Research Repository UCD

Title	Quantitative evaluation of deep retrofitted social housing using metered gas data
Authors(s)	Beagon, Paul, Boland, Fiona, O'Donnell, James
Publication date	2018-07-01
Publication information	Beagon, Paul, Fiona Boland, and James O'Donnell. "Quantitative Evaluation of Deep Retrofitted Social Housing Using Metered Gas Data" 170 (July 1, 2018).
Publisher	Elsevier
Item record/more information	http://hdl.handle.net/10197/11000
Publisher's statement	<p>This is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in Energy and Buildings. Changes resulting from the publishing process, such as peer review, editing, corrections, structural formatting, and other quality control mechanisms may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in Energy and Buildings (174, (2018))</p> <p>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2018.07.007</p>
Publisher's version (DOI)	10.1016/j.enbuild.2018.04.022

Downloaded 2023-04-07T10:52:29Z

The UCD community has made this article openly available. Please share how this access benefits you. Your story matters! (@ucd_oa)

© Some rights reserved. For more information

Quantitative evaluation of deep retrofitted social housing using metered gas data

Paul Beagon^a, Fiona Boland^b, James O'Donnell^a

^a*School of Mechanical and Materials Engineering and UCD Energy Institute,
University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland*

^b*Royal College of Surgeons in Ireland, Lower Mercer Street, Dublin 2, Ireland*

Abstract

Research into home energy retrofit is important because most existing homes will operate in 2050. A lack of funding or incentives often prevents home energy retrofit, particularly of social housing. This study analysed retrofitted Irish social housing and their gas meter data, including pre-payment meters that require regular “top-ups” purchased from shops. The data comprised records from 100 retrofit and control group homes throughout 2013–2015.

A novel evaluation of retrofitted rented homes processed meter data into multiple metrics. Gas consumption is computed per house and weather correction is incorporated, enabling statistical testing of the retrofit. A “difference in difference” technique compared the retrofit and control groups. Gas consumptions of the most popular building type are plotted as distribution curves before and after retrofit. Subsequently the energy use intensity (kWh/m²/year) is computed per home; leading to calculation of the prebound effect. In social housing, prebound effect quantifies energy underconsumption due to self-rationing.

Retrofit significantly reduced gas consumption, and reduced its variance among homes. A small positive skewness in the statistical distribution of home gas consumption prevented characterisation as a normal distribution. The prebound effect is high, but alleviated by the retrofit. Finally, retrofit extended average pre-payment intervals.

Table 1

Nomenclature used in this paper, prebound and rebound meanings from Galvin and Sunikka-Blank [24].

Symbol, acronym or term	Meaning
β_{dd}	difference in difference
BER	Building Energy Rating
EU	European Union
EPC	Energy Performance Certificate
EUI	energy use intensity [kWh/m ² /year]
$\bar{G}$	mean average gas consumption of homes
HDD	heating degree days
kWh	kilowatt-hours
kWh/m ² /year	kilowatt-hours per square metre per year
P_{act}	Actual prebound effect
P_{pred}	Predicted prebound effect
p-value	The smallest level of significance at which the null hypothesis can be rejected. Lower values indicate results of greater significance.
Prebound effect	A measure of the shortfall in actual energy consumption as a proportion of theoretical, calculated consumption.
Rebound effect	A measure of the proportion of an energy efficiency increase used to increase the level of energy services, rather than decrease the level of energy consumption.
σ	Standard deviation

1. Introduction

Energy use in residential and commercial buildings accounts for 40% of EU total secondary energy consumption and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions [16]. In 2014, the Irish housing sector consumed 23.4% of secondary energy, according to Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland [50]. The proportion of secondary energy allocated to homes is even higher at 30% when pooled over eight European countries [32]. Furthermore, most existing housing will still operate in 2050 [46]. The long lifespan of homes and their considerable proportion of GHG emissions highlight the role of home energy retrofit. Home energy retrofits are not uniform however, varying in depth and evaluation.

Deep retrofits tend to be described rather than defined. Gupta et al. [27] characterise deep retrofit as multiple measures; fabric, ventilation, heating, lighting and micro-generation that improve energy performance by 65–95%. Filippidou et al. [21] identify deep retrofit in Dutch social housing as a combination of measures, adoption of innovative heat pumps or μ CHP and improvement to the entire building fabric. Improving the entire building fabric provides a consistent building envelope. [21] conclude that common “maintenance measures” of improved boiler efficiency or replacement glazing will not achieve Dutch energy

45 performance targets. One or two maintenance measures constitute “shallow”
46 retrofit.

47 Scaling up deep building retrofit is recommended internationally [15, 38, 37].
48 Large-scale shallow retrofit predominates in Dutch social housing, however, Fil-
49 ippidou et al. [21] recommend deep retrofit. Gupta et al. [26] propose community
50 led retrofit; possibly combined with an area-based approach supported by local
51 government [15]. Fylan et al. [22] report that local councils or housing asso-
52 ciations could maximise retrofit return by scaling up to “area-by-area” while
53 simultaneously treating each dwelling as a whole-house.

54 The Irish energy agency (SEAI) has launched a domestic retrofit programme,
55 and one of the main aims is “development toward large-scale deployment” [51].
56 Scaling from building to city levels suffers from a research gap [2]. Koch et al.
57 [33] argue for *neighbourhood* retrofit. Differentiating a *district* as an administra-
58 tive boundary, the neighbourhood defines a group of buildings both spatially and
59 socially. Galster [23] describes neighbourhoods as bundling attributes including
60 structural characteristics of buildings and infrastructure. A shared infrastruc-
61 ture and similar building structure facilitate the delivery of home energy retrofit
62 at neighbourhood level.

63 Similarity of building structure includes similarity in thermal envelope. This
64 assumption underpins neighbourhood retrofit proposals by Koch et al. [33].
65 Their proposals predict that a standard building type exemplifies the average
66 energy use in a neighbourhood of similar homes. They conclude that the en-
67 ergy use of a neighbourhood’s homes is expressed as a statistical distribution
68 around a calculated average of a specific building type. Existing research al-
69 ready identifies the building types influencing energy demand. In their review of
70 building stock retrofit in Germany, McKenna et al. [38] forecast that single fam-
71 ily houses will account for approximately two thirds of heat demand until 2050.
72 Single family homes dominate heat demand due to their large average area and
73 higher specific heat demand. Having identified a building type, its associated
74 statistical distribution of heat demand would increase prediction accuracy at
75 neighbourhood scale compared to individual homes.

76 A literature review finds a dearth of empirical plots that illustrate heat
77 demand variation by homes in the same neighbourhood. One exception is an
78 analysis of 41 German houses; providing distribution plots to illustrate energy
79 demand variation among a neighbourhood of passive houses [20].

80 Social housing facilitates large-scale retrofit, due to a single owner and fre-
81 quent energy underperformance. The retrofits potentially support social policies
82 by reducing hardship upon low income dwellers. Furthermore, social homes are
83 less likely to be retrofitted by dwellers when compared to owner occupied homes.
84 A drawback is the prebound effect where energy savings are not achieved due to
85 underheating before retrofit [54]. More recently, Galvin and Sunikka-Blank [24]
86 find that a prebound effect combined with low income indicates fuel poverty.
87 They recommend further research to understand the motivations and practices
88 of affected households. A study of social housing in a tower block estimated
89 40% prebound effect [55]. The study concluded that typical energy modelling is
90 unrepresentative of social housing and retrofit of social housing may not achieve

CO₂ reduction targets. On the other hand, retrofit makes social impacts in thermal comfort, occupant well-being and health.

The overarching aim of this work is to quantitatively evaluate the effectiveness of large-scale retrofit when applied to rented social housing. The novelty herein derives from: i) the retrofit of rented homes as opposed to self-selecting households; ii) customised processing of empirical metered data to produce multiple quantitative metrics and iii) comparison of the treatment group to itself in a prior year and a concurrent control group.

Instead of focusing on individual buildings, individual households or individual retrofit measures this study uses a set of interlinked criteria to capture the effects of scaled retrofit. These criteria measure energy effects to the owner, utility provider and importantly the dwellers. This is achieved through interlinked objectives. First, quantify annual gas consumption by every house, and test the differences after retrofit for statistical significance. Second, select the most popular type of home and plot their distribution of gas consumption before and after retrofit. The plot tests for a statistical distribution function of gas energy demand by buildings of the same type, as proposed by Koch et al. [33]. Third, quantify the prebound effect across all houses based on metered gas consumption. The fourth objective focuses on the homes that pre-pay their supplier for networked gas. Pre-pay meters reduce risk and transaction costs to suppliers, but increase transaction costs upon households [43, 56]. This last objective measures the intervals between gas pre-payments, before and after retrofit.

This quantitative study develops as follows; the background in Section 2 expands on the motivation and evaluation of home energy retrofit, followed by a methodology in Section 3 of quantitative techniques. Subsequently, the calculated results are presented in Section 4, completed by conclusions, limitations and further work in Section 5.

2. Background

In this study the social housing landlord retrofitted homes to improve comfort and lower energy bills [44]. At the scale of national building stock, retrofit motivation stems from the low rate of annual building renovation; 1-1.5% in Denmark [37], “only” 1% in Britain [28] and in Germany 1% but targeting 2%. McKenna et al. [38] consider the German target rate of 2% rate as ambitious and define renovation rate as the fraction of total living area renovated per year, including supply and demand side measures. Most current buildings will remain in 2050 [46]. Haines and Mitchell [28] estimate that 75% of British dwellings will exist in 2050.

The need for household energy retrofit is more acute in Ireland. According to EPA [18] assessment: “the average Irish household uses just under 50 kWh daily, comprising 13 kWh electricity”. By this metric, Irish homes are the second worst performing in Europe, after Finland. SEAI [46] discusses the energy underperformance of Irish homes in its Residential Roadmap to 2050.

134 This report outlines scenarios to reduce the 2010 average household energy
 135 consumption of 22,500 kWh/year by 60–65% by 2050.

136 Years later, CRU [11] estimates a lower average energy use by Irish homes at
 137 15,200 kWh/year; split into 11,000 kWh/year gas and 4,200 kWh/year electric-
 138 ity. Nevertheless, the Residential Roadmap assumes the realisation of energy
 139 savings by at least one million home retrofits.

140 Ma et al. [35] address the difficulty in realising retrofit energy savings with
 141 a detailed retrofit methodology. They identify five key phases in a complete
 142 retrofit programme (Fig. 1). The study presented in this paper executes phase
 143 five: “validation and verification”.

Fig. 1. Key phases of building retrofit, completed by validation and verification [35].

144 Various metrics exist to evaluate building retrofits. Gupta et al. [27] rec-
 145 commend absolute metrics of energy consumption or GHG emissions. Metrics
 146 of one-off reductions in energy or GHG emissions ignore long-term building op-
 147 eration. For example, a New Zealand community intervention to retrofit home
 148 insulation results in 13% reduction in metered energy compared to the control
 149 group [30].

150 One mandatory building certification is relevant to this study, due to its
 151 application by European law. Energy Performance Certificates (EPCs) exist due
 152 to the Directive on Energy Performance of Buildings by the European Union.
 153 Their purpose is a market tool; creating demand for energy efficiency in buildings
 154 [3]. Home EPCs such as the Irish Building Energy Rating (BER) are calculated
 155 from modelled, not metered data as discussed in Section 2.1.

156 2.1. BER: energy performance certification of residential buildings

157 SEAI [52] have administered the Building Energy Rating (BER) of Irish
 158 homes since 2007. A BER certification estimates the primary energy for home
 159 energy services: heating, lighting, pumps and fans. This certificate excludes
 160 appliances such as cookers, fridges and washing machines. Being a metric of
 161 primary energy, BER comprises all “source” energy including production and
 162 distribution losses. The energy consumption during a year is divided by home
 163 floorspace, expressing a result in kWh/m²/year. The same building performance
 164 metric appears internationally. The United States Energy Star [17] programme
 165 terms it “energy use intensity” (EUI). An identical mathematical division by

166 floorspace produces the other BER metric of CO₂ emissions. The two BER
 167 metrics are:

- 168 • Primary energy value: kWh/m²/year
- 169 • CO₂ emissions indicator: kgCO₂/m²/year

170 BER certificates are modelled estimates of home energy performance in
 171 terms of primary energy EUI. The certification comprises 15 discrete bands
 172 where lower EUI indicates superior home energy performance. Bands ranges
 173 from low energy intensity A1, through to high energy intensity G (Fig. 2).

Fig. 2. Discrete BER bands of primary energy use intensity [7].

174 The average BER certification is band D of 225–300 kWh/m²/year [46].
 175 Dennehy et al. [13] report a lower average home consumption calculated from
 176 energy balances; equating to BER band 150–175 kWh/m²/year.

177 BER certifications calculate primary energy by converting a model of sec-
 178 ondary energy use. This model, called Dwelling Energy Assessment Procedure
 179 (DEAP), executes energy conversions by primary energy factors. The primary
 180 energy factor for gas is 1.1, and the 2017 revision for electricity is 2.08 [49].

181 The assumptions inherent in DEAP are based on building age, standard
 182 occupancy and minimum thermal comfort levels. Further drawbacks exist in
 183 BER’s intended purpose as market information. An analysis of BER ratings
 184 from the SEAI Better Energy Homes scheme reveal bunched ratings post-retrofit
 185 [9]. The discrete nature of BER bands provides a perverse incentive known as
 186 the threshold effect. “Threshold effects refer to the use of minimum performance
 187 standards which incentivise improved performance for those below the threshold
 188 but lead to stagnation of those above the threshold”.

189 2.2. Reduced energy savings due to prebound effect

190 The underconsumption of building energy compared to its rated energy per-
 191 formance quantifies the prebound effect. This prebound effect is often caused

by occupant self-rationing of energy and increases in homes of inferior energy ratings - the type of homes more likely to be rented. O’Sullivan et al. [42] find that pre-pay metering increases information feedback to consumers, accompanied by risks of self-disconnection and heat self-rationing. They quote examples of self-rationing as prioritising other energy services (such as refrigeration and lighting) instead of heating. The prebound effect is the reverse of the well known “rebound”, the reduction in predicted energy efficiency gains due to increased user demand.

Sorrell et al. [53] exemplify the rebound effect by “temperature take back” in buildings after energy retrofit. Temperature take back occurs where occupants prefer a warmer internal temperature instead of maximum energy and financial savings. Hamilton et al. [29] refer to the reduction in potential energy savings as “comfort taking”. The evidence from their research is that lower income households are less likely to realise energy savings compared to higher-income households.

This study computes both energy savings and the prebound effect from metered gas data of rented homes. The results presented in this paper compare the actual prebound effect to predictions defined in Section 3.4, originating from Loga et al. [34].

3. Methodology

This study analyses the gas meter data of rented social housing owned by Respond! Housing Association, hereinafter “Respond!”. The purpose is to evaluate home energy retrofits completed in 2014 after Respond! received funding from the SEAI Better Energy Communities scheme [48]. The meter data extends across three calendar years 2013–2015 (Fig. 3).

Respond! selected the retrofit homes. Unlike many home retrofits the households are neither self-selecting nor constrained by household funding. Twenty-four housing estates in over a dozen towns and cities across the Irish Republic benefited from the retrofit programme [44]. The total of 100 gas metered households that permitted access to gas meter data are located in seven housing estates. This total of 100 homes splits evenly into 50 retrofitted group and 50 control group.

Fig. 3. Retrofit programme timeline. Data collected throughout the calendar years before and after retrofit year 2014 [10].

224 Data access requests were made during household surveys, permitting this
 225 study to access gas meter data from the beginning of 2013 to year end 2015.
 226 The household surveys are not considered in this study. Analysis of the house-
 227 hold surveys appears in an ESRI working paper [10]. The available data enables
 228 statistical tests of the differences in per home gas consumption by data process-
 229 ing (Fig. 4). Post-retrofit gas consumption during 2015 is weather corrected for
 230 comparison to 2013 pre-retrofit gas consumption (Section 3.5).

Fig. 4. Overall method of data cleaning, allocation, shaping and results calculation.

3.1. Retrofit Measures

Deep home retrofit delivers a combination of retrofit measures. Six individual measures to upgrade homes of this study are:

- Gas boiler upgrade
- Heat boiler replacement by gas boiler
- Heating controls
- Lighting replacement
- Window and door replacement
- Cavity wall insulation

The first three measures improve the heat generation and its control, while the last two measures improve the building fabric. A “Heat boiler” replaces a back boiler located behind a fire with a new gas boiler. Compact fluorescent lighting (CFL) replaces the existing lighting. Other measures from the retrofit programme are absent from the studied homes: attic insulation and external wall insulation. Data cleaning removes houses below the aforementioned gas consumption threshold and reduces the studied retrofits to 49. Their retrofits are delivered in four combinations of measures (Table 2).

Table 2

Six retrofit measures in a total of four combinations, all include fabric upgrades to windows, doors and walls.

Gas boiler	Heat boiler	Heating controls	CFL lights	Windows and doors	Cavity wall	Total homes
-	✓	-	✓	✓	✓	21
✓	-	-	✓	✓	✓	16
✓	-	✓	✓	✓	✓	11
-	-	-	✓	✓	✓	1

3.2. Processing meter data

Due to the timing of waiver signatures, the quantity of available gas meter data differs across the three years. Imported data from the available meters enters a process beginning with data cleaning. The clean data step ensures valid comparisons of gas consumptions by selecting meters that supply the primary heat energy fuel to the home (Fig. 4). In order to be considered a home’s main source of heat energy, the gas meters consume a minimum threshold of 1,500 kWh during 2013. The threshold is 10% of reported non-electric energy per home in 2011 [13]. The clean data step outputs a list of meters that supply the main heat energy during years 2013–2015.

Metered gas consumptions are allocated, shaped and input to calculations of energy use intensity and prebound effect. Automation of the data processing

is performed by R statistical software and its “lubridate” library developed by Golemund and Wickham [25].

The “Allocate” consumption step apportions a consumption to its year of recording and an adjoining year where applicable. Most gas consumption records are apportioned completely to the year recorded, except those closest to adjoining years. This step outputs gas energy allocations in kWh to year of recording, the previous year and the following or “latter” year using defined equations (Appendix A.1).

The “Shape consumption” step sums the gas allocations into the three calendar years 2013, 2014 and 2015, using defined equations (Appendix A.2). Meters failing the aforementioned minimum consumption threshold are removed. This step outputs total gas consumption per home, per calendar year in kWh/year. After weather correction, the yearly gas consumption by each home during 2013 and 2015 are compared. Boxplots display the pattern of gas consumption by the retrofit and control groups pre-retrofit 2013 and post-retrofit 2015. Barplots illustrate the yearly gas consumption differences between the same homes during the same years.

3.3. Statistical tests on gas consumption results

A paired t-test was used to test the hypothesis of reduced home gas consumption after retrofit. The t-test is “paired” because it compares the 2013 and 2015 consumption paired by each home. The Engineering Statistics Handbook describes how a t-test determines if two population means are equal [40]. If the measured means of gas consumption before and after retrofit are different with statistical significance, the retrofit most likely reduced gas consumption. As mentioned in Table 1, a lower p-value corresponds to more significant hypothesis result. The p-value is the probability of observing the difference in means in a retrofit sample, without a difference in means existing in a population of all retrofitted homes. In other words, it is the probability that the null hypothesis is true. A null hypothesis states that the retrofit had no impact on the mean gas consumption.

This statistical test was applied to the gas consumption results grouped by retrofit and control; then the sub-categories of post-pay and pre-pay meter types. Note that the control group comprises similar homes owned by Respond! during the same years 2013–2015.

Another technique that directly compares results between the retrofit and control groups, is “difference in difference”. Difference in difference incorporates other factors impacting gas consumption by directly comparing the retrofit group to a concurrent control group. Potential factors are extreme weather events or pricing; the latter is discussed in results (Section 4.1).

Both the retrofit and control groups have two averages of 2013 and 2015 home gas consumption ($\bar{G}_{2013}$, $\bar{G}_{2015}$). Difference in difference technique computes four averages in total. Therefore each group has their own change in averages between 2013 to 2015. The parameter β_{dd} is the difference between the each group’s change in averages from 2013 to 2015 (Eq. 1). Adan and Fuerst [1] and

304 Scheer et al. [45] employ the difference in difference technique and interpret its
 305 result as the reduction due to retrofit.

$$\beta_{dd} = (\bar{G}_{2013} - \bar{G}_{2015})_{retrofit} - (\bar{G}_{2013} - \bar{G}_{2015})_{control} \quad [kWh/year] \quad (1)$$

306 The most common building type in the retrofit group is a semi-detached,
 307 two storey, single family home. Statistical distributions of gas consumption are
 308 plotted for these similar buildings to allow comparison. These distributions are
 309 the only plots based on the single most popular home type. All other plots
 310 include the remaining home types. The reduction in average gas consumption
 311 and its variance between 2013 and 2015 are computed.

3.4. Calculation of prebound effect and pre-payment intervals

313 The final step calculates two result: the prebound effect and pre-payment
 314 intervals. The prebound effect described in Section 2.2, is a proportion of the
 315 BER. As mentioned in Section 2.1, the BER is a metric of primary energy.

316 Metered domestic gas consumed is secondary or “site” energy. The con-
 317 version from secondary to primary energy relies on parameters in the DEAP
 318 procedure. The procedure includes lights, pumps and a gas primary energy fac-
 319 tor of 1.1. DEAP variables complete the home EUI calculation of Eq. 2: lighting
 320 9.3 kWh/m²/year, central heating pump 130 kWh/year and gas boiler flue fan
 321 45 kWh/year [47].

$$EUI = 9.3 + \frac{(gas\ energy \times 1.1) + 130 + 45}{floor\ area} \quad [kWh/m^2/year] \quad (2)$$

322 The actual prebound effect (P_{act}), found with Eq. 3, is a function of the EUI
 323 and the BER. As a dimensionless proportion it may be expressed in %.

$$P_{act} = 100 \times \left(1 - \frac{EUI}{BER} \right) \quad [\%] \quad (3)$$

324 The BER determines a predicted prebound (P_{pred}) using Eq. 4 developed
 325 by Sunikka-Blank and Galvin [54] from a model based on German homes by
 326 Loga et al. [34]. This study presented here quantifies the BER variable as
 327 the lower threshold of the BER band; for example a B1 band converts to a
 328 75 kWh/m²/year (Fig. 2). Selection of a lower BER moderates the prebound
 329 results.

$$P_{pred} = 100 \times \left(1.2 - \frac{1.3}{(1 + \frac{BER}{500})} \right) \quad [\%] \quad (4)$$

330 Finally, one indicator of transaction costs due to pre-pay meters is the pre-
 331 payment intervals. The subset of pre-pay meters in retrofitted homes is identified
 332 for years 2013 and 2015. The pre-payment intervals amongst the retrofit group
 333 are converted into days by R statistical software and categorised.

334 3.5. Weather correction and comparison of gas consumption

335 Although outside temperature differences are implicit when comparing retrofit
 336 and control groups, it is good practice to quantify weather differences by heating
 337 degree days (HDD). The Chartered Institution of Building Services Engineers
 338 describe HDD degree days as a tool to analyse weather related energy consump-
 339 tion in buildings [8].

340 Degree days quantify the difference between the outdoor temperature and a
 341 reference temperature over a specified period. CIBSE recommends daily sum-
 342 mation of positive hourly temperature differences from a 15.5°C base tempera-
 343 ture. Dividing the summation by 24, converts the hourly degree difference into
 344 degree days. This study inputs hourly temperature data from Met Éireann, into
 345 a standard weather correction defined in Eq. 5 [36].

$$\text{Weather correction factor (post-retrofit)} = \frac{\sum (HDD \text{ pre-retrofit})}{\sum (HDD \text{ post-retrofit})} \quad (5)$$

346 After weather correction, the 2015 gas consumption per home is compared to
 347 2013. The first test compares the differences in gas consumption, per individual
 348 home, before and after retrofit. This paired t-test, treats the 2013 and 2015 gas
 349 consumption of each home as an individual pair. As mentioned, the number of
 350 retrofitted homes with available metered data increases during 2015. The larger
 351 set of 2015 gas consumptions cannot all be paired with 2013 gas consumptions,
 352 but are plotted as a statistical distribution (Section 4.4).

353 4. Results and discussion

354 The timing of data waivers reduced the meter data during 2013. Data clean-
 355 ing subsequently removed eight homes that fail the minimum gas consumption
 356 threshold, as discussed in Section 3.2. Seven homes fail the threshold during
 357 2013, as does one home during 2015.

358 As a result, the study analysed 20 retrofit group and 25 control group meters
 359 that provide paired meter data throughout 2013–2015. The number of retrofit
 360 group meters increases to 49 by 2015, the final year of the study. The retrofit
 361 20 meters from 2013 are a subset of the 49 meters available in 2015 (Table 3).

Table 3
Gas meters with available data after data cleaning.

Year	Retrofit	Control	Total
2013	20	25	45
2015	49	37	88

362 A few of the same meters indicated fuel switching after retrofit. During 2013–
 363 2015, eight gas meters exchanged from post-pay to pre-pay. No meters reverse
 364 exchanged from pre-pay to post-pay. Pre-payments constitute the majority of

meter records due to their shorter intervals (Section 4.6). This study measures pre-payment intervals between non-zero payments, excluding the 8% of zero value pre-payments.

The weather correction factor is applied to comparisons of gas consumption between 2013 and 2015 (Section 3.5). Gas consumption in 2015 is scaled up due to the slightly warmer outdoor air temperature during that year. Heating degree days reduced from 2000 during 2013 to 1937 during 2015; causing a weather correction factor of 1.03 (Eq.5). Having secured a cleaned list of meters and the weather correction factor, the following four objectives are calculated:

1. Quantify and test for differences in annual gas consumption per home
2. Plot the density of gas consumption by semi-detached home type
3. Quantify the prebound effect
4. Illustrate the measured intervals between pre-payments

Household sizes range from one to eight but a majority are of two or three persons. Household composition and occupant behaviour are, however, not analysed separately. One reason is the small sample sizes of most household types. Another reason is that household variables have limited accuracy in identifying homes with cold indoor temperature [31], unless extended to a persona-based approach [28].

In this study, household and other user variables manifest in the variation of the distribution density of gas consumption (Fig. 8). This variation reduces after retrofit, illustrating a reduced influence of user-specific variables.

4.1. Yearly gas consumption per home

The annual gas consumption of all homes during 2013 and 2015 was computed and weather corrected. The results, including outliers, are split into boxplots and are all used in this study's analysis. Fig. 5a summarises the gas consumption of the retrofit group in 2013 and 2015. Between the two years, the retrofit group medians reduced from 10,011 to 6,271 kWh; while standard deviations (σ) reduced from 3,952 to 2,678 kWh. Fig. 5b summarises the control group gas consumption over the same two years. The control group reduces its median gas consumption from 8,078 to 5,696 kWh and σ from 3,243 to 3,955 kWh.

Fig. 5. Gas consumption by group during 2013 and 2015 (weather corrected)

Annual gas consumption is dis-aggregated to illustrate yearly gas consumption per anonymous home (Fig. 6, Fig. 7). Of the 20 retrofitted homes, 16 (80%) reduced gas consumption during the post-retrofit year 2015. Of the four increases in gas consumption after retrofit, the three largest are reported by the minority pre-pay meter type (Fig. 6; indices 14, 18 and 20), index 11 refers to a post-pay meter. Hence, these three pre-pay meters indicate possible self-rationing during 2013 and high post-retrofit rebound effect. Fuel switching may also be a factor. Three post-pay meters report large system overestimates during the post-retrofit heating season (Fig. 6; indices 4, 17, 19). Such overestimates add independent evidence of reduced gas consumption.

Fig. 6. Retrofit group gas consumption: 2013 and 2015 (weather corrected).

Fig. 7. Control group gas consumption: 2013 and 2015 (weather corrected).

Turning to the control group, its annual gas consumption during 2013 and 2015 appears in Fig. 7. Of the 25 homes, a majority of 21 (84%) reduced gas consumption between 2013 and 2015. Two of the four meters that increase gas consumption are pre-pay (Fig. 7; indices 21 and 24). Similar to the retrofit group, these two control group pre-pay meters indicate self-rationing during 2013.

Note that two control group meters exchanged from post-pay to pre-pay after the 2012–2013 heating season (Fig. 7; indices 5 and 6). They report the largest and third largest absolute reductions in gas consumption. The change to pre-pay metering may have contributed to their reductions.

According to Ireland’s CSO, residential consumption of networked gas was 6.7% higher in 2013 than 2015; 7,752 GWh and 7,262 GWh respectively [12]. Hence, a reduction in gas consumption by the control group is expected between the same years. Since the aforementioned weather correction provides insufficient scaling up of 2015 gas consumption, gas price is the likely alternative cause. During 2013 annual gas prices were 3% lower at €0.0653/kWh compared to €0.0673/kWh during 2015 [19]. Moreover the lowest residential consumption of networked gas between 2011–2016 occurred in 2014, coinciding with peak annual prices to households of €0.0681/kWh. These summary comparisons evince a negative correlation of annual residential gas consumption with annual gas price, potentially explaining the differences in gas consumption after weather correction (Fig. 7).

4.2. Tests for differences in mean gas consumption per home

The difference in mean gas consumption between 2013 and 2015 were investigated using the paired t-test (Section 3.3). The retrofit and control groups

432 were tested for difference in mean consumption between 2013 and 2015, followed
 433 by their sub-categorises of pre-pay and post-pay meter types (Table 4).

434 Considering the available retrofit group (n=20), their difference between
 435 mean gas consumption of 2013 and 2015 is 2,512 kWh with p-value=0.004. The
 436 low p-value equates to a highly significant t-test result, despite dweller “comfort
 437 taking” of energy savings (Section 2.2).

438 Turning to the control group, its mean difference between 2013 to 2015 is
 439 1,235 kWh, less than half that of the retrofit group. Control group p-value=0.045
 440 or 4.5%; less significant than the retrofit group. Nevertheless, a significance un-
 441 der 5% indicates a difference within the control group between 2013 and 2015
 442 gas consumption caused by factors other than retrofit, for example pricing (Sec-
 443 tion 4.1).

444 Reviewing p-values in Table 4, the most significant differences appear in
 445 the post-pay metered homes. A contributory reason for the difference is the
 446 larger average floorspace of post-pay metered homes. Other reasons linked to
 447 the meters themselves may be higher self-rationing by pre-pay households dur-
 448 ing 2013, coupled with higher metering accuracy due to shorter pre-payment
 449 intervals. Post-pay meter records recur every 63 days, but weekly pre-payment
 450 intervals are the most common (Section 4.6).

Table 4

Paired t-test of the same meters yearly gas consumption during 2013 and 2015 (weather corrected).

Group	Meter type	Pair size (n)	Mean differences 2013–2015 (kWh)	p-value*
retrofit	all	20	2512	0.004
retrofit	post-pay	9	3709	0.006
retrofit	pre-pay	11	1532	0.185
control	all	25	1235	0.045
control	post-pay	17	1376	0.026
control	pre-pay	8	934	0.541

*Statistical significance of difference in mean gas consumption from 0 kWh.

451 4.3. Difference in difference and cost saving estimates

The difference in difference (β_{dd}) is calculated by substituting mean differ-
 ence values from Table 4 into Eq. 6. As mentioned in Section 3.2 it is interpreted
 as the reduction in gas consumption due to retrofit.

$$\beta_{dd} = (\bar{G}_{2013} - \bar{G}_{2015})_{retrofit} - (\bar{G}_{2013} - \bar{G}_{2015})_{control} \quad (6)$$

$$\beta_{dd} = 2512 - 1235 = 1277 \quad [kWh] \quad (7)$$

452 The mean difference in gas consumption by 20 retrofitted homes between
 453 2013 and 2015 is 2,512 kWh. Without a control group the 2,512 kWh average
 454 difference appears large; equating to over 27% of the 2013 mean consumption

9,253 kWh. The 25 control group homes, owned by Respond! in Ireland, provided a reference to the retrofit group. Control group homes simultaneously reduced mean gas consumption by 1,235 kWh, almost half of the retrofit group mean reduction. Such a high ratio of control to retrofit reductions was unexpected after the application of weather correction to 2015 metered data (Section 3.5).

The difference in difference test resulted in a p-value of 9.7%. Thereby, the null hypothesis of no difference between the retrofit group differences and the control group differences is rejected at 10% significance, but not at 5% significance. Given the relatively small sample size, further analysis should be conducted. Finally, the mean difference between the retrofit and control groups is 1,277 kWh (95% confidence interval: -675 to 3,228). This mean difference of 1,277 kWh represents 13.8% of the retrofitted homes 2013 mean of 9,253 kWh.

A typical cost saving per home is estimated from the difference in difference of gas consumption at 1,277 kWh and representative tariff €0.06/kWh [4]. In the context of the social costs of cold homes, the energy saving converts to €77.62 or 13% of the €585 yearly Fuel Allowance provided by Government [14]. The largest home gas saving of 8,676 kWh due to retrofit converts to €521, still below the €585 allowance. Cost savings from reduced gas consumption will not offset the Fuel Allowance, partially due to the relatively low cost of utility supplied gas.

4.4. *Distribution of gas consumption by semi-detached home type*

As mentioned, Koch et al. [33] propose expression of neighbourhood energy use as a statistical “distribution function around a mean value”. The mean value corresponds to “a specific calculation of a building type”. In this study one building type predominates. The semi-detached, two storey building type accounts for 42 of the available 49 retrofitted homes; complemented by three apartments, three bungalows and a single terraced house.

Three distributions of metered gas consumption are superimposed for comparison (Fig. 8). The distribution comparisons are plotted using smoothing methods in R [5]. Smoothing parameters are selected as “asymptotically optimal for the normal distribution” and rely on kernel techniques [6]. Each distribution represents a sample density of structurally similar semi-detached houses. The two n=16 plots are the same homes before and after retrofit, years 2013 and 2015 respectively. The n=42 plot is a superset, containing the 16 homes of the other two plots after retrofit.

Fig. 8. Distribution of 2013 and 2015 (weather corrected) gas consumption by semi-detached houses.

491 The solid irregular grey line distributes the gas consumption of 16 semi-
 492 detached homes during 2013 before retrofit (Fig. 8). The 16 consumption values
 493 are a subset of the 20 values available for all retrofit homes (Fig. 6). Subset
 494 mean is 10,137 kWh/year, peaking at 17,760 kWh/year during 2013. As a
 495 result, this asymmetric distribution plateaus around 18,000 kWh/year and with
 496 high variance ($\sigma=3,678$).

497 After retrofit, a solid black line distributes the same 16 homes with improved
 498 symmetry and reduced variance ($\sigma=2,688$). Finally, the broken line of 42 retrofit
 499 homes during 2015 includes the previous 16 homes and further enhances the
 500 post-retrofit distribution (Fig. 8). The increased set of 42 semi-detached homes
 501 reduces the mean from 7,105 (n=16) to 6,718 kWh/year (n=42), but increases
 502 variance ($\sigma=3,019$). As expected, the n=42 distribution converges its mean and
 503 median, 6,718 kWh/year and 6,232 kWh/year respectively.

504 Taking the 2013 mean gas consumption of 10,137 kWh/year, the same 16
 505 houses reduce that mean by 30%. When compared to the larger set of 42
 506 retrofitted homes, the reduction in mean gas consumption increases to 34%. The
 507 percentage reductions in mean gas consumption exceeds that of the distribution
 508 variance. The 2013 standard deviation of 3,678 kWh/year reduces by only 18%
 509 to 3,019 kWh/year during 2015 (n=42).

510 The positive skewness of both 2015 statistical distributions prevent clas-
 511 sification as a symmetric normal distribution. From the distribution curves,
 512 it can be seen that high gas consumers persist after retrofit. The n=16 2015

consumption peak of 13,188 kWh/year is followed by 10,685 kWh/year. The n=42 consumption adds one higher value of 13,915 kWh/year, forming five values above 11,000 kWh/year. This cluster of values exceeding 11,000 kWh/year disrupts the smooth distribution curve, but are not boxplot outliers (Fig. 5a).

Considering the other extreme, the 2015 (n=42) consumption contains two values near the minimum threshold of primary heat fuel - 1,500 kWh/year (Section 3.2). The smoothed distribution extrapolates these low values to a sample density greater than 0.00001 for homes consuming no gas at all. Such a high sample density at low gas consumption levels is an exaggeration due to plot smoothing. Practical occurrences would be due to combinations of non-occupancy, alternative primary heat fuel and self-rationing (Section 4.5).

4.5. Prebound effect

The prebound effect is described and its formulae defined in Sections 2.2 and 3.4. The actual prebound effect (P_{act}) mostly exceeds that predicted by a German model (P_{pred}), across both retrofit and control groups (Figs. 9 & 10).

Amongst the retrofit group, the 2013 P_{act} mean is 42.5% (n=19). During 2013, only two retrofit group homes overconsume energy compared to their BER certification, producing negative 2013 P_{act} points (Fig. 9). During 2015, four retrofitted homes display negative P_{act} . Prebound measures the unused proportion of the modelled energy certification, thus negative prebound identify energy use exceeding the same energy certification. High prebound values indicate that dweller comfort would benefit from the planned home retrofit.

Retrofit alleviates the prebound effect as expected; reducing the 2015 P_{act} mean to 36.6% (n=36). Overall prebound reduction after retrofit is illustrated by curves fitted to 2013 and 2015 prebound values (Fig. 9; 2013 P_{act} , 2015 P_{act}). The fitted curves are computed by a non-linear least squares function, and extend over different BER bands due to retrofit upgrades.

Fig. 9. Retrofit group prebound effect 2013 and 2015, reduced by retrofit but consistently above predictions for German homes [34].

Turning to the control group, the 2013 P_{act} mean of 44.1% ($n=25$) marginally exceeds the 42.5% mean of the retrofit group during the same year. One cause may be the superior average BER compared to the retrofit group. Control group P_{act} values increase slightly in 2015 to a mean of 49.7%, as illustrated by the fitted curves (Fig. 10). Likely causes of increased prebound during 2015 are the aforementioned lower degree days and higher gas tariffs. Reviewing both the retrofit and control plots, the P_{act} fitted curves increase with band of BER certification as expected.

Fig. 10. Control group prebound effect 2013 and 2015, increasing in 2015 and consistently above prediction for German homes [34].

After conversion of the dimensionless prebound effect to EUI ($\text{kWh/m}^2/\text{year}$), the 2013 retrofit group ($n=19$) displays greater absolute prebound than the 2013 control group ($n=25$). Where prebound is expressed in EUI, the 2013 retrofit group mean of $110 \text{ kWh/m}^2/\text{year}$ exceeds the $88 \text{ kWh/m}^2/\text{year}$ of the control group. The 2015 retrofit group reduces its mean absolute prebound to $58 \text{ kWh/m}^2/\text{year}$ ($n=36$), substantially under the 2015 control group mean of $98 \text{ kWh/m}^2/\text{year}$ ($n=23$). In summary, retrofit alleviates the prebound effect to below that of the control group when expressed in EUI and proportion (%).

4.6. Prepay meter payment intervals

Pre-payment intervals demonstrate patterns of consumer transactions and potentially their budgeting. O'Sullivan et al. [41] define interval categories but rely on self-reported results at household scale. This study adopts the same interval categories; but measures empirical results of each non-zero pre-payment.

To allow comparison, available meters must operate as pre-pay throughout 2013–2015. This constraint reduces the group sizes to 10 retrofit and 6 control meters. During 2013, control group average fewer pre-payments; approximately 30 per meter but of greater average energy ($>200 \text{ kWh}$). In contrast, the retrofit group average 44 repayments per meter of smaller average energy (150 kWh). In 2015, average pre-payments per year by the retrofit group reduce by 13%

567 to 38 per meter. The quantity of control group pre-payments remains steady
 568 (Fig. 11).

Fig. 11. Pre-payment intervals of a the same retrofit and control groups during 2013 and 2015. The retrofit group shifts a proportion of payments occurring every few days to weekly.

569 The number of pre-payments occurring every few days by the retrofit meters
 570 reduces by 37% from 153 to 97 (Fig. 11). Simultaneously, the weekly interval
 571 increases its proportion of retrofit meter pre-payments to almost half at 47.7%.

572 Control group pre-payments in the same interval category remain steady at
 573 35 and 33. The 2015 control group resembles the proportion of pre-payments
 574 in O’Sullivan et al. [41]: 18% every few days, 52% weekly, 22% fortnightly, 6%
 575 monthly and 2% less than once monthly.

576 The data indicates that retrofit increases the interval between pre-payments,
 577 mainly those payments previously occurring every few days. A by-product of
 578 home retrofit for pre-payment households appears to be reduced transactions
 579 and inconvenience upon dwellers.

580 5. Conclusions and future work

581 Analysis of the available meter data illustrates that deep retrofit has the
 582 potential to significantly reduce gas consumption by social housing in Ireland.
 583 The deep retrofits, selected by the social housing owner, upgrade homes tradi-
 584 tionally prone to the rebound effect. This study finds a 13.8% mean reduction
 585 in gas consumption by the difference in difference technique. By this metric,
 586 the study concurs with 13.3% reduction in Britain [1] and 13% in New Zealand
 587 [30]. As expected, this study finding of 13.8% gas reduction is below the 21%
 588 average reduction by 444 self-selected households analysed by Scheer et al. [45].

589 This study of social housing also contrasts with those higher income, self-
 590 selected, households in operation after retrofit. The mean gas consumption by

591 42 semi-detached social housing after retrofit is 6,718 kWh/year (Section 4.4).
592 Irish self-selected homes more than double the social housing mean gas con-
593 sumption with a mean of 14,124 kWh/year persisting after their retrofit [45]. In
594 environmental terms, the associated GHG reductions are far short of the 80%
595 targeted by a British retrofit programme [27].

596 Differences in the weather corrected gas consumption between 2013 and 2015
597 were seen in both the retrofit and control groups, but the mean differences were
598 higher in the retrofit group. The deep retrofits of home fabric, gas boilers and
599 their controllers are effective without complicated energy storage or local energy
600 generation. On the other hand, this study of rented social housing found that
601 the bulk of the gas consumption remains after retrofit, albeit from an already
602 low baseline before retrofit.

603 Homes of the same structural type reduce their mean and variance in gas
604 consumption. The reduced variance reshapes the statistical distribution of gas
605 consumption towards a normal but somewhat skewed curve. High measures
606 of prebound effect are calculated in the retrofit and control group. Retrofit
607 reduces the prebound effect as expected. Reduced prebound effect in low income
608 households is welcome because it reduces the risk of self-rationing.

609 This study is prevented by data unavailability from executing a paired t-test
610 on all retrofit homes between 2013 and 2015. Two other limitations with the gas
611 meter records appeared during the analysis. First, estimated final consumptions
612 at the end of 2015 would be more accurate with the first meter readings of 2016
613 (Appendix A.1.2). Second, any self-disconnections are obscured by the reporting
614 of meter payments without visibility of possible meter zero balances.

615 Comparing meter types, the pre-pay meters display the biggest difference
616 in statistical p-values between retrofit group (0.185) and control group (0.541).
617 This means that the difference in retrofitted pre-pay metered homes is much
618 more unlikely to be caused by chance, compared to its pre-pay meter control
619 group. Pre-pay metered households generally minimise gas consumption due to
620 information feedback and the transaction costs of pre-payments.

621 In terms of absolute energy savings the post-pay households are assisted by
622 their larger floorspaces and report larger energy savings. A sole focus on abso-
623 lute energy savings could lead to selection of only post-pay homes as recipients
624 of limited retrofit resources. The authors do not recommend home retrofit se-
625 lection by a single home characteristic to achieve a sole evaluation metric. One
626 observed reason is the dynamic nature of a the home characteristic of pre-pay
627 metering. Eight meters exchanged from post-payment to pre-payment meter
628 type, with no reports of reverse meter exchanges. In literature Hutchinson et al.
629 [31] describe how property and household characteristics provide only limited
630 prediction potential of energy efficiency in homes due to occupant choices. The
631 occupants making the choices will also change from time to time.

632 The authors recommend the neighbourhood and community retrofit ap-
633 proach to economically deliver multiple objectives of home retrofit. As men-
634 tioned, the multiple objectives are energy savings, reduction of variance in neigh-
635 bourhood energy consumption, reduced prebound linked to self rationing and
636 finally reduced transaction costs for occupants.

637 The first objective of energy savings has been evaluated already. Any con-
638 comitant savings in operational costs depend on occupant schedules, current
639 and future energy tariffs. Retrofitting an existing gas heated rented home re-
640 turns small cost savings (Section 4.3). Current gas tariffs limit operational cost
641 savings to a fraction of the State provided Fuel Allowance. Small operational
642 cost savings postpone payback periods into the distant future and impact the
643 aims of other home retrofit programmes. Reviewing Retrofit for the Future,
644 Gupta et al. [27] refer to the “Golden Rule” that retrofit is repaid by energy
645 savings but unintentionally restricts GHG reductions. A longer view is that
646 natural gas fuel is finite and reduced home heat demand facilitates any future
647 electrification of heat.

648 The second objective plotted the statistical distribution curves of the 2013
649 and 2015 gas consumption by the retrofit group. Two 2015 plots illustrate re-
650 duced mean and variance of the gas consumed by structurally similar homes.
651 This reduced variance in gas consumption by type of home is predicted in lit-
652 erature and referred to as increased homogeneity [33]. Despite the increased
653 homogeneity, a skewness in the statistical distribution by approximately 10% of
654 the retrofitted homes prevents its characterisation as a symmetric Normal dis-
655 tribution. Skewness of the distribution manifests in its mean values exceeding
656 the median.

657 Translated into practice, a small proportion of high gas consumers persist
658 in these socially rented homes after retrofit. The gas consumption of 11,000
659 kWh/year to identify skewed observations in the study’s rented social housing,
660 is in fact average home gas consumption [11]. Therefore one may accept the
661 minority of high heat demand in the rented social housing, especially as the
662 population ages and proportion of retirees increases. Assuming the users are
663 educated and their home heat controls work, further progress to GHG reduc-
664 tion may require an energy systems approach. An neighbourhood of increased
665 homogeneous energy demand is a step towards transforming a neighbourhood
666 into a distributed energy system argued by Koch et al. [33].

667 The third objective found that the prebound effect impacts both retrofit
668 and control groups, despite the latter having superior energy ratings. During
669 2013, the mean P_{act} of both groups are consistent with the 40% estimate in a
670 British study of tower block social housing [55]. The prebound effect of both
671 groups exceeds the 30% predicted prebound in German homes [54, 34]. Thus
672 best fit curves of prebound values follow the shape, but not the magnitude of the
673 predicted prebound - increasing prebound with inferior BER bands. These BER
674 bands are based on a reasonable heating schedule. (Specifically, BER assumes
675 8 hours daily of required internal temperature [47].) Despite these efforts at
676 accurate BER banding, the observed increases in prebound with BER band
677 hinders social housing retrofit. The largest shortfalls in retrofit savings caused
678 by prebound occur with inferior BERs, common in social housing.

679 The control group has a higher *percentage* of prebound in 2013 than the
680 retrofit group. Possible explanations are the control group self-rationed heat-
681 ing or used their higher performing homes to reduce gas consumption by a
682 greater proportion than the retrofit group. In terms of *absolute* prebound in

683 kWh/m²/year, the retrofit group exceeds the control group as expected. For-
 684 tunately, retrofit alleviates P_{act} , as illustrated in retrofit group during 2015
 685 (Fig. 9). In contrast, the control group increases P_{act} across all BER bands
 686 during 2015 (Fig. 10). The consistent P_{act} increase by the control group indi-
 687 cates correlation with warmer weather and higher gas prices during 2015.

688 Solid fuel use may marginally contribute to the prebound effect in certain
 689 homes. Self-reported estimates of solid fuel consumption are discussed in a
 690 working paper [10]. These estimates of solid fuel reduce after retrofit. Whilst
 691 beneficial, partial fuel switching to gas after retrofit are unquantifiable, thus not
 692 evaluated in this study. Homes that relied on solid fuel for primary heat fuel
 693 are removed from this study by initial data cleaning (Fig. 4).

694 One final unappreciated benefit of retrofit is reduced pre-payment frequency
 695 and transaction costs on pre-pay households. In 2015, a portion of treatment
 696 pre-payments shifts from every few days to weekly. The total quantity of prepay-
 697 ments reduces after retrofit, although the median prepayment in kWh remains
 698 steady. This is a rare example of reducing dweller transaction costs, as opposed
 699 to alleviating supplier transaction costs.

700 5.1. Future work

701 Fuel switching and use of alternative solid fuel, deserve further analysis.
 702 Ideally their contribution to the calculated prebound effect could be quanti-
 703 fied. Fuel switching to gas, while not a stated goal of home energy retrofit,
 704 addresses three drawbacks of solid fuel: i) higher GHG emissions per unit en-
 705 ergy, ii) air pollution and iii) fuel transportation costs. Measuring the success
 706 of fuel switching requires temperature sensors to confirm occupant comfort is
 707 maintained.

708 The use of external wall insulation at a few homes mainly in one estate
 709 is notable. A larger sample of external wall insulation could allow an energy
 710 performance analysis to compare external and cavity wall insulation.

711 The 2015 distribution of gas consumption displays a sizeable variance, even
 712 after retrofit (Fig. 8). It could be more accurate to define neighbourhood gas
 713 demand by multiple distributions representing distinct heating schedules. The
 714 schedules would reflect the heating needs of retired persons and those who work
 715 or study outside the home.

716 6. Acknowledgements

717 The authors thank Respond! Housing Association for access to data that
 718 made this research possible. The authors also thank ESRI researchers Professor
 719 Seán Lyons and Daire McCoy for their feedback and constructive comments.

720 Paul Beagon gratefully acknowledges that his research is supported in part by
 721 a research grant from Science Foundation Ireland (SFI) under the SFI Strategic
 722 Partnership Programme Grant Number SFI/15/SPP/E3125

723 Bibliography

- 724 [1] Adan, H., Fuerst, F., 10 2016. Do energy efficiency measures really reduce
 725 household energy consumption? A difference-in-difference analysis. *Energy*
 726 *Efficiency* 9 (5), 1207–1219.
 727 URL <http://doi.org/10.1007/s12053-015-9418-3>
- 728 [2] Anderson, J. E., Wulfhorst, G., Lang, W., 2015. Energy analysis of the built
 729 environment - a review and outlook. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy*
 730 *Reviews* 44, 149–158.
 731 URL <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2014.12.027>
- 732 [3] Arcipowska, A., Anagnostopoulos, F., Mariottini, F., Kunkel, S., 2014.
 733 Energy performance certificates across the EU. Tech. rep., Buildings
 734 Performance Institute Europe (BPIE).
 735 URL [http://bpie.eu/publication/energy-performance-](http://bpie.eu/publication/energy-performance-certificates-across-the-eu/)
 736 [certificates-across-the-eu/](http://bpie.eu/publication/energy-performance-certificates-across-the-eu/)
- 737 [4] Bord Gáis Energy, 2017. Publications - Tariffs.
 738 URL <https://www.bordgaisenergy.ie/publications/tariffs/>
- 739 [5] Bowman, A., Azzalini, A., Bowman, M. A., 2015. Smoothing methods for
 740 nonparametric regression and density estimation.
 741 URL <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/sm/sm.pdf>
- 742 [6] Bowman, A. W., Azzalini, A., 1997. Applied smoothing techniques for data
 743 analysis : the kernel approach with S-Plus illustrations. Clarendon Press.
- 744 [7] Building Energy Ireland, 2008. BER certificates.
 745 URL <http://www.buildingenergyireland.ie/BERCerts.htm>
- 746 [8] CIBSE, 2006. Degree Days – Theory and Application - TM41 : 2006.
 747 CIBSE.
 748 URL [http://www.cibse.org/Knowledge/knowledge-items/detail?id=](http://www.cibse.org/Knowledge/knowledge-items/detail?id=a0q20000008I73TAAS)
 749 [a0q20000008I73TAAS](http://www.cibse.org/Knowledge/knowledge-items/detail?id=a0q20000008I73TAAS)
- 750 [9] Collins, M., Curtis, J., 2017. Evidence, drivers and sources of distortions
 751 in the distribution of building energy ratings prior to and after energy
 752 efficient retrofitting. In: *ECEEE Summer Study Proceedings*. ECEEE,
 753 Presqu’île di Giens, France, pp. 1699 – 1708.
 754 URL [https://www.ecee.org/library/conference_proceedings/](https://www.ecee.org/library/conference_proceedings/eceee_Summer_Studies/2017/8-monitoring-and-evaluation-building-confidence-and-enhancing-practices/)
 755 [eceee_Summer_Studies/2017/8-monitoring-and-evaluation-](https://www.ecee.org/library/conference_proceedings/eceee_Summer_Studies/2017/8-monitoring-and-evaluation-building-confidence-and-enhancing-practices/)
 756 [building-confidence-and-enhancing-practices/](https://www.ecee.org/library/conference_proceedings/eceee_Summer_Studies/2017/8-monitoring-and-evaluation-building-confidence-and-enhancing-practices/)
- 757 [10] Coyne, B., Lyons, S., McCoy, D., 2016. The effects of home energy
 758 efficiency upgrades on social housing tenants: Evidence from ireland. ESRI
 759 Working Paper No. 544.
 760 URL [https://www.esri.ie/publications/the-effects-of-home-](https://www.esri.ie/publications/the-effects-of-home-energy-efficiency-upgrades-on-social-housing-tenants-evidence-from-ireland/)
 761 [energy-efficiency-upgrades-on-social-housing-tenants-](https://www.esri.ie/publications/the-effects-of-home-energy-efficiency-upgrades-on-social-housing-tenants-evidence-from-ireland/)
 762 [evidence-from-ireland/](https://www.esri.ie/publications/the-effects-of-home-energy-efficiency-upgrades-on-social-housing-tenants-evidence-from-ireland/)

- 763 [11] CRU, 2017. Electricity and Gas Retail Markets Report Q2 2017.
 764 URL [https://www.cru.ie/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/CRU17290-](https://www.cru.ie/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/CRU17290-Q2-electricity-and-gas-retail-markets-report.pdf)
 765 [Q2-electricity-and-gas-retail-markets-report.pdf](https://www.cru.ie/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/CRU17290-Q2-electricity-and-gas-retail-markets-report.pdf)
- 766 [12] CSO Ireland, 2017. Networked Gas Consumption 2016.
 767 URL [http://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/er/ngc/](http://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/er/ngc/networkedgasconsumption2016/)
 768 [networkedgasconsumption2016/](http://www.cso.ie/en/releasesandpublications/er/ngc/networkedgasconsumption2016/)
- 769 [13] Dennehy, E., Lyons, S., Howley, M., 2013. Energy in the Residential Sector.
 770 Tech. rep., SEAI.
 771 URL [https://www.seai.ie/resources/publications/Energy-in-the-](https://www.seai.ie/resources/publications/Energy-in-the-Residential-Sector-2013.pdf)
 772 [Residential-Sector-2013.pdf](https://www.seai.ie/resources/publications/Energy-in-the-Residential-Sector-2013.pdf)
- 773 [14] Dept of Employment Affairs and Social Protection, 2017. Fuel Allowance
 774 Scheme.
 775 URL [http://www.welfare.ie/en/Pages/820_National-Fuel-Scheme.](http://www.welfare.ie/en/Pages/820_National-Fuel-Scheme.aspx)
 776 [aspx](http://www.welfare.ie/en/Pages/820_National-Fuel-Scheme.aspx)
- 777 [15] Dixon, T., Eames, M., 2013. Scaling up: the challenges of urban retrofit.
 778 Building Research & Information 41 (5), 499–503.
 779 URL <http://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2013.812432>
- 780 [16] EC, 2008. Proposal for a Recast of The Energy Performance of Buildings
 781 Directive. Tech. rep., European Commission.
 782 URL [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52008SC2865)
 783 [52008SC2865](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52008SC2865)
- 784 [17] Energy Star, 2015. What is energy use intensity (EUI)?
 785 URL [https://www.energystar.gov/buildings/facility-owners-and-](https://www.energystar.gov/buildings/facility-owners-and-managers/existing-buildings/use-portfolio-manager/understand-metrics/what-energy)
 786 [managers/existing-buildings/use-portfolio-manager/understand-](https://www.energystar.gov/buildings/facility-owners-and-managers/existing-buildings/use-portfolio-manager/understand-metrics/what-energy)
 787 [metrics/what-energy](https://www.energystar.gov/buildings/facility-owners-and-managers/existing-buildings/use-portfolio-manager/understand-metrics/what-energy)
- 788 [18] EPA, 2016. Ireland’s Environment - An Assessment 2016. Environmental
 789 Protection Agency, Ch. 11, pp. 174 – 185.
 790 URL [http://www.epa.ie/pubs/reports/indicators/SoE_Report_](http://www.epa.ie/pubs/reports/indicators/SoE_Report_2016.pdf)
 791 [2016.pdf](http://www.epa.ie/pubs/reports/indicators/SoE_Report_2016.pdf)
- 792 [19] Eurostat, 2017. Energy - Data - Main tables.
 793 URL <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/energy/data/main-tables>
- 794 [20] Fiest, W., 2001. Passive House Measured Results.
 795 URL [https://passiv.de/former_conferences/Passive_House_E/](https://passiv.de/former_conferences/Passive_House_E/Passivehouse_measured_consumption.html)
 796 [Passivehouse_measured_consumption.html](https://passiv.de/former_conferences/Passive_House_E/Passivehouse_measured_consumption.html)
- 797 [21] Filippidou, F., Nieboer, N., Visscher, H., 2016. Energy efficiency measures
 798 implemented in the Dutch non-profit housing sector. Energy and Buildings
 799 132, 107–116.
 800 URL <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.05.095>

- [22] Fylan, F., Glew, D., Smith, M., Johnston, D., Brooke-Peat, M., Miles-Shenton, D., Fletcher, M., Aloise-Young, P., Gorse, C., nov 2016. Reflections on retrofits: Overcoming barriers to energy efficiency among the fuel poor in the United Kingdom. *Energy Research and Social Science* 21, 190–198.
URL <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2016.08.002>
- [23] Galster, G., 2001. On the nature of neighbourhood. *Urban Studies* 38 (12), 2111–2124.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980120087072>
- [24] Galvin, R., Sunikka-Blank, M., 2016. Quantification of (p)rebound effects in retrofit policies - Why does it matter? *Energy* 95, 415–424.
URL <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2015.12.034>
- [25] Grolemund, G., Wickham, H., 2011. Dates and Times Made Easy with lubridate. *Journal of Statistical Software, Articles* 40 (3), 1–25.
URL <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v040.i03>
- [26] Gupta, R., Barnfield, L., Hipwood, T., 2014. Impacts of community-led energy retrofitting of owner-occupied dwellings. *Building Research and Information* 42 (4), 446–461.
URL <http://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2014.894742>
- [27] Gupta, R., Gregg, M., Passmore, S., Stevens, G., 2015. Intent and outcomes from the Retrofit for the Future programme: key lessons. *Building Research & Information* 43 (4), 435–451.
URL <http://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2015.1024042>
- [28] Haines, V., Mitchell, V., 2014. A persona-based approach to domestic energy retrofit. *Building Research & Information* 42 (4), 462–476.
URL <http://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2014.893161>
- [29] Hamilton, I. G., Summerfield, A. J., Shipworth, D., Steadman, J. P., Oreszczyn, T., Lowe, R. J., 2016. Energy efficiency uptake and energy savings in English houses: A cohort study. *Energy and Buildings* 118, 259–276.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.02.024>
- [30] Howden-Chapman, P., Viggers, H., Chapman, R., O’Dea, D., Free, S., O’Sullivan, K., 2009. Warm homes: Drivers of the demand for heating in the residential sector in New Zealand. *Energy Policy* 37 (9), 3387–3399.
URL <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2008.12.023>
- [31] Hutchinson, E. J., Wilkinson, P., Hong, S. H., Oreszczyn, T., 11 2006. Can we improve the identification of cold homes for targeted home energy-efficiency improvements? *Applied Energy* 83 (11), 1198–1209.
URL <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2006.01.007>

- [32] Itard, L., Meijer, F., 2008. Towards a sustainable Northern European housing stock : figures, facts, and future. IOS Press.
- [33] Koch, A., Girard, S., McKoen, K., 2012. Towards a neighbourhood scale for low- or zero-carbon building projects. *Building Research & Information* 40 (4), 527–537.
URL <http://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2012.683241>
- [34] Loga, T., Diefenbach, N., Born, R., 2011. Deutsche gebaudetypologie. beispielhafte maßnahmen zur verbesserung der energieeffizienz von typischen wohngebäuden. Tech. rep., Institute Wohnen und Umwelt, Darmstadt.
URL http://www.building-typology.eu/downloads/public/docs/brochure/DE_TABULA_TypologyBrochure_IWU.pdf
- [35] Ma, Z., Cooper, P., Daly, D., Ledo, L., 2012. Existing building retrofits: Methodology and state-of-the-art. *Energy and Buildings* 55, 889–902.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2012.08.018>
- [36] MacKenzie, F., 2011. Commitment to reduce carbon emissions on the Government Estate by 10% - weather correction methodology. Tech. rep., Building Research Establishment.
URL https://data.gov.uk/sites/default/files/10percent_analysis_methodology_v5_10.pdf
- [37] Mathiesen, B. V., Drysdale, D., Lund, H., Paardekooper, S., Ridjan, I., Connolly, D., Jensen, J. S., 2016. Future Green Buildings. Tech. rep., Department of Development and Planning, Aalborg University.
URL <http://www.energyplan.eu/buildings/>
- [38] McKenna, R., Merkel, E., Fehrenbach, D., Mehne, S., Fichtner, W., 2013. Energy efficiency in the german residential sector: A bottom-up building-stock-model-based analysis in the context of energy-political targets. *Building and Environment* 62, 77 – 88.
URL <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2013.01.002>
- [39] Met Éireann, 2017. Met Éireann - The Irish Weather Service.
URL <http://www.met.ie>
- [40] NIST, 2012. Two-Sample t-Test for Equal Means. In: *Engineering Statistics*. NIST, Ch. 1.3.5, pp. 227–230.
URL <http://www.itl.nist.gov/div898/handbook/eda/section3/eda353.htm>
- [41] O’Sullivan, K. C., Howden-Chapman, P. L., Fougere, G. M., Hales, S., Stanley, J., 2013. Empowered? Examining self-disconnection in a postal survey of electricity prepayment meter consumers in New Zealand. *Energy Policy* 52, 277–287.
URL <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2012.09.020>

- 880 [42] O’Sullivan, K. C., Stanley, J., Fougere, G., Howden-Chapman, P., 2016.
 881 Heating practices and self-disconnection among electricity prepayment me-
 882 ter consumers in New Zealand: A follow-up survey. *Utilities Policy* 41,
 883 139–147.
 884 URL <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jup.2016.07.002>
- 885 [43] O’Sullivan, K. C., Viggers, H. E., Howden-Chapman, P. L., 2014. The in-
 886 fluence of electricity prepayment meter use on household energy behaviour.
 887 *Sustainable Cities and Society* 13, 182–191.
 888 URL <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2013.10.004>
- 889 [44] Respond!, 2015. Energy Upgrades Delivered to 550 Homes Nationally in-
 890 cluding 54 Homes and Four Community Facilities in Ennis - Respond!
 891 URL <http://www.respond.ie/events/9588/>
- 892 [45] Scheer, J., Clancy, M., Hógáin, S. N., 2013. Quantification of energy savings
 893 from Ireland’s Home Energy Saving scheme: an ex post billing analysis.
 894 *Energy Efficiency* 6 (1), 35–48.
 895 URL <http://doi.org/10.1007/s12053-012-9164-8>
- 896 [46] SEAI, 2010. Residential energy roadmap 2010 to 2050.
 897 URL [https://www.seai.ie/resources/publications/Residential-](https://www.seai.ie/resources/publications/Residential-Energy-Roadmap.pdf)
 898 [Energy-Roadmap.pdf](https://www.seai.ie/resources/publications/Residential-Energy-Roadmap.pdf)
- 899 [47] SEAI, 2012. Dwelling Energy Assessment Procedure (DEAP) v3.2.1. Tech.
 900 rep., SEAI.
 901 URL [https://www.seai.ie/resources/publications/DEAP_Manual.](https://www.seai.ie/resources/publications/DEAP_Manual.pdf)
 902 [pdf](https://www.seai.ie/resources/publications/DEAP_Manual.pdf)
- 903 [48] SEAI, 2016. Better energy communities 2017.
 904 URL [http://www.seai.ie/Grants/Better_Energy_Communities/BEC-](http://www.seai.ie/Grants/Better_Energy_Communities/BEC-2017-Overview.pdf)
 905 [2017-Overview.pdf](http://www.seai.ie/Grants/Better_Energy_Communities/BEC-2017-Overview.pdf)
- 906 [49] SEAI, 2016. Derivation of Primary Energy and CO₂ Factors for Electricity
 907 in DEAP. Tech. rep., SEAI.
 908 URL [https://www.seai.ie/resources/publications/DEAP-Elec-](https://www.seai.ie/resources/publications/DEAP-Elec-Factors-2017.pdf)
 909 [Factors-2017.pdf](https://www.seai.ie/resources/publications/DEAP-Elec-Factors-2017.pdf)
- 910 [50] SEAI, 2016. Energy Efficiency in Ireland - 2016 Report. Tech. rep., SEAI.
 911 URL [http://www.seai.ie/resources/publications/Energy-](http://www.seai.ie/resources/publications/Energy-Efficiency-in-Ireland-2016-Report.pdf)
 912 [Efficiency-in-Ireland-2016-Report.pdf](http://www.seai.ie/resources/publications/Energy-Efficiency-in-Ireland-2016-Report.pdf)
- 913 [51] SEAI, 2017. Deep Retrofit Pilot Programme.
 914 URL [https://www.seai.ie/grants/home-grants/deep-retrofit-](https://www.seai.ie/grants/home-grants/deep-retrofit-programme/)
 915 [programme/](https://www.seai.ie/grants/home-grants/deep-retrofit-programme/)
- 916 [52] SEAI, 2017. Domestic BERs Dashboard.
 917 URL [https://www.seai.ie/resources/publications/NAS-Dashboard-](https://www.seai.ie/resources/publications/NAS-Dashboard-Dec-2017.pdf)
 918 [Dec-2017.pdf](https://www.seai.ie/resources/publications/NAS-Dashboard-Dec-2017.pdf)

- 919 [53] Sorrell, S., Dimitropoulos, J., Sommerville, M., 2009. Empirical estimates
920 of the direct rebound effect: A review. *Energy Policy* 37 (4), 1356–1371.
921 URL <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2008.11.026>
- 922 [54] Sunikka-Blank, M., Galvin, R., 2012. Introducing the prebound effect: the
923 gap between performance and actual energy consumption. *Building Re-*
924 *search & Information* 40 (3), 260–273.
925 URL <http://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2012.690952>
- 926 [55] Teli, D., Dimitriou, T., James, P., Bahaj, A., Ellison, L., Waggott, A.,
927 2016. Fuel poverty-induced ‘prebound effect’ in achieving the anticipated
928 carbon savings from social housing retrofit. *Building Services Engineering*
929 *Research and Technology* 37 (2), 176–193.
930 URL <http://doi.org/10.1177/0143624415621028>
- 931 [56] Telles Esteves, G. R., Cyrino Oliveira, F. L., Antunes, C. H., Souza, R. C.,
932 2016. An overview of electricity prepayment experiences and the Brazilian
933 new regulatory framework. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 54,
934 704–722.
935 URL <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.10.002>

936 Appendix A. Appendix

937 Appendix A.1. Allocation of metered consumption by calendar year

938 The allocation stage apportions a metered consumption to its year of reading,
 939 and if at a year transition, to the adjoining year. The first and last consumption
 940 values of an individual meter differ from those at year transitions. The interval
 941 to the neighbouring reading is unknown, requiring estimated allocations to the
 942 year of reading. Techniques and worked examples of consumption allocation
 943 appear for meter first records (Appendix A.1.1), meter last records (Appendix
 944 A.1.2) and records at year transitions (Appendix A.1.3).

945 Appendix A.1.1. Allocation of gas consumption from meter first records

946 The technique distinguishes between post-pay and pre-pay meter records.
 947 In both meter types, year to date (YTD) is the number of *completed* days into
 948 the year. A post-pay meter is assumed to record consumption bimonthly, every
 949 63 days. Hence, the allocation of the first consumption record is the proportion
 950 of its YTD divided by 63 (Eq. A.1)

$$Post\text{-}pay\ 1^{st}\ allocation = \frac{YTD}{63} \times 1^{st}\ meter\ record \quad (A.1)$$

951 Pre-pay meters exclude the period from the start of the year to the first
 952 reading. An estimate is made by scaling up the pre-pay consumption to include
 953 the time interval from the year start to the first record. The extended period
 954 sums the YTD *and* the interval between the first and second non-zero records.
 955 The assumption is that the average consumption between the first and second
 956 readings equals that of the YTD interval.

$$Pre\text{-}pay\ 1^{st}\ allocation = \left(1 + \frac{YTD}{interval}\right) \times 1^{st}\ meter\ record \quad (A.2)$$

957 Worked examples of consumption allocations from a meter first records ap-
 958 pear in Table A.5. Each example of a post-pay and pre-pay meter display the
 959 consumption allocations from the initial three records of each meter.

Table A.5
 Worked examples of first records allocation: post-and pre-pay meters.

Type	Record date	YTD days	Interval days	Consumption kWh	Record year allocation kWh
post-pay	2013-02-04	34	63	100	54
	2013-04-04	-	-	100	100
	2013-06-04	-	-	100	100
pre-pay	2013-01-05	4	11	100	136
	2013-01-16	-	-	100	100
	2013-01-25	-	-	100	100

960 *Appendix A.1.2. Allocation of gas consumption from meter final records*

961 The techniques to estimate final consumptions again distinguish between
 962 post-pay and pre-pay meters. The final meter records coincide with public hol-
 963 idays during heating season, increasing the variation in daily consumption rate.
 964 As a result, pre-pay meter final consumptions are estimated by two equations,
 965 each of which applies depending on the number of remaining days (Eqs. A.4,
 966 A.5).

967 The post-pay meters lack consumption allocation for the number of remain-
 968 ing days in the year (Yrem) after the final record. The consumption value
 969 equals the last consumption record scaled up by Yrem, as a proportion of the
 970 last record interval. The record interval is the number of days between the final
 971 and penultimate records of an individual meter. It is assumed that the most
 972 recent average of daily consumption continues during Yrem.

$$Post\text{-}pay\ final\ allocation = \left(1 + \frac{Yrem}{interval}\right) \times final\ record \quad (A.3)$$

The final pre-pay record allocates consumption to the year end, without the date of the next pre-payment. Where Yrem is small, a similar allocation method as post-pay is applied. It is assumed that the recent average of daily consumption continues during Yrem. As this is pre-pay, the penultimate consumption value is scaled by the Yrem as a proportion of the last known record interval. Such a scaled value of allocation cannot exceed the final reading, thus a 80% figure acts a upper boundary.

$$Pre\text{-}pay\ final\ allocation\ (Yrem \leq 5) = \min\left(\frac{Yrem}{interval} \times penultimate\ record, OR\ 0.8 \times final\ record\right) \quad (A.4)$$

Where the Yrem is larger, the last pre-payment is allocated by estimating its probable meter interval. The YTD of the first pre-payment in the final year offers an estimated number of days in the unobserved year (YTD_{est}) until the next reading. The proportion of consumption allocated to the final year is Yrem divided by the sum of Yrem and YTD_{est} .

$$Pre\text{-}pay\ final\ allocation\ (Yrem > 5) = \frac{Yrem}{(Yrem + YTD_{est})} \times final\ record \quad (A.5)$$

973 Worked examples of consumption allocations of meter final readings appear
 974 in Table A.6. The post-pay and two pre-pay examples display the final three
 975 records of each meter.

Table A.6
Worked examples of final records allocation: post-and pre-pay meters.

Type	Date	Yrem days	Est. interval days	Reading kWh	Read year allocation kWh
post-pay	2015-11-25	-	-	100	100
	2015-12-03	-	-	100	0
	2015-12-10	15	22	100	247
pre-pay	2015-12-21	-	-	100	100
	2015-12-24	-	-	100	100
	2015-12-30	2	6	100	33
pre-pay	2015-12-04	-	-	100	100
	2015-12-16	-	-	100	100
	2015-12-22	10	11	100	91*

* The first 2015 meter reading on 2015-01-02, makes $YTD_{est} = 1$ and estimated interval = 11.

Appendix A.1.3. Consumption allocation over year transitions

The nature of post-pay and pre-pay meters require different calculations at year transitions. The post-pay meters require a consumption allocation of the *first record of the latter year* across both years; the record (latter) year and the prior year. Initially the interval between the first meter record of the year and the last meter record of the prior year is calculated. The record year allocation is proportional to the YTD divided by the record interval (Eq. A.6). The allocation to the prior year is proportional to the record interval minus the YTD (Eq. A.7).

$$Post\text{-}pay\ record\ year\ allocation = \frac{YTD}{interval} \times year\ 1^{st}\ record \quad (A.6)$$

$$Post\text{-}pay\ prior\ year\ allocation = \left(1 - \frac{YTD}{interval}\right) \times year\ 1^{st}\ record \quad (A.7)$$

Pre-pay meters require an allocation of their *last record of prior year* across the prior year and the subsequent latter year. After the record interval is computed, the prior year allocation is proportional to the year remaining (Yrem) divided by the record interval. The latter year allocation is proportional to the reading interval minus the Yrem. The interval of records demarcating the year transition, and Yrem are computed in days. Consumption allocations over year transitions appear in Table A.7. As expected, the small sample of pre-pay meter readings are more frequent and report smaller consumption values than post-pay readings.

$$Pre\text{-}pay\ record\ year\ allocation = \frac{Yrem}{interval} \times year\ last\ record \quad (A.8)$$

$$Pre\text{-}pay\ latter\ year\ allocation = \left(1 - \frac{Yrem}{interval}\right) \times year\ last\ record \quad (A.9)$$

Table A.7
Worked examples of year transition allocations: post and pre-pay meters.

Type	Date	YTD days	Yrem days	Interval days	Reading kWh	Yearly allocation kWh		
						Read	Prior	Latter
post-pay	2014-12-09	-	-	-	100	100	0	0
post-pay	2015-02-09	39	-	62	100	63	37	0
post-pay	2015-04-13	-	-	-	100	100	0	0
pre-pay	2014-12-11	-	-	-	100	100	0	0
pre-pay	2014-12-23	-	9	13	100	69	0	31
pre-pay	2015-01-05	-	-	-	100	100	0	0

996 *Appendix A.2. Shaping of consumption data*

997 The allocation of metered consumption to its recorded year, and where ap-
 998 plicable to the prior and latter years is complete. The next step is summation,
 999 or shaping, allocations into calendar years. Most allocations belong to same
 1000 year they are recorded. As discussed, allocations at year transition include the
 1001 prior or latter year. The middle year 2014, reports allocations from both is
 1002 adjoining years. It receives 2013 latter year allocations, and the prior year allo-
 1003 cations from 2015 (Eq. A.11). Summation equations use abbreviations of cons
 1004 (consumption), yr (year) and rec (recorded).

$$2013 \text{ cons} = \sum 2013 \text{ rec. yr} + \sum 2014 \text{ prior. yr} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

$$2014 \text{ cons} = \sum 2013 \text{ latter. yr} + \sum 2014 \text{ rec. yr} + \sum 2015 \text{ prior. yr} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

$$2015 \text{ cons} = \sum 2014 \text{ latter. yr} + \sum 2015 \text{ rec. yr} \quad (\text{A.12})$$