ABSTRACT

For the existing housing, retrofitting single or double glazed clear glass window with solar films can be an effective measure to reduce their peak power demand, and large scale application of the same on national level can be an effective tool for demand side management. This paper analyses the field performance data of a solar control film, retrofitted in a Kuwait villa, for establishing its technical viability and cost effectiveness. The paper concludes that the solar film, besides enhancing the thermal comfort, reduced the peak cooling demand and the peak power demand by 6.7% and 4.7%, respectively, during the peak summer period.
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INTRODUCTION

In Kuwait, fast economic growth and rapid urbanization over the past few decades has resulted in ever increasing demand for electricity, which is well over 5% annually, at present. During the past five years, the power demand grew from 6750 MW in 2001 to 8900 MW in 2006 and during the same period, the electricity consumption increased from 34300 GWh to 46400 GWh. The Ministry of Electricity and Water (MEW), the sole body responsible for meeting the national requirement of electricity and water, has to spend nearly KD200 million on yearly for the purchase of new power plants while its fuel bill for 2006 for electricity generation, estimated for a fuel price of KD10/bbl was KD730 million (MEW, 2007).

Buildings are the major consumer of electricity in Kuwait. Together, air-conditioning (AC), a must for all types of buildings, and lighting account for over 85% of peak power demand and nearly 60% of the annual electricity consumption (Marafie et al., 1989). Thus, implementation of energy conservation and energy efficiency measures in buildings, particularly for their AC and lighting systems can be very effective for demand side management.

In the modern buildings, fenestration is a major contributor to the building cooling load. Also, ability of the fenestration system to allow visible light can be very effective in limiting the use of artificial lighting (Al-Hadban and Maheshwari, 2008). Thus, electricity demand in buildings for AC and lighting can be effectively controlled by selecting an appropriate fenestration system. In Kuwait, fenestration quality in general and for the residential villas in particular is poor. Most of the villas use single glazed clear glass windows. Heat transfer through these windows is a major source of heat gain and contributor to the building cooling and peak power demand. Retrofitting these single or double glazed clear glass window with solar films can be an effective measure to reduce peak power demand in buildings and large scale application of the same on national level can be an effective tool for demand side management.

This paper based on field performance data establishes technical viability and cost effectiveness of retrofitting windows in Kuwaiti villas with solar control films. High quality solar control film of a reputable make was used to retrofit double glazed-clear glass windows in a newly constructed-unoccupied villa in Egailah (Plate 1).

DESCRIPTION OF BUILDING, HVAC SYSTEM AND SOLAR CONTROL FILM

Description of Building and Air Conditioning System

The building used was newly constructed residential villa located south of Kuwait at Egailah residential area. The total land area of the villa is 480 m². It consists of 3.5 floors; basement, ground floor, 1st floor and half second floor. It is constructed with reinforced concrete along with columns and beams encapsulated with thermally insulated bricks, and double glazed clear glass windows and doors with total glazing area of 50 m².

AC system of the building comprises packaged units and split units. Full details of AC system with connected load of 55.4 kW are given in Table 1

Solar Control Film

Solar control film was selected based on strong technical performance characteristics such as clear, neutral, non reflective visual quality that would restore the building to its original appearance, while reducing building cooling demand. IQue Anchor Product film with a commercial name 73FG (V-Cool...
70) was used. It has a total solar heat rejection of 65%, a visible light transmission of 73% and shading coefficient of 0.5.

FIELD DATA COLLECTION ANALYSIS

Instrumentation and Field Data Collection

Technical specifications of instruments used to measure and record global solar radiation, indoor and outdoor temperature and humidity, and cooling production and power demand of the AC system are given in Table 2.

The internal lights during the experimentation were completely switched off, while the doors and the windows with their glazing surfaces were cleaned and kept fully closed. Also, efforts were made to have minimal movement. Global solar radiation was measured simultaneously for incidental and the transmitted radiation on the exterior and interior surfaces of the glazing. These measurements were carried out for few days for all the four orientations of the building. First data were collected for a period with a clear glass without any film to establish the baseline cooling and power demand hourly patterns. The same process for the similar duration was repeated after applying the solar film on the interior glazing. The cooling and power demand for the baseline were compared after applying the solar control film of the product that has been selected. The reductions in hourly cooling and power demands were quantified. This information has been used to estimate the impact of reducing the peak power demand and the annual energy consumption.

Field data were collected during the last week of September and first week of October. Data for 16th September, without the solar control film and for 1st October, with solar control film are analyzed. Incidental and transmitted global solar radiation on the east and west windows for these two days are shown in Fig 1 and 2 respectively. Also, for these days, the measured profiles for the indoor temperature and relative humidity (RH), outdoor temperature, power demands of the A/C units, and the total for the villa were measured.

Field Data Analysis

Using the temperature and RH data, the enthalpy of the indoor and outdoor were established, and their difference, which represents the fresh air or ventilation load, was calculated. These values for the two days were very different as far as the ventilation load was concerned. Likewise the indoor-outdoor temperature differential, which manifests the transmission load for the two days, was very different. Accordingly, the days selected for the comparison had very different cooling load. Therefore, the values could not be used to predict the savings realized due to the application of the solar control film. Alternatively, reduction in transmitted radiation data has been used for estimation of reduction in cooling load and thereby a reduction in the power demand of the A/C units.

Reduction in Cooling Load

The reduction in the transmitted radiation ($\Delta t$) after the application of the film is assumed to be the reduction in cooling demand ($Q_{c}$). This is based on the assumption that the transmitted radiation is fully absorbed by the interior of the villa and it contributes instantaneously to the cooling load. $\Delta t$ is estimated as the difference of the transmitted radiation without the film ($I_{t}$) and the transmitted radiation with the film ($I_{tWF}$) for the same incidental radiation ($I_{i}$).

$$\Delta t = I_{t} - I_{tWF} \quad (1)$$

The readjusted transmitted radiation after the film for the 1st October ($R_{tWF}$) was for the variation in the incidental radiation as follows:

$$R_{tWF} = (I_{i} \text{ for 16th Sep/} I_{i} \text{ for 1st Oct}) \ast I_{t} \text{ for 1st Oct} \quad (2)$$

The hourly average values of the incident radiation, the transmitted radiation without the film and the transmitted readjusted radiation for the east and the west glazing are shown in Figs 3 and 4, respectively. The reduction in the transmitted radiation for the east ($E_{A\Delta t}$) and the west ($W_{A\Delta t}$) were calculated. Finally, combing these values with the glazing areas covered with the films for the east (EA) and the west (WA) glazing, reduction cooling demand for the villa ($\Delta Q_{c}$) is estimated as follows:

$$\Delta Q_{c} = EA \ast E_{A\Delta t} + WA \ast W_{A\Delta t} \quad (3)$$

Reduction in Power Load

Reduction in power demand of the A/C system ($\Delta P_{c}$) at a given time is estimated as follows, as the product of $\Delta Q_{c}$ and the power rating (PR) of the A/C units.

$$\Delta P_{c} = \Delta Q_{c} \ast PR \quad (4)$$

The expected PR for the actual ambient temperature has been estimated assuming a 2.75% (ElSherbini and Maheshwari, 2010) improvement or reduction in PR for every degree Celsius drop in ambient temperature. For different hour of the day, the value $\Delta P_{c}$ in kW is presented in Fig. 5.

Reductions in Cooling Demand and Power Demand for the Peak Summer Day
The reductions in the cooling demand and peak hour power demand for the ambient temperature of 40.4°C were estimated at 1.3 RT and 1.8 kW, respectively. For the design dry bulb temperature of 46°C, the reduction in the cooling demand ($\Delta Q_{cD}$) and power demand ($\Delta P_{cD}$) are estimated as:

$$\Delta Q_{cD} = 1.3 \times \frac{46-24}{40.4-24} = 1.74 \text{ RT (5)}$$

$$\Delta P_{cD} = \Delta Q_{cD} \times 1.6 = 2.8 \text{ kW (6)}$$

Based on the installed capacity of A/C units of 25.8 RT, retrofitting of the building reduced the cooling demand by 6.7% and same is the reduction in the peak power demand for the A/C. Considering that A/C account for 70% of the peak load, the retrofitting is going to reduce the building peak power demand by 4.7%.

**Reduction in Annual Energy Consumption**

Reduction in annual energy consumption for the cooling season has been estimated by estimating the reduction in monthly heat gain in the building and the weighted average power rating of the A/C units for that month. As a first step, monthly irradiation on plane vertical surfaces for different orientations was estimated (Al-Taqi et-al, 2009). The results are shown in Fig. 6. Using the Eq. 3, the monthly reductions in heat gain have been estimated and the results are presented in Table 3. Using the monthly average ambient dry bulb temperature, the weighted average power rating of the A/C units were estimated. The cooling season has been considered from March to November. The annual energy savings were estimated to be 9763.9 kWh/y.

**COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF SOLAR CONTROL FILM**

This involved establishing reductions in cooling demand and power demand by retrofitting all the windows with the solar control film and conducting the cost-benefit analysis using the cost data from the film dealer.

Combining the benefits such as reductions in cooling capacity, power demand and annual energy consumption of retrofitting the glazing with solar films, with the cost of the film and other economic parameters specified in Table 4, a cost-benefit analysis has been conducted to estimate the payback period of retrofitting the glazing with solar films. The payback period (n) years has been estimated as follows:

$$n = \frac{\text{net capital expenditure}}{\text{Annual cost of saved electricity}} \quad (9)$$

where

Net Capital Expenditure = Cost of the installed film - (Cost of reduced A/C capacity + Cost of reduced power) (10)

and

Annual Cost of Saved Electricity = Annual reduction in electricity consumption

$$\text{(kWh)} \times \text{unit cost of electricity (KD/kWh)} \quad (11)$$

Analysis has been carried out separately for the cost of electrical power and energy for the user and the nation (Table 5). For the nation’s perspective, net initial expenditure of retrofitting the solar film is negative. This means the benefits of capacity reduction and the peak power demand reduction of retrofitting the film exceeds the cost of film. The annual electricity savings is an added advantage. However, for the user perspective, due to the electricity being highly subsidized, retrofitting of the solar film is not very encouraging as it has a payback period of over 40 years, which is significantly more than the film life.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

- Besides enhancing the thermal comfort during the peak summer period, the solar film was found to reduce the peak cooling demand by 6.7% in a residential villa which originally had windows with double clear glasses. The benefit of retrofitting solar film with single glazed windows is going to be significantly higher.
- Retrofitting the windows with solar film reduced the peak power demand of the A/C system by 4.7%. This reduction, similar to the reduction in cooling demand is going to be significantly higher for villas with single glazed windows.
- The financial benefits of the reduced cooling capacity for the A/C systems and its power demand were found to exceed the installed cost of the solar film. The reduction in annual energy consumption 9763.9 kWh/y was an added advantage.

**CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Solar film are easy to install in the existing buildings and need no maintenance.
2. In view of their cost-effectiveness, MEW should promote their large scale application as a technique for national load management,
3. Solar film offers a good solution for buildings which are deficient in cooling capacity and suffer from solar glare.
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Fig 1. Incidental and transmitted global radiation on the east window

Fig 2. Incidental and transmitted global radiation on the west window
Fig. 3. Hourly Incidental and transmitted global radiation on the east window.

Fig. 4. Hourly Incidental and transmitted global radiation on the west window.
Fig. 5. Hourly reduction in cooling and power demand for the villa.

Fig. 6. Monthly irradiation on plane vertical surface facing the cardinal directions (after correction)
### Table 1. Details of the AC System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Make</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Total Capacity (Btu/h) 115° F</th>
<th>Total Power (kW)</th>
<th>Power Rating (kW/RT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basement Floor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Goodman</td>
<td>CKF60-5/A60-2</td>
<td>45,300</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground Floor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>coolex</td>
<td>PNG-076</td>
<td>66,380</td>
<td>16.06</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>coolex</td>
<td>PNG-076</td>
<td>66,380</td>
<td>8.03</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PNG-090</td>
<td>85,890</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Floor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Goodman</td>
<td>CKF60-5/A60-2</td>
<td>45,300</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. The Technical Specifications of Instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the instrument</th>
<th>Measuring variable</th>
<th>Manufacturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Power Analyzer</td>
<td>Total Power consumption of the villa, Individual power consumption of A/C units</td>
<td>HIOKI, Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambient Temperature/ Relative Humidity Datalogger</td>
<td>Ambient Temperature/ Relative Humidity</td>
<td>HOBO (Onset Computers, USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miniature Temperature/ Relative Humidity</td>
<td>Indoor air temperature, Relative Humidity, Light, Supply air temperature, Return air temperature</td>
<td>HOBO (Onset Computers, USA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data logger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyranometers with Data logger</td>
<td>Global radiation inside and outside window</td>
<td>Onset Computers, USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3. Estimation for Monthly Energy Savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Incidental Radiation, kWh/m²/month</th>
<th>Reduction in heat gain, RTh</th>
<th>Average Ambient Temp. during Sunshine hours, Deg C</th>
<th>Power Rating, Kw/RT</th>
<th>Energy Saving, kWh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
<td>West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>1126.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>104.6</td>
<td>1027.4</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>139.0</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>1337.4</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>148.2</td>
<td>121.7</td>
<td>1401.5</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>122.1</td>
<td>108.3</td>
<td>1196.5</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>113.4</td>
<td>1131.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>935.9</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>817.3</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>717.6</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>N A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Total</td>
<td>1199.5</td>
<td>1096.3</td>
<td>9691.9</td>
<td>9763.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Total</td>
<td>967.6</td>
<td>898.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Total</td>
<td>231.9</td>
<td>197.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Parameters for Cost Benefit Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC Capacity installed, RT</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost KD*</td>
<td>8200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KD/RT</td>
<td>317.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of film KD/m²</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area covered, m²</td>
<td>30.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in Cooling Demand, RT</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in peak power demand, kW</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Energy Saving, kWh</td>
<td>9764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost for Power Production and Distribution for MEW, KD/kW</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Cable Connection to the User, kD/kW</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Electricity for user, kD/kWh</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Electricity for MEW without equipment, kD/kWh</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 KD = 3.3 US$
### Table 5. Pay Back Period for the User and the Nation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reductions in Capital Cost of AC System, KD*</td>
<td>540.3</td>
<td>540.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reductions in Power Cost, KD</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reductions in Capital Cost, KD</td>
<td>680.3</td>
<td>1660.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure incurred in film installation, KD</td>
<td>1522</td>
<td>1522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Initial Expenditure, KD</td>
<td>841.7</td>
<td>-138.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Cost of Energy Saved, KD</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>234.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay Back Period, years</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 KD = 3.3 US$