of value
- So design your M&V well, using recognized methods.





# Project Examples in Applying IPMVP

### Sample M&V Project Commercial Building

| Energy Conservation<br>Measures | Simple Payback<br>(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   |
|                                 | <b>EVO</b><br>EFFICIENCY VALUATION ORGANIZATION |

ենքիկի Բիկին Հնդեսինինինինինինինին

Sample M&V Project Commercial Building

#### M&V Approach - OPTION C

- Whole facility approach using data from utility gas and electric meters.
- We will analyze baseline gas meter data and compute savings for two months.



# **Sample Option C**

### Baseline period Data

| Meter Reading     | Gas         | Heating |
|-------------------|-------------|---------|
| Date              | Consumption | Degree  |
| February 5, 1991  | mcf         | Days    |
| March 5, 1991     | 210,692     | 650     |
| April 7, 1991     | 208,664     | 440     |
| Мау б, 1991       | 157,886     | 220     |
| June 5, 1991      | 120,793     | 150     |
| July 7, 1991      | 116,508     | 50      |
| August 7, 1991    | 107,272     | 20      |
| September 5, 1991 | 95,411      | 14      |
| October 6, 1991   | 126,423     | 29      |
| November 6, 1991  | 149,253     | 125     |
| December 4, 1991  | 166,202     | 275     |
| January 6, 1992   | 221,600     | 590     |
| February 5, 1992  | 224,958     | 723     |
| Total             | 1,905,662   | 3,286   |



### Sample Option C Baseline Model

Find Gas vs Heating Degree Day relationship:



### Sample Option C Method

For each month after retrofit predict what the baseline gas use <u>would have been</u> under conditions of the current month's weather.

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

Gas = 173.27 \* HDD + 111,358

3. Compare baseline model's gas with actual post-retrofit gas, to determine avoided gas.



### **Sample Option C** Graphical Savings

Baseyear model (line) and post-retrofit data (points) 250,000 200,000 150,000 Gas 100,000 50,000 0 200 400 800 0 600 HDD



### Sample Option C Computations

|                    | A atual D   | Actual Post  |          | Projected Baseyear (Wouldavbin) |         |         | Coving |         |
|--------------------|-------------|--------------|----------|---------------------------------|---------|---------|--------|---------|
|                    | Retrofit l  | usi-<br>Data | Baseload | Weather                         | Total   | Savings |        |         |
|                    |             |              |          | Sensitive                       |         |         |        | Value   |
| Meter Reading Date | Consumption | HDD          | Factors  |                                 | Total   | mcf     |        | Price   |
|                    | mcf         |              | 111,358  | 173.27                          |         |         |        | 6.232   |
| March 6, 1994      | 151,008     | 601          | 111,358  | 104,135                         | 215,493 | 64,485  | \$     | 401,871 |
| April 4, 1994      | 122,111     | 420          |          |                                 |         |         |        | ?       |
| May 6, 1994        | 102,694     | 188          | 111,358  | 32,575                          | 143,933 | 41,239  | \$     | 257,001 |
| June 5, 1994       | 111,211     | 250          | 111,358  | 43,318                          | 154,676 | 43,465  | \$     | 270,874 |
| July 5, 1994       | 80,222      | 41           | 111,358  | 7,104                           | 118,462 | 38,240  | \$     | 238,312 |
| August 6, 1994     | 71,023      | 15           | 111,358  | 2,599                           | 113,957 | 42,934  | \$     | 267,565 |
| September 8, 1994  | 65,534      | 5            | 111,358  | 866                             | 112,224 | 46,690  | \$     | 290,972 |
| October 9, 1994    | 77,354      | 12           |          |                                 |         |         |        | ?       |
| November 4, 1994   | 103,000     | 190          | 111,358  | 32,921                          | 144,279 | 41,279  | \$     | 257,251 |
| December 10, 1994  | 115,112     | 300          | 111,358  | 51,981                          | 163,339 | 48,227  | \$     | 300,551 |
| January 7, 1995    | 160,002     | 700          | 111,358  | 121,289                         | 232,647 | 72,645  | \$     | 452,724 |
| February 4, 1995   | 145,111     | 612          | 111,358  | 106,041                         | 217,399 | 72,288  | \$     | 450,499 |



### Sample Option C Best Applications

- Significant energy saving (10% or more of consumption on the utility meter)
- All parameters significantly affecting energy usage can be clearly identified (baseline and after implementation)
- Adjustments factors are simple
- Individual ECM measurement not required
- Multiple ECMs
- Complex ECMs
- Soft savings measures included (training, awareness)



### **Option C summary** Whole Facility

#### Advantages:

- Evaluates performance of the entire facility
- Interactive effects between EE measures

#### **Disadvantages:**

- No separation of the impact of different ECMs
- Not a saving control method, since normal unexplained total facility energy variations may obscure individual months' savings. However the method provides annual reconciliation.

### Sample M&V Project Textile Mill in India

| Energy Conservation<br>Measures   | Simple Payback<br>(years) |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Ventilation pre-heat              | 2.2                       |
| Pumping power reduction           | 2.8                       |
| Compressed air leakage reduction  | 3.3                       |
| Waste water aeration optimization | 3.3                       |
| Steam condensate optimization     | 2.2                       |
| On-site power generation upgrade  | 2.9                       |



## Sample M&V Project

#### Textile Mill

| ECM                              | Item<br>Measured | Level<br>Measured | How often<br>Item<br>Measured |
|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|
| Ventilation pre-heat             | Steam            | 100%              | Continuous                    |
| Pumping power reduction          | kW, kWh          | 100%              | Continuous                    |
| Compressed air leakage reduction | kW, kWh          | 100%              | Continuous                    |
| Wastewater aeration              | kW, kWh          | 100%              | Continuous                    |
| Steam condensate                 | Steam            | 100%              | Continuous                    |
| On-site power generation         | kW, kWh          | 100%              | Continuous                    |

Sample M&V Project Retrofit Isolation

- Many aspect of the plant are changing and not relevant to the performance of an ESCO so retrofit isolation is needed.
- Determine savings in the compressed air system:
  - Continuous measurement needed to demonstrate continuous performance, so use **Option B.**



Sample M&V Project Measurement Boundary





### **Sample Option B** Measurement Boundary

To set the measurement boundary, decide:

1. What affects energy use *inside* the Boundary?



- Mill operating hours (mill either operates steadily or is shut down)
- Leakage in compressed air distribution system
- 2. What energy effects happen *outside* the boundary?

- less heat rejected from compressor room



### Sample Option B M&V Plan

#### **Baseline period:**

- 1. Measure compressor plant electricity consumption (kWh) continuously for a month
- 2. Determine mean energy use per operating hour and nonoperating hour.

#### **Reporting period:**

- a) Measure compressor plant electricity consumption (kWh) continuously
- b) Model baseline energy for each hour from baseline test (2)

#### **Cost Avoidance**

Compute the difference between a) and b)



### Sample Option B Baseline Test

Averaged over the one month period of baseline test:

| Mode                     | Energy Use (kWh/hr) |
|--------------------------|---------------------|
| Mill ON (operating)      | 140.3               |
| Mill OFF (not operating) | 102.3               |

\* Energy use is constant in each mode.

Baseline Energy = (140.3 \* ON hrs) + (102.3 \* OFF hrs)



### **Sample Option B** 2003 Reporting period 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       |

### **Sample Option B** 2003 Energy Avoidance

During 2003, no new machines were added and no modifications were made to existing machines affecting their use of compressed air.

**Test:** What is the Energy Avoidance for January?



### Sample Option B Best Applications

- Contractor is responsible for all aspects of energy use in the system that was retrofitted.
- On-going measurement required to verify savings methodology is still in place.
- Meter maintenance cost insignificant relative to savings.
- Few changes are expected from baseline conditions.



### **Option B** Retrofit Isolation

#### Advantages:

- Savings correlate with process changes
- Actual savings verified with metered usage
- Provides operational feedback

### **Disadvantages:**

- Can be expensive to install and maintain meters
- Not reconciled to total energy costs
- Difficult to establish baseline loads for varying process and energy consumption levels



# Conclusions

- Carefully crafted M&V Plans are a key tool in demonstrating performance in risky projects.
- The M&V approach selected should balance the desire for accuracy with cost to install and maintain M&V activities.
  - More complex ECMs may require more complex and expensive M&V methods to determine energy savings
  - M&V costs should not normally exceed 3-5% of project cost



# Conclusions

- M&V is the only approach that shows the return on energy efficiency investments ("ROI").
- EVO's IPMVP can play an important role in the development of the ESCO industry because it provides credibility for M&V activities.
- EVO also provides training and certification to help develop M&V expertise.



# EVO

#### Join EVO today: www.efficiencyvaluation.org

Download IPMVP today: www.ipmvp.org

Pierre Baillargeon Vice President, Econoler International pbaillar@econolerint.com

