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Project overview - location

Canberra ACT
Project overview

- Complete refurbishment of sandstone heritage building
- Grade A office building 5,000m²
- Substantial data centre (125kW)
- Incomplete design and specification
- Lump sum contract
- Required commissioning skills
Performance targets and outcomes

- Separate Base Building and tenancy targets
  - Base Building > 4.5 Stars NABERS
  - Tenancy (excl data centre) > 4.5 Stars NABERS
  - Tenancy (Incl data centre) >1 Star NABERS

- NABERS is:
  - National rating system
  - Australian buildings, tenancies and homes
  - measures the energy efficiency and its impact on the environment.

- It uses measured and verified performance information and converts it a 6 star rating scale
NABERS – as a measurement system

- Four environmental rating tools
  - NABERS Energy,
  - NABERS Water,
  - NABERS Waste and
  - NABERS Indoor Environment

- measures actual operational performance of existing buildings and tenancies. (energy in kg/CO2/m2/pa)

www.nabers.gov.au

The NABERS rating tools

1. ENERGY USE
2. Multiplied by constant GHG emission factors
3. Adjusted for area, climate, hours and equipment
4. Compared to star rating benchmarks
5. BENCHMARK FACTOR
Achieved targets

- Base Building reached 4.5 Stars – tracking well

Stretch target is 4.75 Stars
Achieved targets

- Tenancy (Excl Data Centre) exceeding target
Soft Landings – what is it?

- An open source protocol developed by BSRIA and Usable Buildings Trust
- For improved delivery, hand over and operation of high performance buildings
- Continuity of outcome focus across 5 stages
  - Inception and briefing
  - Design development & review
  - Pre-handover
  - Initial after-care
  - Extended after-care years 1-3
- 12 core principles
- Rolled out in 2009
Project challenges

- Incomplete and faulty design
- Sub-contractors lack commissioning experience
- Complex system integration (Data Centre)
- Poor response and attendance – designers
- High security – no comms on site
- Demanding client/tenant
- Rental review linked to performance
Methodology

Planning stage

- Develop commissioning plan & procedures
- Clear commissioning objectives
- Establish leadership, define roles and responsibilities
Methodology

Implementation stage

- Structured and frequent feedback
- Continuous monitoring and verification
- Handover, training and tuning plans
- Register of issues
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Holiday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CREMS & STOP sensor calibration**
- 100% complete

**Public Holiday**

**CREMS Pastel Commissioning documentation**
- Tests ready for review

**All Failure Modes testing 3pm - 5pm**

**All Failure Modes - Data Centre**
- Operation
- All day

---

**Integration testing**
- Doc review

**Lock-up and alright**
Trend log confirming AHU response to temperature loop (Moffitt, 2011)
Methodology

Tuning stage

- As-builts, O&M Manuals and deliver training
- Engage with Building manager and maintainers
- Leadership of tuning and monitoring activities
- “Close out” issues identified during implementation stage
Heating hot water consumption well aligned with target

Trend log of Base Building gas consumption – against target (Moffitt, Ardren, 2012)
Chillers tracking on target. Nil consumption in winter.

**Trend log of Base Building Chiller energy consumption**

*(Moffitt, Ardren, 2012)*
## Verification against Soft Landings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Framework and core principle</th>
<th>Applied Yes/No</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adopt the entire Soft Landings process from commencement. Be explicit in implementation through all 5 stages</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Our observation is that it is essential to be brought in to play <em>before commissioning planning</em> begins. Earlier is preferable, but maybe not as critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provide leadership and have champions for Client and Contractor. Engender trust and open/honest collaboration</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Clear <em>leadership</em> definitely helped the team embrace and focus on performance outcomes. While there was a bit of a “contractual” mindset overshadowing completion, in terms of demonstrating operation of systems, all parties had a “no blame” attitude and “pulled together” to make sure it all worked correctly and efficiently</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Verification against Soft Landings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Set roles and responsibilities for all stages and ensure continuity. Active participation of client/owner and occupant representative</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Unclear role definitions resulted in a lack of ownership of outcomes As leadership was established, focus on outcomes improved dramatically. The same leadership continued throughout Continuity of performance intent was essential from construction to operation and operations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ensure continuity of Soft Landings thread throughout the entire project</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>As noted above, a successful outcome has been achieved, even though the initial stages of the project did not focus on the performance outcomes Observations indicate that person nominated to be responsible for carrying the continuity of intent through from one stage to the next.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Verification against Soft Landings

|   | Commitment to post Practical Completion “aftercare” for 3 years with continuous feedback in place | Yes | Has proven to be critical to the achievement of the target performance  
Structured tuning and regular measurement / reporting against targets  
Remedial actions done in a time |
|---|---------------------------------------------------------------|-----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5 |                                                               |     | Since there was no contractual obligation for the construction team to achieve the performance outcomes, sharing of risk was practiced.  
This “no blame” mindset definitely contributed to the willingness of parties to contribute and collaborate. |
| 6 | Share risk and responsibility in a collaborative “no blame” approach | Yes |                                                                                 |
## Verification against Soft Landings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Use feedback and surveys to inform design</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feedback and contribution of ideas and experience from previous projects had a big role to play in the success of this project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occupant observations and feedback have had significant input into the resolution of issues and identification of energy efficiency opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of participation by the design engineers, has prevented them from incorporating in future designs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Verification against Soft Landings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Focus on operational outcomes in-use and refine targets</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>The continuous focus and attention to in-use performance outcomes has unquestionably contributed to the success of the outcomes to date. Regular tracking and monitoring of energy use against target has been essential in maintaining focus. Targets will be reviewed and refined in next quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Involvement of Building Manager and maintenance crew</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Early involvement of the Building manager and maintenance crews, prior to commissioning provided substantial value to the process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Verification against Soft Landings

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td>Involve end-users in all stages of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>Early involvement ensured that the occupants were able to operate the building efficiently in record time. A Building Users guide was developed from the perspective of occupants. Customised “Quick reference” cheat sheets were produced and placed above each piece of equipment. Direct feedback from occupants has been crucial in the identification of efficiency opportunities in the work spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Verification against Soft Landings

|   | Set realistic performance objectives | Yes | In Australia, the NABERS rating scheme provides a realistic industry benchmark. This allows for the identification of achievable performance goals. All monitoring and measurement is carried out following strict protocols against these standard benchmarks. Regular and open communication in terms of expected outcomes and required activities played a major part in the finalisation of the commissioning and handover processes. During the latter part of the 12 months of “aftercare” to date, communication has diminished |}
Conclusions

Contrary to expectations of failure…
- delivered performance outcome that exceeds industry experiences and timelines.
- Soft Landings core principles have demonstrated best practice outcomes in a timely manner

Additional practices
- more structured in-depth analysis of system operations prior to hand-over
- planning requirements for the tuning process
- defining the Soft Landings lead role through-out all stages
- Require active independent verification of planning and execution
- define the scope and procurement services post 12 months DLP
- define the need for post-occupancy training and coaching for occupants and maintainers
Questions?