

Topical group B: calculation methodology

Executive summary afternoon session stakeholder meeting 2019-03-26

The topical group session was led by Glenn Reynders (EnergyVille/VITO) and opened by reminding the scope of the second technical study on the SRI and the topical group meetings within the project. The slideshow accompanying the topical group session are made available to the topical group members and to the whole stakeholder community. It was clarified that, in order to stimulate an open discussion, Chatham-house rules are applied, meaning that no names or affiliations will be linked to the statements and positions formulated during the meeting.

Introduction

In the introduction it was explained that the role of Topical Group B is to:

- Help consolidate the SRI calculation methodology (all within the scope of the EPBD text)
- Enable stakeholders to provide support in shaping the development of the SRI
- Foster informal and open discussion

Discussion and brainstorming on the SRI impact criteria and weightings

Based on a review of the first technical study and the input and feedback received from stakeholders, Member States and the European Commission during and after that first study, three proposals were introduced focussing on three principal alternatives in defining the impact criteria. The following proposals were introduced to the participants:

- Proposal 1: Eight impact criteria (from outcome 1st SRI study)
- Proposal 2: Three impact criteria (from the EPBD)
- Proposal 3: Hybrid solution: eight initial impact criteria aggregated to three EPBD impact criteria

The hybrid approach of scoring services on eight impact criteria and aggregating them to three EPBD criteria is preferred. This approach combines the advantage of being clearly in line with the EPBD theme and the possibility of aggregating first on the level of the eight impact criteria.

Regarding the weighting of the impact criteria, mixed visions exist on the relative importance of occupant needs in the SRI. In any case, sub-scores for impact criteria are considered to be highly informative and should be provided together with a single SRI score.

Discussion and brainstorming on the calculation and assessment method implications of a potential quick-scan methodology for assessing the SRI

The second discussion dealt with the working assumptions, namely a light quick-scan method (A), a detailed expert analysis (B) and the automated analysis (C). Members proposed to either extend the triage process by selecting only high-impact services from the service catalogue or simplifying the terminology. Alternatively, a validated SRI product database could be envisioned, in which the manufacturer provides the SRI score for its products. This approach could gain support from industry (e.g. ecodesign) but the trustworthiness of the database is a point of attention.

Participants indicated that method A is expected to be more suitable for residential buildings. Method B is more appropriate for non-residential buildings.

The workplan for Topical Group B

It was agreed that future meetings of Topical Group B would be organised in the coming months to address the following themes:

- Impact criteria
- Aggregation and weighting
- Triage process: dealing with missing services
- Updating the framework
- Tailoring to building context
- Partial presence of services