


# Pathway to Zero Energy Windows

Advancing Technologies and Market Adoption

April 2022



## Disclaimer

This work was prepared as an account of work sponsored by an agency of the United States Government. Neither the United States Government nor any agency thereof, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or any third party's use or the results of such use of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States Government or any agency thereof or its contractors or subcontractors. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof, its contractors or subcontractors.

## Authors

The author of this report is:

Chioke Harris, National Renewable Energy Laboratory

The technical manager of this report is:

Marc LaFrance, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE)

The program managers providing overall guidance for this report are:

Ram Narayanamurthy, DOE

Erika Gupta, DOE (now with Siemens)

Karma Sawyer, DOE (now with the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory).

## Acknowledgments

The author and technical manager would like to thank the many researchers who contributed to this report as well as the stakeholders who provided input throughout the development of this report. The authors would like to thank the following list of contributors.

*Contributors:*

**DOE:** Sven Mumme and David Nemtsov

**Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL):** D. Charlie Curcija, Luis Fernandes, Robert Hart, Christian Kohler, Jared Langevin, Eleanor Lee, and Steve Selkowitz

**National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL):** Lena Burkett, Christopher CaraDonna, Shanti Pless, Marlena Praprost, Janet Reyna, Rob Tenent, Lance Wheeler, and Philip White

**Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL):** André Desjarlais, Diana Hun, Simon Pallin, and Som Shrestha

**Prescriptive Data:** Cindy Zhu (previously a DOE ORISE Fellow)

**View, Inc.:** Rob Guglielmetti (previously at NREL).

## List of Acronyms

ABC	Advanced Building Construction Initiative
BTO	Building Technologies Office
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
ECM	energy conservation measure
EERE	Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy
EIA	U.S. Energy Information Administration
GEB	grid-interactive efficient building
HVAC	heating, ventilation, and air conditioning
IGU	insulated glass unit
ISO	independent system operator
LBNL	Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory
LSG	light to solar gain ratio
MPC	model predictive control
NFRC	National Fenestration Rating Council
NGO	nongovernmental organization
NIR	near-infrared
NREL	National Renewable Energy Laboratory
ORNL	Oak Ridge National Laboratory
PACE	property-assessed clean energy program
PV	photovoltaic
R&D	research and development
SHGC	solar heat gain coefficient
TRL	technology readiness level
Tsol	solar transmittance
Tvis	visible light transmittance
uPVC	unplasticized polyvinyl chloride
VIG	vacuum-insulated glazing

## Executive Summary

### Background

As of 2021, buildings account for 39.1% of total U.S. primary energy use and 75% of total U.S. electricity use [1]. Much of this energy is used to maintain a comfortable indoor environment. The building envelope consists of transparent and opaque elements that serve as a controllable barrier to help maintain the indoor environment regardless of external conditions. The envelope also allows the exchange of light and air, as well as other transfers with the external environment when it is beneficial for the building occupants. By leveraging desirable external environmental conditions (e.g., fresh air and natural light) and mitigating the influence of undesirable conditions (e.g., moisture, hot or cold temperatures, wind), the building envelope can reduce the need for space conditioning and electric light, and thus reduce energy use associated with lighting and heating, cooling, and ventilation equipment. In turn, high-performance building envelopes can reduce the substantial CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with energy use to satisfy heating, cooling, and lighting needs in buildings.

As the transparent portion of the building envelope, windows provide a visual connection for building occupants to the surrounding environment. Windows are a critical element to creating indoor spaces that people enjoy. High-performance windows, daylighting, and shading systems that can substantially reduce undesirable heat transfer and air leakage compared to current typical systems have the potential to dramatically enhance occupant satisfaction. Future high-performance transparent facade technologies could deliver a three-fold improvement in performance over the current ENERGY STAR<sup>®</sup> specification.

This document focuses on research and development (R&D) for windows and window system technologies and provides guidance for the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) Building Technologies Office's (BTO) investments—in partnership with industry and researchers—in developing the next generation of high-performance, highly efficient, affordable, cost competitive windows, as well as integrated daylighting and shading technologies. This document also addresses areas where DOE invests in software and design tools that translate complex physics into easy-to-use energy performance and optimization methods used by industry and other stakeholders for implementation.

Improving the energy performance of windows, daylighting, and shading technologies in U.S. buildings is key to achieving aggressive climate goals that support a clean energy economy and an equitable energy future for communities across the United States. Rapid deployment and broad adoption of advanced, high-performance transparent facade technologies are required to realize the full potential of windows to reduce energy use and carbon emissions. In turn, continued successful market entry and widespread adoption of these technologies requires sustained, long-term R&D investment. This document outlines multiple avenues for technology development, deployment, and adoption to increase the impact that the transparent facade can have on these goals.

Overall, windows are responsible for 8.6% of energy use in buildings, and they influence end uses that make up about 43% of building energy use (Figure ES-1). Although windows compose only 8% of building surface area, they represent 45% of thermal energy transmission through the building envelope.<sup>1</sup> Energy use associated with windows varies widely among buildings depending on climate, building vintage, window and glazing characteristics, window/wall ratios, and other factors.

Although windows have a significant annual energy impact, their biggest impact is on occupant comfort and on peak electricity and natural gas use. Comfort is a major concern in cold climates where poorly insulated windows create extreme radiant discomfort and generate cold drafts from air dropping across the surface of the glass—many building occupants report that it feels as if the windows are open or have very large edge gaps. In hot summers, with static glass optical properties, occupants in perimeter zones may be uncomfortably warm even with conventional blinds and shading installed. Providing consistent visual comfort can be a challenge in all climates throughout the year during sunny or other bright sky conditions. Highly insulating and dynamic solar control technology solutions can solve these problems in residential and commercial buildings independent of climate, and have the potential to save more than 1.6 quads of energy by tailoring window characteristics to align with ambient conditions and occupant needs, thus offsetting significant energy use associated with windows.

---

<sup>1</sup> See: <https://windows.lbl.gov/window-heat-transfer-fraction>

## The Importance of Windows

*Windows provide our homes and places of work with light, view, and feeling of being part of the outside world.*





Figure courtesy of Cristen Farley, LBNL.



**Figure ES-1. Windows affect end uses (highlighted with darker bars) that compose about 43% of building energy use and lead directly to 8.6% of building energy use, corresponding to 3.25 quads of primary energy use (see Figure 3).**


Data from the EIA 2021 Annual Energy Outlook [1].

## Current Technologies—Opportunities and Challenges

Modern windows provide improved thermal performance, including reduced air leakage, but also offer enhanced amenities such as daylight, views to the outdoors, and natural ventilation. Optimizing the energy performance of

windows requires taking into account heat conduction, convection, and radiation while also ensuring that aesthetic considerations are satisfied. Opportunities exist in improving window glazing, gas filling, vacuum insulation, insulating frames, and air leakage (air infiltration and exfiltration). Furthermore, improvements to dynamic facades and glazing, fixed and operable attachments, and daylight redirection can significantly increase the value of window systems.

BTO's Windows Program has played a major role in the development and high market adoption of low-emissivity (low-e) glass and improved frame performance that has resulted in today's typical ENERGY STAR windows being two to three times better performing than windows installed in the 1980s (Figure ES-2) [2]. The Windows Program also played a key role in the development of dynamic glazing and the highest thermally performing windows on the market, which offer dramatic improvements over ENERGY STAR windows with static solar control. However, further R&D is needed to achieve the next level of performance and affordability.



**Figure ES-2. Market share by glazing type; triple-pane is still 2%.**

Figure updated from Selkowitz, Hart, and Curcija [3].

R&D is needed to enable next-generation windows that have the same thermal performance of most existing buildings' insulated walls,<sup>2</sup> while also harvesting passive heating contributions in winter and rejecting unwanted solar heat gain in summer. An R-10 (0.1 U-factor) window with dynamic glazing has the ability to be energy positive in many climates, thus resulting in buildings with less energy use than if they did not have any windows at all.

Additional opportunities exist for whole-building modeling software tools to better capture the energy and nonenergy impacts of window features, and to allow for outputs to be readily incorporated into building design workflows, as well as building operation. Today, the overwhelming majority of U.S. windows are designed using DOE/Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) software tools that enable performance improvements to be assessed and incorporated with much less impact compared to the prior approach, which required the construction of costly prototypes. New software tools that clearly articulate the impact of window and window attachment performance and design decisions on whole-building energy use, heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning (HVAC) system require-


<sup>2</sup>Many walls have R-11 or R-13 cavity insulation, and with structural thermal shorts have only R-10 or lower performance.

ments, and nonenergy benefits like occupant visual and thermal comfort could help with customer acquisition and could minimize value engineering of transparent facade elements that can substantially reduce energy use.

## Future Technology Development

R&D, including new material discovery, novel technological approaches, as well as applied engineering, is key to addressing many of the performance and cost challenges faced by industry to produce highly efficient affordable windows that can achieve mainstream market acceptance. These technologies are generally expected to offer significant energy savings compared to the current cost-effective technology, but they also have other energy and nonenergy benefits—reduced peak load, time-shifted envelope-related thermal loads to match distributed renewable generation availability, reduced glare, increased thermal comfort, and improved occupant satisfaction and productivity.

High-performance windows are crucial to achieving low-energy buildings. Modifications to the frame, advanced glazing packages, and subcomponents are essential to achieving window performance that can surpass ENERGY STAR performance by more than three times. These include advanced glazing (e.g., thin triple or vacuum-insulated glazing [VIG]), higher-performing inert gas fills (e.g., krypton), or replacing the fill with a transparent low-conductivity solid material and developing highly insulated window spacers and frames (Figure ES-3).



**Figure ES-3. Thin-triple-pane glazing requires production engineering and will fit in about 80% of existing frames; VIGs need extensive R&D to become affordable and practical.**

Photos courtesy of LBNL.

For this report, modeling helped establish price and performance targets for residential and commercial windows. Table ES-1 summarizes these targets, which were guided by an energy savings analysis that includes future energy prices, building replacement and new construction rates, window replacement rates, and projected baseline (“business-as-usual”) improvements in window performance. The targets are based on energy savings estimates under a technical potential scenario, which assumes immediate national adoption of the specified high-performance windows and thus represents an upper bound on total energy savings potential.

This analysis used energy savings and the resulting utility bill savings with varying simple payback targets to determine market-acceptable price premiums for given window performance levels. The savings estimates from this analysis yield the following results: to be cost-effective in typical residential buildings, windows can have a total installed price premium of 2.10 \$/ft<sup>2</sup> window area for 0.17 U-factor windows (assuming a 5-year payback period), ranging to a total installed price premium of 6.60 \$/ft<sup>2</sup> window area for 0.077 U-factor windows (assuming a 10-year payback period). These varying cost-effectiveness thresholds, defined using simple payback, allow for a range of financing mechanisms for residential buildings to amortize the cost of window upgrades. For commercial buildings, total installed price premiums range from 2.70 \$/ft<sup>2</sup> window area to 10.10 \$/ft<sup>2</sup> window area for 0.17 and 0.1 U-factor windows assuming an acceptable payback of 3 and 7 years, respectively.

The difference between residential and commercial window installed price premiums is a result of the lower performance of existing commercial windows compared to residential windows and the low rates of window performance

upgrades in commercial buildings. The lower performance level of the existing window stock yields much larger per-building energy savings from upgrades in commercial buildings versus residential buildings, thus yielding better cost-effectiveness at higher installed prices. These targets are based on stock-wide performance, including both new construction and existing buildings. In general, upgrading existing buildings with new high-performance windows yields much greater energy savings compared to newer construction. Accordingly, primary energy savings decrease between 2030 and 2050 because of the gradual replacement of some older buildings with new construction that, by default, meets or exceeds projected future building energy codes. As a result, these new buildings deliver less savings with a given upgrade (e.g., to 0.17 U-factor) than existing buildings.

**Table ES-1. Whole-window performance and installed price premium targets are based on two cost-effective payback period ranges (5–10 years for residential and 3–7 years for commercial buildings) and the corresponding primary energy savings for the upper end of the performance range in 2030 and 2050.**


Windows								
Building Sector	Performance		Installed Price Premium		Primary Energy Savings (quads)		Avoided CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions (Mt)	
					2030	2050	2030	2050
Residential	0.17–0.077	U-Factor	2.10–6.60	\$/ft <sup>2</sup> window area	1.72	1.41	83.9	66.8
Commercial	0.17–0.1		2.70–10.10		0.89	0.64	48.0	34.9

Dynamic facades and glazing, including shading systems with variable solar heat gain control characteristics in response to diurnal and seasonal changes in heating and cooling demand, occupancy, and available daylight can substantially lower energy use compared with static glazing. With a 10-year target payback period, high-performance dynamic windows with an operating range between 0.05 and 0.65 solar heat gain coefficient<sup>3</sup> are 4.30 \$/ft<sup>2</sup> window area for residential buildings and 11.80 \$/ft<sup>2</sup> window area for commercial buildings by 2030. Ten-year payback periods allow for higher price premiums, though such long investment periods might only be feasible for some building owners. Buildings with the greatest energy savings potential include those with high window-wall ratios, high perimeter to floor area ratios, older, single-pane glazing and metal frames, and significant daytime winter heating or summer cooling needs. If all of these price and performance targets are successfully realized by 2030 and if the technologies are applied to the entire stock by 2050, annual U.S. primary energy savings would exceed 1.6 quads, or almost 2% of total U.S. primary energy use. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in 2050 would be reduced by almost 68 Mt annually, or about 1% of U.S. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

Novel approaches that rely on low-cost, high-throughput production methods could reduce product costs and expand availability of dynamic glazing and shading systems along with holistic building systems that can allow for longer investment scenarios. Self-powering systems (e.g., using photovoltaic [PV] cells, or transparent PV for glazing) for automated attachments and dynamic glazing would reduce installation and construction complexity while also simplifying ongoing maintenance. Additionally, improved control methods such as model predictive control and adaptive models using sensor inputs, user feedback, or machine learning algorithms can be used to improve energy efficiency performance and user satisfaction over the life of the installation (Figure ES-4). More broadly, the use of sensors and advanced controls to support the operation of high-performance dynamic facade technologies will likely be required.

Visible light redirection increases the usability of available natural light to illuminate interior spaces. The calculated installed price based on a technical potential scenario for light redirection systems, assuming 40% lighting energy savings, is 3.70 \$/ft<sup>2</sup> window area added into existing windows. Light redirection systems must be designed so that they avoid glare and thermal discomfort while still being aesthetically pleasing, and they usually require integration with sensors and controls to turn off electric lighting when not needed. Technologies that do not depend on side-lighting for visible light redirection have the potential to be effective for spaces with low or otherwise incompatible ceilings and for windowless interior spaces.

<sup>3</sup>Small differences in the solar heat gain coefficient range between the target and commercialized technologies should not significantly impact energy savings or market-acceptable price premiums.



**Figure ES-4. Dynamic window systems can be fully integrated with building energy management systems.**

Figure courtesy of LBNL.

## Accelerating Market Adoption

A small share of buildings each year receive window retrofits, and the majority of these window replacements do not take advantage of available high-performance window technologies. Window replacements are often perceived to be expensive, but when windows are already planned to be replaced, the incremental cost to install products with superior energy performance compared to the typical new window can be quite small. The ready availability of higher performance windows and customer and installer awareness of the additional energy and nonenergy benefits are among the barriers to broader adoption of higher-performance windows even when window replacements are already planned. These window replacements thus represent a missed opportunity for an energy performance upgrade for minimal additional cost. Through a range of deployment and market transformation activities, BTO seeks to accelerate the adoption of high-performance transparent facade technologies, especially retrofits of existing buildings, by increasing the total number of retrofits each year, and converting all updates to retrofits that reduce energy use associated with windows.

## Integration

The integration of advanced windows and integrated window system technologies into a building can be improved by the consideration of holistic system-level strategies as well as incorporating technologies and business practices from other industries. Window and opaque envelope features that can deliver energy savings also affect building occupants and the operation of major building subsystems, including space conditioning, ventilation, and lighting.


In residential buildings, advanced windows can allow for the downsizing of mechanical equipment and eliminate the need to run ductwork to the perimeter, typically installed above or below windows. Improved comfort and reduced peak cooling are additional benefits of advanced windows with appropriate solar control, and dynamic solar control can also offer passive heating in winter. Replacement of older windows can be a challenge because of high cost, but during major renovation, integration with wall systems can allow for entire home renovation that may also lead to increased property values. Thus, whole-house integrated solutions may offer increased financial viability and affordability that can be justified based on financing at the time of purchase or refinancing for upgrade, where the energy savings are greater than the increased monthly expenditures. These approaches are consistent with BTO's Advanced Building Construction (ABC) Initiative,<sup>4</sup> which seeks automation in whole-building design and renovation.

Commercial buildings also have significant opportunities for integration that help improve comfort and reduce HVAC system capacities. A major benefit is the ability to harvest natural daylight through automated solar control,

<sup>4</sup>See: <https://www.energy.gov/eere/buildings/what-advanced-building-construction-initiative>.

## Window Accelerated Deployment and Market Transformation

Realizing greater energy savings by increasing the installation of high-performance windows and attachments.




including dynamic glass and window shades. Integrated facade and electric lighting control systems have been shown to reduce whole-building energy use by approximately 20% [4] while reducing peak demand by up to 25%<sup>5</sup>. These integrated systems can have a particularly significant effect at the perimeter of the building, where peak period lighting demand can be reduced by 30–40%. System-level approaches can be pursued during design for new construction, which offer the greatest financial benefit, but they also can play a key role in building renovation. For example, secondary glazing systems can be incorporated as an upgrade to existing buildings without disrupting occupants. Solutions today include low-e glass panels (i.e., storm windows), but in the future they could include dynamic and vacuum glazing. Such windows could dramatically improve the thermal and optical performance of large glass facades, and the avoided cost of full HVAC system replacement can help offset window upgrade costs.

Energy used at different times and locations will vary in cost and impacts according to the fuel used, market structures, and technological constraints. For electricity, the increasing penetration of variable renewable energy generation underscores the need for additional flexibility to facilitate balancing electricity demand and supply. Active control of building electric loads can provide demand-side flexibility. BTO is developing a new strategy to elaborate the potential for buildings to provide grid services through demand flexibility, which complements BTO's continuing focus on energy savings [5].<sup>6</sup> Buildings that can automatically and dynamically adjust the timing of their electricity use in response to time of use or real time electricity rates could yield significant utility bill savings, and these savings could be an important benefit of windows and shading with dynamic solar control.

<sup>5</sup>This percentage represents median non-coincident peak electricity demand reduction by building type among simulated commercial buildings with window-wall ratios greater than 0.25.

<sup>6</sup>See: <https://www.energy.gov/eere/buildings/geb>



**Figure ES-5. Dynamic glazings have been field validated and show significant potential in reducing peak electricity demand, reducing total annual energy use, and improving comfort.**

Figure adapted from Gehbauer et al. [6] and photo courtesy of LBNL, Test Facility 71T.

## Market Transformation and Implementation

To realize the energy savings potential of novel technologies developed for windows, these technologies must be brought to market by companies that can market, sell, distribute, and support them, and adopted by building owners, architects, and builders. Beyond window technology development, BTO conducts technical field validation of advanced windows in collaboration with industrial partners. DOE also supports technical analyses to enable stakeholders to pursue downstream market activities. The building construction and window industry in the United States is a mature market with significant inertia; fundamental changes take time. Prevailing construction and building retrofit market conditions and adjacent factors can create significant barriers to technology uptake. These barriers can be financial, knowledge-related, or implementation-related. Approaches to addressing these barriers can include a range of voluntary actions, marketing and information sharing strategies, and policy interventions by stakeholders as well as technical assistance to enable industry and other stakeholders. Although the market is slow to mature, past BTO window successes have matured and today's window industry is producing much higher-performing products because of this federal investment. Key market studies have estimated the economic value of the energy savings as a result of double-pane low-e (e.g., ENERGY STAR) high market share to be \$150 billion [7]. The potential for dramatic improvements in the future is likely with continued technical innovation.

## About the Building Technologies Office

The mission of BTO is to invest in R&D and additional approaches that accelerate the development and adoption of novel technologies and practices that can improve the efficiency, reduce the energy costs, and reduce the carbon footprint of the nation's residential and commercial buildings, in both the new and existing buildings markets. Research supported by BTO is focused on reducing energy intensity and cost for technologies across the buildings sector, while maintaining or enhancing occupant comfort, productivity, and product performance. Progress supports the goal of reaching net-zero buildings-related carbon emissions by 2050. Achieving this goal will make building energy costs more affordable for U.S. families and businesses.

## About the BTO Emerging Technologies Program

The BTO Emerging Technologies Program<sup>7</sup> supports R&D for technologies, systems, and software tools that contribute to reductions in building energy use, improving energy efficiency to achieve targeted climate goals. The

<sup>7</sup>See: <https://www.energy.gov/eere/buildings/emerging-technologies>

Emerging Technologies Program provides R&D support in several areas: lighting; building equipment; building controls; building electric appliances, devices, and systems; windows; opaque envelope; and building energy modeling. The Emerging Technologies Program contributes to BTO's energy use intensity reduction goal by supporting the development of cost-effective, energy-efficient technologies. Broadly, to make significant progress toward BTO's goals, any next-generation envelope technologies must achieve widespread adoption. As a result, specific emphasis is placed on developing technologies that will have market-acceptable characteristics, including payback period and total installed price, aesthetics, durability, and sustained energy performance during the lifetime of the technology.

# Table of Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Buildings and Their Contribution to U.S. Energy Use	1
1.2 Influence of Windows on Building Energy Use	1
1.3 U.S. Department of Energy Building Technologies Office	5
1.4 BTO Emerging Technologies Program	6
1.5 Organization and Purpose of This Report	6
<b>2 Current Technologies—Opportunities and Challenges</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1 Highly Insulating IGUs	12
2.2 High-Performance Frames	13
2.3 Dynamic Facades and Daylighting	14
2.3.1 Fixed and Operable Attachments	15
2.3.2 Daylight Redirection	15
2.3.3 Dynamic Glazing	16
2.3.4 Dynamic Facades	16
2.4 Characterization of Window System Performance and Benefits	18
2.5 Cross-Cutting Barrier: Envelope Retrofit Adoption	19
<b>3 Future Technology Development</b>	<b>22</b>
3.1 High-Performance Windows	23
3.1.1 High-Performance Glazing	25
3.1.2 Highly Insulating Window Frames	26
3.2 Dynamic Facades and Glazing	29
3.2.1 Reducing Manufacturing Costs	31
3.2.2 Increasing Spectral Selectivity	31
3.2.3 Wired Systems	32
3.2.4 Improving Dynamic Facade Component Sensors, Controls, and System Integration	33
3.3 Visible Light Redirection	34
3.4 Systems-Level Performance Evaluation and Characterization of Windows	37
<b>4 Integration</b>	<b>38</b>
4.1 Systems-Level Approach	38
4.1.1 Building Construction and Retrofit with a Systems-Level Approach	38
4.1.2 Incorporating New Technologies With Advanced Building Construction Approaches	39
4.2 Grid-interactive Efficient Buildings	41
4.2.1 Grid Services and Dynamic Building Operations	41
4.2.2 Co-Benefit of High-Performance Windows: Energy Resilience	42
4.2.3 GEB-Relevant Window Technologies	42
<b>5 Market Transformation and Implementation</b>	<b>48</b>
5.1 Technology Development Pathway	48
5.2 Facilitating Technology Adoption With Market Transformation Partners	49
5.2.1 Financing	51
5.2.2 Window Market Awareness	51
5.2.3 Whole-Building Market Awareness	52
5.3 Stakeholder Engagement in Technology Implementation	53
<b>References</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Appendix A Establishing Technology Performance and Price Targets</b>	<b>62</b>

## List of Figures

Figure ES-1.Primary energy use by end use in residential and commercial buildings . . . . .	vi
Figure ES-2. Insulated glass unit (IGU) configuration market shares from 1970 to 2017 . . . . .	vii
Figure ES-3. Photographs of double-pane, thin-triple-pane, and vacuum-insulated glazing . . . . .	viii
Figure ES-4. Dynamic transparent facade data and control flow diagram . . . . .	x
Figure ES-5. Dynamic glazing impact on peak electricity demand and photograph of evaluation of dynamic glazing in a test facility . . . . .	xii
Figure 1. U.S. primary energy use by sector . . . . .	1
Figure 2. Primary energy use by end use in residential and commercial buildings . . . . .	2
Figure 3. Primary energy use by building envelope component . . . . .	3
Figure 4. Composition of the residential and commercial building stock among new and existing buildings in 2021 and 2050 . . . . .	4
Figure 5. Heat transfer modes within an IGU . . . . .	9
Figure 6. Heat transfer through window frames and the impact of thermal bridging . . . . .	10
Figure 7. Cutaway diagram of a vinyl-frame window and IGU . . . . .	10
Figure 8. IGU configuration market shares from 1970 to 2017 . . . . .	12
Figure 9. Window U-factor as a function of frame U-factor, frame area, and IGU type . . . . .	14
Figure 10. Photographs of dynamic glazing installations . . . . .	17
Figure 11. Window software tools and characterization facilities . . . . .	20
Figure 12. Price premiums for residential and commercial windows as a function of U-factor and payback period . . . . .	25
Figure 13. Arconic OptiQ window cutaway and thermal performance plot . . . . .	27
Figure 14. Photographs of additive manufacturing of forms for precast building facade panels . . . . .	40
Figure 15. Indoor temperatures after a utility service interruption in the winter . . . . .	43
Figure 16. Indoor temperatures after a utility service interruption in the summer . . . . .	43
Figure 17. Hourly electric load from a home with either a typical or high-performance building envelope . . . . .	44
Figure 18. Dynamic glazing impact on peak electricity demand . . . . .	46
Figure 19. Dynamic transparent facade data and control flow diagram . . . . .	47
Figure 20. Technology commercialization process . . . . .	49
Figure 21. Example Home Energy Score report . . . . .	53


## List of Tables

Table ES-1. Whole-Window Performance and Installed Price Premium Targets for 2030 and Corresponding Primary Energy Savings in 2030 and 2050 . . . . .	ix
Table 1. 2016 Window Sales for Residential and Commercial Buildings . . . . .	3
Table 2. Residential Retrofit Projects Undertaken in 2019 in Owner-Occupied Units . . . . .	4
Table 3. Commercial Retrofit Projects Undertaken in 2012 . . . . .	5
Table 4. Summary of Major Challenges and Opportunities by Opportunity Area . . . . .	8
Table 5. Whole-Window Performance and Installed Price Premium Targets for 2030 and Corresponding Primary Energy Savings and Avoided CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions in 2030 and 2050 . . . . .	25
Table 6. Critical Characteristics for High-Performance Windows (IGUs and Frames) . . . . .	28
Table 7. Future Research Opportunities Related to IGUs and Window Frames . . . . .	29
Table 8. Dynamic Window Performance and Installed Price Premium Targets for 2030 and Corresponding Primary Energy Savings and Avoided CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions in 2030 and 2050 . . . . .	30
Table 9. Critical Characteristics for Dynamic Glazing . . . . .	34
Table 10. Future Research Opportunities Related to Dynamic Glazing and Facades . . . . .	34
Table 11. Visible Light Redirection Performance and Installed Price Premium Targets for 2030 and Corresponding Primary Energy Savings and Avoided CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions in 2030 and 2050 . . . . .	35
Table 12. Critical Characteristics of Daylighting and Visible Light Redirection Technologies . . . . .	36
Table 13. Future Research Opportunities Related to Daylighting and Visible Light Redirection Systems . . . . .	37
Table 14. Possible Stakeholder Supporting Activities . . . . .	54

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Buildings and Their Contribution to U.S. Energy Use

Modern buildings need energy to provide heating and cooling, to operate appliances and devices, and to illuminate spaces. The building services provided through energy use are central to the purposes that buildings serve in our society—and this energy adds up. In 2021, residential and commercial buildings in the United States contributed 20.8 and 17 quadrillion Btu (quads), or 21.8% and 17.9%, to total U.S. primary energy use, respectively [1]. As shown in Figure 1, residential and commercial buildings together represent more domestic energy use than either the industrial or transportation sectors. On a primary energy basis, electricity composes a majority of building energy use: 27.1 quads or 72% of all building energy use [1]. Direct fossil fuel use in buildings is limited to only a few end uses, such as heating, water heating, and cooking, but still represents 10.1 quads or 26.6% of primary energy use in buildings [1].



**Figure 1. Residential and commercial buildings together are the largest single sector of primary energy use in the United States.**


Data from the U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) 2021 Annual Energy Outlook [1].

The breakdown of energy use among building services and devices (i.e., end uses) for an individual building can vary widely depending on the building type or function, square footage (size), local climate, and many other factors. More generally, the division of U.S. buildings' energy use among end uses differs between residential and commercial buildings, as shown in Figure 2. For residential buildings, energy use is dominated by space conditioning—heating and cooling—comprising 9.1 quads, or 44% of total residential energy use [1]. Water heating (2.9 quads, 14%) and refrigeration (0.8 quads, 2.8%) are also significant contributors, and together with space conditioning, represent more than 60% of total residential energy use [1]. In commercial buildings, space conditioning and mechanical ventilation together remain the dominant end use (5.2 quads, 30%) [1]. Lighting is also a significant contributor to primary energy use that is relevant to windows, representing 1.3 quads or 7.8% of the total in commercial buildings [1].

## 1.2 Influence of Windows on Building Energy Use

Both transparent (i.e., windows) and opaque (i.e., walls, roof, and foundation) components of the building envelope protect building occupants from undesirable external environmental conditions. Some envelope elements can also be configured to take advantage of desirable external conditions by allowing visible light, infrared radiation, or air to pass through. Both strategies—leveraging desirable external environmental conditions and mitigating the influence of undesirable conditions—can reduce the need for space conditioning and electric lighting, and thus reduce energy use associated with lighting and heating, cooling, and ventilating equipment.

High-performance windows, such as those discussed in this report, have substantial potential to reduce energy use in buildings. Data in Figure 2 show that 38% of U.S. buildings' primary energy use is from space heating and cooling. Figure 3 shows the breakdown of that energy use by envelope component—both windows (through heat conduction



**Figure 2. Apart from “other uses” in commercial buildings, heating is the largest single end-use contributor to total primary energy use in both residential and commercial buildings. When all space conditioning-related end uses—heating, cooling, fans and pumps, and ventilation—are taken together, they represent significantly more energy than any other end use. These end uses (along with lighting, to a lesser degree), highlighted with darker bars, represent the energy that can be reduced with performance improvements in windows.**


Data from the EIA 2021 Annual Energy Outlook [1].

and solar heat gain) and the opaque envelope.<sup>8</sup> The opaque envelope is represented by the major building elements where sensible heat transfer<sup>9</sup> occurs—the roof, walls, and foundation. Air and moisture flows that carry sensible and latent heat into or out of the building (denoted by “air leakage”) pass primarily through interfaces between components, such as around window sashes and frames, between window frames and rough openings, between walls and the roof and foundation, and around miscellaneous penetrations through the opaque envelope (e.g., ducts and electrical outlets). Based on the data shown in Figure 3, for both residential and commercial buildings, the components that offer the greatest opportunity for energy savings (meaning they represent the largest contributors to energy use) are air leakage, walls, and conduction through windows. The data shown in Figure 3 represent U.S. totals, and the balance of energy use among envelope components varies by climate zone. For example, solar heat gain through windows reduces net HVAC energy use in heating-dominated climates, but not in cooling-dominated climates. Related to this, as single-pane windows are replaced with low-emissivity (low-e) double-pane windows, significant overall energy savings are realized, but passive solar heat gain benefits are diminished. Note that the data in Figure 3 do not include the potential lighting energy savings from the management of visible light available from windows or skylights to offset electric lighting needs (“daylighting”).

Taken together, windows for new construction and for retrofits of existing buildings represent a substantial market in the United States, as shown in Table 1. Notably, in residential buildings, the retrofit market is already larger—by number of units sold—than the new construction market. Novel technologies that are appropriate for retrofits are therefore especially relevant to the current market. In commercial buildings, new construction dominates, but retrofits still make up one-third of the total market. Technologies that can reduce the price of commercial building window retrofits or expand the nonenergy benefits of replacement windows might help increase the uptake of new

<sup>8</sup>These data do not account for the potential for daylighting to reduce lighting loads.

<sup>9</sup>“Sensible heat” denotes heat transfer that causes the temperature of the system to be increased or decreased. “Latent heat” denotes heat transfer that occurs without a change in temperature; it relates to the difference in how a 90°F day feels in Phoenix and Atlanta. In the context of the building envelope, this type of heat transfer is associated with the movement of water vapor (i.e., changes in humidity) through the opaque envelope.



**Figure 3. The breakdown of heating, cooling, and ventilation system energy use attributable to building envelope components in residential and commercial buildings shows that the opaque envelope is the single largest contributor to envelope-related energy use, followed by air leakage and heat conduction through windows. Bars with negative values represent component contributions that reduce energy use (e.g., solar heat gain through windows in the heating season).**

Data from Scout [8].

**Table 1. The breakdown of window sales in 2016 by millions of units (residential) and million square feet (commercial) shows that although both sectors have some sales to existing buildings, the retrofit market share in commercial buildings lags significantly behind that of residential buildings.**

Data from the American Architectural Manufacturers Association [9].


	Residential (million units)	Commercial (million ft <sup>2</sup> )
New Construction	21.4	306
Existing/Retrofit	27.6	152
Total	49.1	458

windows as part of commercial building retrofit projects. Of particular interest, 105 million square feet of the 458 million square feet of commercial windows delivered in 2016 were for curtain wall systems [9].

The composition of the building stock changes over time as new buildings are built and some old buildings are demolished, but existing buildings, particularly residential buildings, tend to persist in the U.S. building stock. Figure 4 shows the effect of building construction and demolition on the prevalence of “existing” buildings (built before 2021) and “new” buildings (built in or after 2021); residential buildings are shown by housing unit and commercial buildings by available square footage. Because windows, air- and water-resistive barriers, and insulation are built into the envelope at the time of construction, it is generally easiest to augment the energy performance of the envelope during initial construction.

Though it might be easiest to incorporate high-performance envelope components in new construction, the data in Figure 4 highlight the importance of developing technologies that are also suitable for retrofit of existing buildings. By 2050, these data indicate that 40% of the commercial square footage existing today will have been supplanted, though projected growth in the commercial buildings sector means that 56% of the commercial square footage in 2050 will have been built in or after 2021. In the residential sector, 114 million housing units that exist today—93% of the stock—will still be in service in 2050.

Table 2 shows the approximate number of retrofits of various envelope components in millions of owner-occupied housing units in 2015. These data show that some retrofits, particularly those that involve key critical structural



**Figure 4. To maximize energy savings, new technologies must be suitable for retrofitting existing buildings, particularly in the residential sector, where by 2050, nearly three-quarters of the building stock will still be composed of “existing” buildings—those built before 2021. A greater share of the commercial building stock built before 2021 is expected to be demolished by 2050 compared to the residential building stock, but even then, approximately 60% of square footage existing in 2021 will remain in the stock in 2050.**

Data from the EIA 2021 Annual Energy Outlook [1].

**Table 2. In residential buildings, windows/doors and roofs are replaced at rates comparable to HVAC systems, though with widely differing median project sizes. The median expenditure for window and door replacements suggests only a few windows are typically being replaced, as compared to substantial or complete replacement of the heating or cooling system in HVAC projects.**

Data from U.S. Census Bureau 2019 American Housing Survey [10].

	Number of Projects (millions)	Median Expenditure
HVAC	10.5	\$4,000
Insulation	2.6	\$900
Windows/Doors	7.3	\$1,500
Roofing	7.1	\$7,000
Siding	2.1	\$3,500

or life safety components (e.g., roofs) are pursued more frequently, in spite of their high prices, than retrofits to insulation or siding that might be principally to improve aesthetics or thermal comfort. HVAC systems are shown as a cost and scale point of comparison to underscore that although HVAC systems must often be replaced because of major mechanical faults, other envelope components are also regularly replaced. The replacement of envelope components at a rate that approaches or even exceeds the total number of new housing units built each year suggests that there might be meaningful opportunities for package retrofits that simultaneously repair or replace a major envelope component and improve energy performance. Table 3 shows renovation data for commercial buildings in 2012. These data show similar relationships between upgrade rates for different envelope components, where roof replacements occur at rates comparable to HVAC system upgrades and replacements, while insulation upgrades lag behind.

Novel approaches discussed in this report have the potential to increase the retrofit rates or adoption of envelope energy performance upgrades for existing buildings by addressing the labor requirements (and concomitant price implications), disruption to building occupants, and other factors that currently limit the frequency of window replacements. Furthermore, in many cases window replacement is not an option, but window attachments such as low-e panels (storm windows), cellular shades, low-e window films, and a large variety of shading products can be added to existing windows to improve performance. Recently, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) supported the

**Table 3. Among commercial buildings constructed before 2008, roof replacement occurred at a rate nearly comparable to HVAC system upgrade or replacement. Other envelope upgrades were less prevalent, led by windows and followed by insulation upgrades and other exterior wall renovations.**

Data from EIA 2012 Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey [12].

	Number of Buildings (millions)	Percentage of Pre-2008 Buildings
HVAC	1.10	21.0%
Insulation	0.38	7.2%
Windows	0.56	10.7%
Roof	0.99	18.8%
Exterior Walls	0.19	3.7%

formation of the Attachment Energy Rating Council, which has developed initial product ratings and is continuing to add more product categories [11].

### 1.3 U.S. Department of Energy Building Technologies Office

Research supported by DOE's Building Technologies Office (BTO) is focused on reducing energy intensity and cost for technologies across the buildings sector, while maintaining or enhancing occupant comfort, productivity, and product performance. In essence, a building must use energy more productively and efficiently, not only use less energy. Progress toward achieving this goal will make building energy costs more affordable—especially beneficial to U.S. families and businesses.

BTO's approach to improving energy productivity includes its grid-interactive efficient building (GEB)<sup>10</sup> strategy, which advances the role buildings can play in energy system operations and planning. This strategy includes both new and existing residential and commercial buildings, including their end-use equipment. BTO's strategy supports greater affordability, resilience, environmental performance, reliability, and other goals, recognizing that:

- Building end uses can be dynamically managed to help meet grid needs and minimize electricity system costs, while meeting occupants' comfort and productivity requirements.
- Technologies like rooftop photovoltaics, electrochemical and thermal energy storage, combined heat and power, and other distributed energy resources can be co-optimized with buildings to provide greater value and resilience to both utility customers and the electricity system.
- The value of energy efficiency, demand response, and other services provided by behind-the-meter distributed energy resources can vary by location, hour, season, and year.

Developing next-generation building technologies, including building materials, components, equipment, energy models, and systems, is critical to increasing energy productivity cost-effectively.

To achieve these objectives, BTO sponsors R&D efforts that target improving the largest energy uses within buildings (shown in Figure 2): lighting, space conditioning, water heating, appliances, and miscellaneous electric loads, as well as the building envelopes themselves. BTO's R&D support also includes system-level efforts, including developing algorithms for improved energy modeling and system controls required to better predict and manage energy-efficient equipment and whole-building energy usage, particularly to enable grid-responsive operations.

BTO collaborates with industry, academia, and other leaders across the building sector to develop, validate, and verify solutions that help building owners and homeowners reduce energy use. Ultimately, design and decision tools

<sup>10</sup> A grid-interactive efficient building is an energy-efficient building that uses smart technologies and on-site distributed energy resources to provide flexibility while co-optimizing for energy cost, grid services, and occupant needs and preferences, in a continuous and integrated way. For more information, see the *Grid-interactive Efficient Buildings Technical Report Series. The Overview of Research Challenges and Gaps* report can be found at <https://www1.eere.energy.gov/buildings/pdfs/75470.pdf> and contains introductory information as well as links to the other four technical reports in the series.

developed with BTO support help building owners and operators apply efficient building operational practices and technologies through improved understanding of their costs and benefits, resulting in more cost-effective, comfortable, and healthy buildings.

Finally, BTO works with industry, professional societies, trade groups, and nonprofits such as ASTM and ASHRAE to develop and implement methods to evaluate and validate the energy performance of building components. BTO also evaluates changes to model building energy codes developed by ASHRAE and the International Code Council, which inform state and local building code processes. While the weight of glass and the lead time of window manufacturing means that most windows in the U.S. are manufactured domestically, BTO's continuing investment in advancing high-performance window technologies can help ensure that U.S. window manufacturing remains relevant in the global market.

## 1.4 BTO Emerging Technologies Program

The BTO Emerging Technologies program supports R&D for technologies, systems, and software tools that can contribute to improving energy efficiency and load flexibility. The Emerging Technologies program provides R&D support in several areas: lighting; building equipment; building controls; building electric appliances, devices, and systems; windows; opaque envelope; and building energy modeling. The majority of Emerging Technologies funding is distributed competitively through solicitations (i.e., Funding Opportunity Announcements), which in general are open to applications from large industry, small businesses, academia, national laboratories, and other entities. BTO also invests in state-of-the-art capabilities at DOE national laboratories that support its mission; these facilities are available to the buildings R&D community for cooperative research, component evaluation, and product performance validation. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) is designated the core window energy performance laboratory, and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) is designated as the enabling laboratory for window durability. Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) is designated as the enabling laboratory for window air and moisture leakage, and Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) is designated as the enabling laboratory for window market transformation.

The Emerging Technologies program contributes to BTO's energy use intensity reduction goal by supporting the development of cost-effective, energy-efficient technologies. Broadly, to make significant progress toward BTO's goals, any next-generation window technologies must achieve widespread adoption. As a result, specific emphasis is placed on developing technologies that will have market-acceptable characteristics, including payback period and total installed price, aesthetics, durability, and sustained energy performance over the lifetime of the technology.

## 1.5 Organization and Purpose of This Report

This report focuses on R&D for energy-efficient window technologies. It is the result of collaboration with prominent researchers and leaders in the field and aims to provide strategic guidance for BTO's investments in developing the next generation of high-performance, cost-competitive windows.

The R&D opportunities identified in this report are predicated on an assessment of the need for improvements in the performance of windows. This assessment is included in Section 2, "Current Technologies—Opportunities and Challenges," and provides the motivation for the fundamental and enabling research areas identified in Section 3, "Future Technology Development." Section 3 includes a discussion of the current state of research, future research opportunities, technology-specific performance metrics, and the associated national energy savings potential. Technical, manufacturing, and market risks are also noted briefly in Section 3. The final two sections address topics that are important to the successful market entry of the technologies in Section 3. Section 4, "Integration," addresses two opportunities to fully realize a broader value proposition for envelope technologies: the adoption of a systems-level approach to new building design and deep retrofit planning, and the application of envelope technologies to benefit electric grid operations. Section 5, "Market Transformation and Implementation," examines the technology transfer landscape as it relates to moving technologies from early-stage R&D to market-ready, commercially available products. Section 5 discusses the roles of industry, academia, national laboratories, and other public- and private-sector entities alongside BTO in accelerating technology R&D and commercialization, and facilitating market readiness.

This report is a reconsideration of the technology R&D opportunities, technical risks, and deployment barriers presented in the 2014 roadmap [13]. Many of the technology R&D opportunities discussed in this report are also mentioned in that earlier document. This report seeks to build on the earlier effort by broadening the discussion of technical needs and opportunities and moving that discussion forward to fully encapsulate the R&D technology directions detailed in Section 3. This report also goes beyond the 2014 report to address system-level impacts, load flexibility, grid interaction, and resilience.

This report does not provide an exhaustive presentation of all of the R&D opportunities related to windows. The research opportunities presented in this report are seen as the most promising and impactful as they relate to national energy savings, consumer benefits, technical risks, and other factors that might affect the suitability of these R&D opportunities for future investment. This report includes some discussion of manufacturing risks, market barriers, and other concerns not directly tied to R&D, but it does not include an extensive treatment of these factors, only so much as is needed to provide context for and a robust appraisal of the various research directions presented. Similarly, because the focus in this document is on R&D program strategy, regulatory programs and incentive or rebate design are beyond our scope.

By articulating opportunities of particular importance and potential energy use impact, and the barriers inhibiting their progress, this report may help inform the strategic direction of BTO in soliciting and selecting innovative technology solutions to overcome technical barriers and ultimately help fulfill the BTO mission and goal.

Successful research, development, market entry, and widespread adoption of novel window technologies requires sustained, long-term, high-risk research investment. Collaboration between academia, national laboratories, government, and private industry is critical to achieving these objectives. This report is intended to be a resource to assist in this process for the range of entities involved in the development and deployment of these technologies—state and local governments; utilities; academic, national laboratory, and private-sector researchers; international organizations; and others—and as such it will continue to be refined and updated as the market develops and as technology matures.


## 2 Current Technologies—Opportunities and Challenges

This section outlines the challenges of existing window technologies and the opportunities for R&D and novel technology development to address these challenges. These challenges include not only technology characteristics that directly affect energy use at the component level, such as thermal conductivity, but also factors that might influence total U.S. long-term energy savings potential by reducing or increasing technology adoption, such as installation price, quality control and repeatability, durability, and retrofit suitability, among others. This discussion of challenges, which is structured by technology area, provides the motivation for future technology R&D and outlines the potential impact that improvements in these technology areas could have on occupant comfort, durability, and building energy use. A summary of the major challenges and opportunities by opportunity area, corresponding to the subsections within this section, is given in Table 4. Section 3 describes the specific improvements to be made, novel technologies to be researched, and supporting tools to be developed to address these challenges.

**Table 4. Each opportunity area in this section articulates specific opportunities and challenges faced by the current state-of-the-art that should be targeted through novel R&D activities, which are further discussed in Section 3.**

Opportunity Areas	Opportunities and Challenges
Highly Insulating IGUs (Section 2.1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low-cost, highly insulating interpane cavity filling materials</li> <li>• Lower-conductivity spacers</li> <li>• Thin and light (double-pane equivalent thickness and weight) insulated glass unit (IGU) configurations that achieve lower U-factor than existing double-pane IGUs.</li> </ul>
Highly Insulating Frames (Section 2.2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduced air leakage</li> <li>• Novel materials for low thermal conductivity wood, polymer, and metal frames</li> <li>• Novel frame geometries to reduce heat transfer.</li> </ul>
Improved Light Control at the Facade (Section 2.3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decoupling of solar control and visible light transmission</li> <li>• Lighting controls that account for available daylight</li> <li>• More flexible daylight redirection for interior spaces</li> <li>• Simplification of installation and commissioning</li> <li>• Facade system controls that can balance energy savings with occupant optical and thermal comfort.</li> </ul>
Advanced Window Performance Characterization (Section 2.4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integration of window simulation tools into existing computer aided design (CAD) software workflows</li> <li>• Novel methods to manage computational expense for daylighting simulations and controls operation</li> <li>• Integration of window and attachment performance into building information modeling tools to capture the full value of high-performance facades.</li> </ul>

Windows are the transparent portion of the building envelope, and thus serve many of the same functions as the opaque envelope. Additional functions not shared with the opaque envelope include admitting daylight, providing views to the outdoors, allowing natural ventilation, and permitting solar heating that can offset heating energy requirements in cold weather. Windows often incorporate operable elements that facilitate the exchange of indoor and outdoor air. Windows also often have “attachments”—blinds, shades, awnings, or other interior- or exterior-mounted devices that can be used to moderate daylight, provide privacy, and reduce unwanted solar heat gain, resulting in improved comfort and reduced energy use. The adjustable features of windows and window attachments offer the potential for dynamic heat, air, and moisture exchange through the envelope; this ability to operate dynamically could provide GEB services if combined with appropriate sensors, controls, and actuation systems [14]. Opportunities remain for both energy efficiency improvements in windows and window attachments, as well as improvements that can enable their GEB potential and expand that potential through further developments in both the dynamic elements themselves and the components that facilitate their automated operation.




**Figure 5. Heat transfer between the building interior and ambient exterior through the glazed portion of the window can occur through conduction, convection, and radiation. The extent of the heat transfer by each mode depends on weather conditions, interior temperature and air movement, and the design of the window itself. Heat transfer also occurs by all three modes through the frame as well (not shown), though the relative contributions of the modes will differ from the glazing. The total heat transfer per unit surface area through the frame will likely far exceed that of the glazing for a typical new window.**

Figure courtesy of LBNL.

Modern windows have undergone decades of refinement, which has dramatically improved energy performance compared to their single-pane ancestors [15] (see the Enabling a Game Changer: Low-Emissivity Coatings success story). In spite of these improvements, typical new windows still have R-values around R-3.5 (U-factor of around 0.29), whereas a well-insulated wall might be R-20 and a roof system R-50 or higher. The overall performance of a window system is a combination of the individual window components' performance. Although actual performance of the same window system can vary considerably depending on different building designs, installation quality, and environmental conditions, the window design usually represents a trade-off between cost and a range of desired performance attributes, including structural performance, thermal performance, solar heat gain, aesthetics, and others. Optimizing the energy performance of windows must take into account heat conduction, convection, and radiation while also ensuring that aesthetic considerations are satisfied—adequate visible light transmission, minimum spectral attenuation, low haze, and high clarity.


Figure 5 illustrates the effects of the various modes of heat transfer on the glazed portion of a window. Conductive heat losses occur through both the glazing and the frame of the window, but frame conductive losses contribute substantially more overall heat loss in multiple-pane windows. Heat conduction through the window frame and glazing is dissipated from the surface to the surroundings by convection and long-wave radiation, accelerating heat losses. Control of solar radiation through windows is also critical to their energy performance. Windows that permit appreciable solar heat gain in colder climates will generally help offset building heating loads, while the same windows in warmer climates will result in increased cooling loads relative to lower solar heat gain windows. In addition to the aforementioned simple heat transfer scenarios, the interfaces between different window components or materials can act as weak points for thermal energy transfer (“thermal bridges”) if not designed properly. Figure 6 illustrates the dramatic impact on heat transfer, and ultimately on energy performance, that arises from thermal bridging in window frames. A holistic perspective must be taken when identifying opportunities for improving window systems for higher thermal performance while maintaining favorable aesthetics and comfort at reasonable cost.

The major components of a modern window are depicted in Figure 7. Typically, two or more glazings (glass panes) are combined and separated by spacers at the interface with the window frame that supports the glazings. Frames



**Figure 6. A simulation of heat transfer through a commercial window assembly shows the impact of thermal bridging. In the left panel, a bolt connecting an exterior frame component exposed to the cold outside air acts as a conduction pathway to the interior of the building, thus transferring warmth from the building to the exterior and making the adjacent interior surface cold. The right panel shows that when that fastener is replaced with an insulating component, heat in the building interior is retained better, which is indicated by the lighter color (higher temperature) on the interior side of the window compared to the left panel.**

Figure created by Alfred Hicks, NREL.



**Figure 7. A typical residential “vinyl” (unplasticized polyvinyl chloride [uPVC]) frame window with a double-pane IGU has some voids and inserts in the frame profile to reduce thermal conductivity. The double-pane IGU, argon gas fill between the panes of glass, and warm-edge spacer all contribute to further reducing the thermal conductivity, measured as U-factor or R-value, of the assembled window.**

Figure created by Alfred Hicks, NREL.

for residential windows employ a combination of plastics, metal (aluminum), wood, and thermally insulating materials, depending on the target market, whereas windows for commercial and high-rise residential buildings use

aluminum because of its superior structural properties. Multiple glazing layers increase the thermal resistance of the window. Air occupies the interstitial space between glazings in simple multiglazed windows, but higher-performance windows are often filled with lower thermal conductivity gases, such as argon or krypton. A low-e coating is typically added to surface 3 for cold climates and surface 2 for hot climates. The low-e coating used in hot climates is typically spectrally selective, thus admitting more visible light for an equivalent solar heat reduction compared to standard low-e coatings. In colder climates, a low-e coating can also often be found on surface 4 (shown in Figure 7), which reflects ambient infrared heat back into the interior space. In warmer climates, window films/coatings can be applied to exterior glazing surfaces (surface 1) to block transmission of a portion of the heat from visible and near-infrared (NIR) light. Extensive reviews of the design of residential and commercial window systems can be found in Carmody et al. [16] and Carmody et al. [17], respectively. Updated information regarding residential window systems as well as general information about window technologies and their effect on building energy use is available from the Efficient Windows Collaborative website.<sup>11</sup> Updated information on residential window attachments is available from the Efficient Window Coverings website.<sup>12</sup>

### Enabling a Game Changer: Low-Emissivity Coatings

Approximately 85% of residential and 50% of commercial windows sold today (98% of energy-efficient windows) incorporate low-emissivity (“low-e”) coatings. DOE’s 40-year continuous support of low-e windows has transformed the windows market and directly contributed to this technology’s dominant status in the window industry globally. DOE investments, from initial R&D through modern ratings updates, have resulted in extensive cost savings within the building industry as well as among consumers. This technology, which involves microscopically thin coatings that allow visible light but block radiant and solar heat, now serves as a technology platform for further innovations related to coatings and glazing.

#### History

DOE funding to Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) in the 1970s and 1980s jumpstarted the low-e R&D efforts, with the intent of understanding the mechanisms of window heat transfer, reducing heat losses, and paving the way for private industry to commercialize the process. This research led to additional funding for an LBNL partnership with a startup company that created the first commercial low-e glass in the 1980s. The demonstrated potential of this technology and the success of the startup partnership inspired major window and glass manufacturers to rapidly accelerate their own investment in low-e research, coating technology, and better window products.

As low-e sales grew in the 1980s and 1990s, DOE helped bolster public trust (and the trust of manufacturers and industry) in this technology’s savings potential by funding facilities to produce performance data. Researchers disseminated those data to code officials, utilities, and research staff from window manufacturers, helping address concerns and build confidence. DOE also funded LBNL to adapt its window performance software tools to be used by the newly created National Fenestration Rating Council (NFRC). This allowed consumers access to an objective and certified resource to help them select windows, and NFRC ratings are now invaluable reference values for national and state codes and standards, as well as for successful programs like ENERGY STAR®. More than 80% of residential windows today are modeled using LBNL’s simulation tools and certified with NFRC ratings.

#### Looking Forward


Continued DOE support allows for upgraded software tools and standardized labeling programs that meet the evolving needs of modern manufacturers, code officials, homebuilders, and the NFRC. Current efforts also make these technologies increasingly cost-effective and contribute to DOE’s ultimate vision for windows—producing solutions that are energy positive and windows that perform even better than insulating walls. DOE’s essential role in developing this technology helped turn low-e windows from a rarity a few decades ago into an integral part of the U.S. building industry today; this success sets the bar for future cutting-edge energy research.

<sup>11</sup>See: <https://www.efficientwindows.org>

<sup>12</sup>See: <https://efficientwindowcoverings.org>

## 2.1 Highly Insulating IGUs

Glazing systems—referring to the assembly of glass and required ancillary components, but not the frame—represent a major opportunity to improve the thermal performance of windows because of their high area ratio in a window (typically 70%–85% of the window area is glazing). In the United States, typical high-performance windows today have double glazing with one or two low-e coatings (one facing the glazing cavity and the other facing the building interior) and 90%–95% argon gas fill. In residential applications, this configuration is equivalent to U-factors of 0.33 to 0.22. Whole-window U-factor can be decreased further in the insulated glass unit (IGU) by increasing the number of panes or adding transparent thermally resistive films in between panes. However, each additional pane requires another spacer system, so the frame and sash will normally require redesign to ensure structural stability with the increases in thickness and weight from the added panes. Although using an intermediate suspended film adds negligible weight to a double-pane IGU, the cost of the suspended low-e film, complex fabrication process, and durability and reliability issues resulting from the tension applied to the suspended film have precluded widespread adoption. Figure 8 shows the rapid adoption of double-pane IGUs and low-e coatings in the U.S. residential market, contrasted with the limited adoption of triple-pane IGUs. As of 2016, triple-glazed windows represent less than 2% of all U.S. windows sold [3].



**Figure 8. Residential glazing market share trends show that low-e coatings have seen rapid adoption since their introduction, while triple-pane IGUs have remained a small portion of the overall market. Commercial glazing shows similar relative trends in the adoption of low-e coatings and triple-pane glazing, but with lower overall adoption of both technologies.**

Figure updated from Selkowitz, Hart, and Curcija [3].

Vacuum-insulated glazing (VIG) has the potential to yield superior thermal performance compared to multiple glazing IGUs, typically reaching center-of-glass thermal resistances of 0.125 to 0.083 U-factor. However, VIGs continue to face challenges with respect to cost, durability, edge seal reliability, and the ability to easily fabricate windows in a wide range of sizes and shapes. Further research is needed to improve the reliability and resilience of VIG technology, reduce complexity of fabrication, improve edge sealing, and improve glass structural characteristics and system thermal expansion management to reduce distortion of the VIG under thermal stress.

Opportunities remain to improve the performance of existing IGU configurations as well. Low-e coatings are required for virtually all insulating windows, and most IGUs need gas fills in addition to low-e coatings to achieve the optimal thermal performance. Low-e coatings are mature technologies for use in protected IGU cavities and are available with a wide range of solar control and light transmission properties in addition to low emissivity. There is some remaining opportunity to improve the performance, durability, and cost of low-e coatings now used in the interior-room-facing surface (surface 4, as shown in Figure 7) and potential for expanding use to the exterior surface (surface 1). Current metal oxide low-e coatings can interfere with high-frequency radio transmissions, such as those being investigated for 5G networks above 24 GHz. Additional research might be needed to develop alternatives to traditional low-e coating materials that are compatible with high-frequency transmissions used in emerging and future cellular network systems. Argon is the preferred gas for filling sealed IGU cavities because of its low cost. The typical IGU gas-filling process in use today—two-probe filling—is simple, but wasteful because argon is plentiful and very low cost. The thinner cavities in triple-pane IGUs require a lower thermal conductivity gas, such as krypton, which is more expensive than argon. Higher-performance IGUs that require low thermal conductivity gases will therefore benefit from more efficient filling processes. Alternatively, fill materials besides noble gases might be able to be used in between panes, achieving a similar effect, potentially with superior insulating performance.


To prevent condensation on interior surfaces of windows, in addition to insulating glazing and frames, spacer systems (the part of the IGU that separates and maintains space between glass panes) need to be insulating as well. Insulating spacer systems increase the temperature of the glass's edges and immediate spacer area and are often made out of polymer materials. These materials must have limited off-gassing, so that interior low-e surfaces are not fouled, and desiccants are also added to trap any moisture that can get past the spacer and between the panes. Spacers are subject to structural loads like the rest of the components in the window assembly; high structural loads, such as those imposed by the most stringent structural performance rating from the American Architectural Manufacturers Association—the Architectural Window rating—creates a particular challenge for relatively soft and flexible polymeric spacers. An opportunity exists for the development of spacer systems that can meet these strict structural standards with improved insulating properties.

## 2.2 High-Performance Frames

Window frames must satisfy many demands, such as hosting operating hardware, supporting the glazing system, and providing mounting infrastructure, which makes improving frame thermal performance especially challenging. Though the frame represents 15%–30% of the total window area, even the highest thermal performance frames lag behind the performance of highly insulating glazing. As such, the frame can often serve as a low thermal resistance pathway for heat conduction and subsequent convection away from the frame, significantly limiting the overall energy performance of the window system. Figure 9 illustrates quantitatively the impact of frame performance on high-performance windows; as IGU performance (U-factor) increases, the frame has an increasing impact on overall window U-factor. Windows with frames that compose a greater share of the total window area are affected even more by a high U-factor frame. Poor frame thermal resistance also limits condensation resistance, which can lead to aesthetic, durability, and indoor air quality problems.

The current state-of-the-art in high-performance materials for residential window frames are various proprietary polymer matrix-fiber composites and unplasticized polyvinyl chloride (uPVC) frames with multiple frame cavities filled with insulating materials. Though these materials are relatively inexpensive and have adequate thermal resistance, alternative materials and assemblies with lower thermal conductivities or the incorporation of thermal breaks and alternative geometries could improve performance. Integration of these new frames into prevailing window frame depths and profile dimensions typical of the U.S. market—especially when also accommodating high-performance IGU thickness—represents a challenge that must be considered when developing new frame materials or configurations.

For commercial buildings, structural requirements almost universally require the use of aluminum alloys for window frames. Unfortunately, the thermal performance of aluminum is relatively poor; its thermal conductivity is three orders of magnitude higher than wood or uPVC. Thermal breaks are used to reduce conduction heat transfer when using aluminum as a frame material, though thermal break technology and adoption have progressed very slowly. Currently, two major thermal break designs dominate the U.S. market: pour-and-debridge polyurethane thermal



**Figure 9. With either traditional low-e double glazing or advanced thin glass triple glazing, as the proportion of the frame contributing to total window area increases, the effect of frame U-factor on overall window U-factor increases (the slope of the line increases). Frame performance is even more important for windows where the frame makes up a greater share of the overall window area. As a result, continuing improvements in IGU performance underscore the need for improvements in frame performance.**

Figure derived from LBNL analysis.

breaks and crimped insulating bars. The thermal performance of thermal breaks can be further improved by increasing heat transfer path lengths and developing new frame materials with low thermal conductivity and high strength.

In commercial buildings, spandrel panels are used in areas of the window assembly (typically in curtain walls) where glazing is not desired, such as to cover electrical infrastructure routed between floors. Spandrel panels can also serve a design function as opaque facade segments providing visual separations between windows. These panels are often made from structurally robust but thermally conductive materials similar to the window frame. While the opaque envelope can have much higher R-values (lower U-factors) than windows through the use of highly insulating opaque materials, current spandrel panel designs do not approach the insulating performance of efficient opaque envelopes. Improving the insulation and minimizing thermal bridging of spandrel areas thus presents an opportunity to substantially improve the overall window system U-factor.

Air leakage through interfaces between operable window elements can significantly increase cooling and heating loads. Though newer windows have significantly improved airtightness, there is still a difference between sliding operable windows and casement or awning-style operable windows. Seasonal changes may also impact the effectiveness or durability of seals. Air leakage tends to increase with age as seals wear and other window components change shape, thus the long-term performance of the seals remains a critical challenge. Methods that can readily identify and products that can easily remediate deficient seals are needed. Incorporation of effective and durable sealing materials and strategies within window assemblies is critical to overall window performance.

## 2.3 Dynamic Facades and Daylighting

Sunlight and air can be selectively transmitted through windows to provide solar heating, cooling, and/or interior illumination. With time-varying properties or configurations, dynamic glazing and other dynamic facade elements can strategically admit or reject solar heat gains and daylight through windows and skylights to reduce heating, cooling, and lighting energy use while improving occupant visual comfort. Dynamic facade components can employ control strategies that incorporate GEB benefits, which is discussed further in Section 4.2. Additionally, variation of solar intensity and its spectral composition, facilitated by daylighting, have been correlated with less-tangible indoor environmental quality and health benefits of building occupants (e.g., sleep-wake cycle regulation, circadian rhythm, seasonal affective disorder, sense of well-being) [18, 19], and with scholastic performance [20]. The applicable tech-

nologies and operational strategies required to obtain these benefits are a function of the latitude, climate, window size and orientation, as well as the type and vintage of the building. In general, improved quantitative understanding of the effects of these factors on the energy and nonenergy impacts of dynamic facades and daylighting is needed, as well as the associated trade-offs in various building/occupant environments. This understanding would provide insight into the critical performance design points to ensure dynamic facade and daylighting systems are appropriately matched to the needs of specific buildings and that these systems are properly installed and operated.

### 2.3.1 Fixed and Operable Attachments

Window attachments comprise fixed and operable interior- and exterior-mounted devices and architectural features, such as blinds, shades, overhangs, and awnings, that can control direct sunlight (for thermal and visual comfort), reduce solar heat gain, improve thermal performance, and provide privacy [21, 22]. Most buildings have some form of attachment, typically indoors, and virtually all currently installed attachments are static or manually operated. Operable exterior shading attachments have the greatest potential for cooling energy savings in both new construction and retrofits, but they have seen limited market adoption in the United States because of their higher installation prices, more difficult maintenance, and interference with facade aesthetics when compared to interior shading attachments [23]. Between-pane static and operable shading systems can reduce maintenance costs, but have also seen limited application. Between-pane angular-selective shading systems, for example, have been used in atria, libraries, and museums to provide solar control, daylight, and view for sloped and vertical glazing.

Advances are needed to improve solar rejection (when needed) while maintaining daylight and views to the outdoors even when the shade is in place. Systems need to be aesthetically acceptable, durable, and require little to no maintenance. Shade materials that block glare from direct sun without eliminating useful daylight and view do not currently exist. These are of particularly critical need, because they can maintain the benefits of windows without compromising occupant visual comfort. Low-e indoor shade materials could reduce radiative heat transfer to nearby occupants, improving thermal comfort and potentially reducing the need for perimeter HVAC. Alternate options for actuating (e.g., nonmechanical, passive) and supplying power to operable components at lower cost with reduced installation effort are needed. Systems that enable solar and glare control without impeding airflow would complement windows used for natural ventilation or provision of outside air.

Automated shading systems have the potential to consistently deliver the energy and nonenergy comfort and productivity benefits that can come from window attachments when used most effectively. Fixed and manually operated attachments are lower cost and less complex than automated systems, but deliver reduced and less dependable energy savings [24, 25, 26, 27]. For automated shading systems to achieve widespread adoption, they need precision actuation, robust cybersecurity, low power requirements, ease of installation and operation, and minimal maintenance. Technology solutions that address the higher installation costs and initial configuration complexity of automated systems are now commercially available, including self-contained power supplies and wireless internet-protocol-based control connectivity. Pre-wiring the building envelope can reduce the installation cost of installing automated shading at a later point in the construction project or for future retrofits.

Cybersecurity and standardization issues are being addressed by the building controls industry. User or facility control of shading systems via mobile app interfaces has increased the transparency of automated system operation and facilitated troubleshooting in residential and small commercial applications. A critical shortcoming, however, is the general lack of knowledge on how best to control attachments for energy savings, occupant thermal and visual comfort, and user satisfaction. Automated systems can also provide GEB benefits by configuring attachment components to affect the timing of HVAC and lighting energy requirements in a manner that is complementary to electric grid operational needs, but controls for automated systems to support demand flexibility require further investigation. Currently, commercialized control systems use building simulations to design rule-based controls for large-scale applications; to accommodate the continuing changes in utility operations and electricity markets in response to evolving demand- and supply-side conditions, more flexible approaches to controls design are needed.

### 2.3.2 Daylight Redirection

Electric lighting savings from daylight is typically limited to the area immediately adjacent to the window—about 1.0–1.5 times the ceiling height—because of the nature of diffuse daylight sources and because shades are typically lowered to reduce glare when direct sun is present. Sunlight has sufficient intensity to provide adequate lighting

30–40 feet from the windows, but the control and distribution of that light remains a challenge. Some static products exist to redirect daylight and sunlight deeper into spaces, but none have managed to achieve significant market penetration because of aesthetics, cost, and inadequate performance. Rooftop skylights are effective at daylighting the top floor of buildings, but light shafts that bring daylight down one or more floors below the top floor have not achieved significant market impact because of cost, complexity, and the disruption to existing building envelopes.

Technological innovations are needed that bring daylight deeper into the building (15–40 feet from the window or across the core zone on floors below the top floor) without glare and thermal discomfort, and without increasing the cooling load in the building. Integration of daylighting redirection devices with active lighting control systems to achieve desired illumination levels amid variation in daylight intensity and patterns of distribution remains a challenge. It is also necessary to avoid downward, specular transmission of intense sunlight, spectral attenuation of daylight, chromatic dispersion (rainbow patterns of light), excessive light absorption, or other undesirable variations in the light, as can happen with certain light guides.

### **2.3.3 Dynamic Glazing**

Switchable or dynamic glazings include technologies that can modulate light transmission, reflection, and/or absorption properties (in specific wavelength ranges) and thermal properties (e.g., thermal mass, thermal insulation). Dynamic technologies offer building energy savings by modulating solar heat gain and visible light transmission. The result is reduced lighting and HVAC energy. Switchable glazing can also offer nonenergy benefits such as reduced glare for greater occupant comfort, increased architectural freedom by enabling more glass in buildings while still meeting codes and standards, reduction or elimination of internal or external shading structures, and contribution toward green building certification.

Various actively modulated and passively responsive glazings have been developed at least at the laboratory scale, including electrochromic, thermochromic, and photochromic devices. Electrochromic glazings that actively modulate visible light and NIR transmission have been introduced to the market over the past decade and have achieved a modest level of adoption in high-end, niche markets (see the Dynamic Windows success story). However, market adoption has been slow because of concerns about color, switching speed, durability, inadequate automated control, and cost. Uniform facade appearance, desired by some in the architecture and real estate industries, can limit control options and long-term energy savings. Neutral color in the bleached and colored states is important for architectural design and occupant desire for neutral color lighting. Slow switching speeds (10–30 minutes) sometimes lead to the installation of supplemental shades to satisfy occupant comfort, which eliminates the aesthetic benefits and potential cost savings from eschewing interior shades.

For maturing dynamic glazing technologies, durability concerns have been partially addressed with the development of ASTM 2141, which defines accelerated aging methods for dynamic glazing. Beyond these existing concerns, novel chromogenic formulations with the ability to independently attenuate visible and NIR light would allow greater control over the tradeoff between daylighting and solar heat gain. This feature would be particularly beneficial in commercial buildings with high internal loads where electrochromic windows otherwise remain in a switched (darkened) state in the winter months. High-performing laboratory-scale electrochromic devices have been developed toward that end [28], but achieving highly replicable, large-scale, and inexpensive manufacturing remains a challenge, alongside outstanding technical concerns related to coloration, switching time, and, in some cases, long-term durability.

### **2.3.4 Dynamic Facades**

Dynamic facades combine multiple static and active transparent facade elements, such as fixed and operable attachments, dynamic glazing, and daylighting systems, with the aim of operating those elements in concert to minimize energy use associated with the facade. Dynamic facades also simultaneously address comfort, indoor environmental quality, and occupant performance objectives. Real-time control of the operable facade elements in response to detected time-varying external (e.g., weather, energy demand) and internal (e.g., occupancy, task) conditions could lead to significantly lower energy use compared to manual operation.

Dynamic facades have seen limited market adoption to date because of various technical and market-related issues: price, real and perceived complexity, concerns regarding technology lifespan, and occupant dissatisfaction with

## How DOE Accelerated the Development of Dynamic Windows

Advancements in energy-efficient windows over the past 50 years have been exceptional, but they represent only a fraction of the energy savings potential of windows. If rejection or admission of solar heat gains and daylight are appropriately timed—based on season, cloud cover, occupancy, or HVAC system operation—then heating, cooling, and lighting energy use at the perimeter zone can be reduced even further. Dynamic glazing enables such control through the glazing’s active modulation of solar control properties.

### History

Starting in the 1970s and continuing today, much of the key work to bring dynamic window technology to market has been conducted at the national laboratories—primarily at LBNL and NREL—with support from DOE (Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy [EERE]). This work has included developing switchable chromogenic coatings, tuning material properties, and improving longevity under extreme conditions. In scaling up these technologies from coupon-size prototypes to large-area windows produced by high-volume manufacturing, LBNL and NREL have helped a wide variety of early-stage companies commercialize them. This R&D was guided by performance specifications developed by national laboratories, indicating what material properties were needed to reduce energy use, minimize discomfort, enhance outdoor views, and meet owner and occupant requirements. National laboratories assumed a critical role during the development phase of dynamic windows by conducting field testing and durability and failure analysis, as well as defining laboratory protocols to characterize material properties and incorporating them into simulation tools. These activities supported decision-making for further industry R&D investment, helped define the value proposition for consumers, and demonstrated the energy-efficient performance of commercially available switchable windows under long-term occupied conditions. This in turn has enabled the development of codes and standards that support the specification of dynamic glazing products by the buildings industry.

### Looking Forward

Through EERE, DOE has supported a diverse group of companies to move their technologies forward—including industry leaders View, Sage Electrochromics, and Pleotint—both through direct funding and indirectly through national laboratory partners. The early work funded by EERE has now led to more than \$2 billion in private sector funding to support commercialization, and large-scale product installations are currently underway. Today, research continues to produce innovative switchable coatings that switch faster and over a broader range, provide independent control of daylight and solar control, and can be manufactured at a fraction of the cost of previous devices.



**Figure 10. Dynamic glazing can be adjusted to a range of levels to manage occupant thermal and optical comfort while maintaining views to the outdoors.**

Photos courtesy of View Inc.

automated controls. Although individual components that might compose a dynamic facade system have seen improvements, simple plug-and-play operation and coordinated control across multiple facade elements have proved elusive. Thus far, controls have been limited primarily to maximizing zonal performance using scheduled control or heuristic logic. Control algorithms are becoming increasingly sophisticated, where building energy simulations are used to enhance rule-based control logic, but this approach is not yet widely adopted. More often, controls are set conservatively and tuned over time to minimize complaints. As with individual automated facade elements, dynamic facades have the potential to offer GEB benefits, though additional research is needed to determine the GEB potential of the elements of dynamic facades, both independently and when operated in a coordinated manner.

Maximizing energy savings requires not just control ability but optimal control strategies that integrate all available dynamic facade elements. These control algorithms should be able to offer an optimal balance of energy savings and occupant comfort and satisfaction given a range of available dynamic facade components and adapt to later changes in what components are available. The proprietary nature of the building automation systems on which these technologies depend can create concerns regarding vendor lock-in and resulting high long-term system operation and maintenance costs, particularly in commercial buildings, where the systems can be very capital intensive. Control solutions that employ open-source interfaces or building-block-style models could provide solutions that enable long-term energy savings and reduce adoption risks for consumers.

## 2.4 Characterization of Window System Performance and Benefits

There are three primary applications of window and attachment component system modeling software tools: (1) supporting R&D of novel components and materials; (2) enabling architects, engineers, and designers to understand the energy, cost, and ancillary impacts of commercially available products; and (3) underpinning rating and labeling programs that provide building owners with quantitative assessments of the energy performance of commercially available products. Window and attachment software tools and databases currently maintained with DOE support include THERM, WINDOW, OPTICS, Radiance, the International Glazing Database, and the Complex Glazing Database. These products are used by manufacturers to design window products; by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the National Fenestration Rating Council (NFRC), and the Attachment Energy Rating Council (AERC) to rate windows and attachment products; and by architects and engineers to design high-performance building envelopes (see the Window Software Tools success story).

Future development of software, modeling tools, and databases that support the evaluation of energy performance and adjacent nonenergy benefits of windows, attachments, and daylighting systems should lower barriers to their use by providing well-documented, open-source, platform-agnostic data and modeling results that can be readily integrated into existing commercial and open-source software workflows employed by manufacturers and building designers. Simple, quick tools that clearly articulate the effect of window performance on building energy use and occupant comfort that can be used at multiple stages in the design and construction process would be especially valuable in encouraging the specification of high-performance windows and reducing value engineering. Additional developments include the introduction of moisture transport modeling, a cloud-based database of glazing and shading products, and the ability to model emerging technologies. Improvements to software tools could also include the THERM graphical user interface and reporting functions, improving the ability to underlay complex drawings, support overlapping elements, perform common calculations (such as psi value), and customize graphical and quantitative report outputs. Needed improvements to the user experience include updates and enhancements to THERM documentation, training and user support via an updated manual, video tutorials, university teaching material, and links to organizations providing support and training. Integration with third-party building design software—and development of graphical user interfaces—could improve the usability of software tools and address current deficiencies.

Advanced simulation software tools could enable the window industry to further accelerate iterative product design and development. For manufacturers, relying on software for characterization helps them to understand how to improve the benefits of their products and provides them the ability to rate and label products for more effective marketing and code compliance. Typically, manufacturers start their design process using computer-aided design software—accurate window modeling software tools also enable manufacturers to do some product design virtually, avoiding the time and expense associated with iteratively manufacturing and testing prototypes. Though existing modeling and simulation tools are widely used, they often do not seamlessly integrate into users' existing (commer-

cial and noncommercial) software workflows, but rather are used as standalone applications. With this disjointed workflow, data exchange is cumbersome. Moreover, the inputs and outputs of these tools might not be well matched to the inputs and outputs of other software tools employed in the design, evaluation, or labeling process. In addition, the energy and nonenergy impacts of some window features and design requirements are not well represented in existing window modeling tools. Often, product performance requirements have conflicting energy and nonenergy effects. For example, the structural requirements of blast-resistant windows typically yield degraded thermal performance, while laminated glazing provides improvements in both blast and acoustic performance. Capturing these various trade-offs entirely within the virtual windows design workflow used by manufacturers can facilitate increased energy performance by incorporating energy performance in-line with the evaluation of nonenergy window features that are critical to meeting customer requirements. It is also important to allow early-stage developers with novel materials to easily bring their data into the tools and seamlessly transfer them between tools.

Daylighting and solar control technologies and glare control methods present an entirely different modeling challenge because the distribution of direct sunlight should be represented accurately to determine their effectiveness in managing glare and thermal discomfort and providing adequate daylighting. Accurately representing the angle-dependent, solar-optical properties of facade elements that affect the intensity and distribution of solar radiation and daylight is thus critical not only to the commercialization of novel daylighting and shading facade materials, but also to facilitate the integration of both novel and currently available technologies into facade designs and provide label-based information to help consumers select appropriate products. For glare modeling, generating high-resolution light ray tracing images requires significant computational expense and yields large data files. Trade-offs between accuracy and calculation speed need to be characterized so that industry can make informed decisions on which simulation methods to use. Simpler methods and performance indices may suffice for early design. For novel products, more detailed and accurate simulations can avoid investment in a technology that looks promising in early stages but can be shown to not be market acceptable based on detailed characterization and modeling. These data therefore cannot be readily incorporated into a design workflow, and the impact of design changes to a daylighting system and supporting controls cannot be evaluated without additional time-consuming simulations.

With regard to building design and construction, architects, engineers, and construction teams, accurately representing the whole-building energy performance impacts of windows, attachments, and daylighting systems is critically important to demonstrating their value and thus retaining high-performance windows and other facade systems in project designs. In addition, building design and construction software workflows need to convey critical construction details to installers. For dynamic facade components and daylighting systems, transitioning from the original design to operation when integrated into a control system is not seamless. Minimizing energy use while controlling glare, maintaining adequate views to the outside, and managing illumination levels often proves challenging, and significant remediation from the original design can be required from the building operations team because of changes during construction or inadequacies in the control configuration. Designers need assistance in their existing software workflows to ensure that the specification and placement of the sensors and configuration of the control system will be sufficient to achieve the intended control objectives and that factors that might result in deactivation of the system (e.g., inadequate glare control) are addressed.

## 2.5 Cross-Cutting Barrier: Envelope Retrofit Adoption

Although equipment in buildings—such as heating and cooling systems, water heaters, and light bulbs and fixtures—is often replaced because of increasing maintenance costs or outright failures, the same does not hold true for windows and other building envelope components. The degradation of these components, including windows, is often gradual and can typically be masked by additional heating and cooling. Given the relatively recent advent of high-performance building envelopes, people are likely accustomed to poorly insulated, leaky facades and windows, and might perceive those conditions as typical or characteristic of best-available envelope performance.

Tables 2 and 3 show that windows and other envelope components in existing buildings are rarely upgraded to reduce energy use, remedy performance problems or defects, or to improve aesthetics in spite of their significant contribution to building energy use. Residential windows are an exception, because they offer aesthetic and functional improvements that are appealing to homeowners and as of today are relatively easy to install, compared to most envelope upgrades that offer energy savings.

## Window Software Tools: Supporting Efficient Next-Generation Window Technologies

Software tools developed by DOE and LBNL enable users to make informed, data-driven decisions as they develop the next generation of energy-efficient window technologies, spurring energy savings and comfort improvements worldwide.


LBNL's window software tool suite enables manufacturers, engineers, professional simulators, architects, researchers, and members of academia to perform their own energy efficiency analyses on windows and building envelopes. They help users design and rate next-generation window products and evaluate the impact of windows on building energy consumption. Some tools supplement basic material characterization, such as the OPTICS software that is used to calculate optical properties of glazing materials. Others, such as WINDOW and THERM, enable users to model thermal and optical performance of windows, shading, and opaque building assemblies. Still others, such as COMFEN and RESFEN, enable users to analyze the energy impacts of various windows and facade elements on the energy balance of buildings exposed to a variety of climates.

### History

These tools are well respected in the industry. Since 1992, they have been used to rate and certify window and facade products. In fact, every NFRC window rating label for windows sold in the United States includes performance indicators that were calculated by OPTICS, THERM, and WINDOW. They also are used globally, often for certification of fenestration products. Annually, the tools get more than 50,000 unique downloads and more than 1 million program starts.

### Looking Forward

Recent versions of WINDOW and THERM include sophisticated methods to calculate the performance of complex window systems, as well as highly insulating and solar control windows and window attachment products. As window technologies advance, LBNL will continue to expand its suite of window software tools to support the next generation of efficient window technologies.



**Figure 11. Window technologies workflow from early research to advanced products.**

Figure courtesy of LBNL.

The cost of envelope retrofits is directly related to the disruption to building occupants and the scale and complexity of teardown and reconstruction of an entire building envelope. These factors contribute to the significant on-site labor effort that can be required to complete an envelope retrofit project, and thus the overall project cost. While manufacturing and on-site installation labor costs do contribute to the overall project cost for window replacements, other manufacturing costs are also significant contributors [29]. With window replacements, as with the opaque envelope, interface detail work performed during installation is critical to the energy performance and durability of the installed window and the surrounding envelope. Additional options for window retrofits include installation of secondary windows, either from the indoor or outdoor side of the window. Those approaches do not require removal of existing windows and substantially reduce occupant disruption. They are also less expensive options. Developing novel frame retrofits that can be added to existing windows are also less disruptive and cost less.

There are some envelope upgrades that are performed more frequently than others, such as window and siding replacements, blown-in ceiling insulation, and drill-and-fill wall cavity insulation. Table 2 shows the frequency of these retrofits by category. In general, these retrofits share the characteristic that they require minimal on-site labor effort. For the insulation retrofits in particular, there are also task-specific off-the-shelf tools that installers can use to simplify and expedite the job. Conversely, window and siding replacements provide an aesthetic upgrade, in addition to improving energy efficiency (in the case of insulated siding retrofits). Additional value streams beyond energy savings, such as aesthetics, ease-of-use, or comfort, can help increase adoption. In particular, value streams that are readily observable, such as aesthetics, noise abatement, or convenience features, can help broaden the appeal of envelope retrofits that also increase energy efficiency.

As shown in Figure 4, existing buildings will dominate the building stock in the coming decades, and thus novel envelope technologies have the greatest potential for energy savings if they are suitable for retrofitting existing buildings. To maximize their potential applicability for retrofit applications, envelope technologies should:

- Minimize on-site labor requirements
- Minimize disruption to building occupants
- Reduce and/or simplify interface detail work
- Offer fault-tolerant installation
- Deliver additional benefits beyond energy savings.

Many of these features would also be beneficial in new construction, so envelope technologies under development need not incorporate these features exclusively for the retrofit market.

### 3 Future Technology Development

This section builds upon the extant challenges described in Section 2 by articulating the characteristics required of any future technologies developed to address those challenges and identifying specific technologies or technology development pathways to target those challenges. These technologies are generally expected to offer significant energy savings compared to the current cost-effective technology. In addition, they might offer other energy and nonenergy benefits: reduced peak load, time-shifted envelope-related thermal loads to match distributed renewable generation availability, reduced glare, increased thermal comfort, or improved occupant satisfaction and productivity. These benefits can broaden the value proposition for these novel technologies and thus help drive industry R&D engagement (see Section 5.1) and accelerate adoption (see Section 5.2). In addition, this section discusses future developments in supporting opaque envelope and window component and system modeling technologies, as well as how these supporting modeling tools and capabilities can be used to accelerate adoption, improve construction quality, and ensure that dynamic systems are configured as intended to maximize energy savings and nonenergy objectives. Although this section focuses on use-phase energy savings from high-performance transparent facades, window materials are often highly energy intensive to manufacture; across the technology areas discussed in this section, consideration should be given to materials and approaches that reduce embodied energy and carbon, and enable recycling and reuse wherever possible.

This discussion is organized into subsections by technology based on capability, functionality, or common material or other technical characteristics. Each subsection: (1) describes the critical quantitative and qualitative characteristics for the technology to be acceptable to architects and engineers, building trades, and building owners and occupants; (2) reviews the state of the relevant literature; (3) specifies total installed price and energy performance-related metrics, future price and performance targets, and the corresponding U.S. energy savings if those targets are achieved; and (4) outlines future work to address shortcomings in the current state-of-the-art and thus achieve the energy performance, total installed price, and nonenergy performance characteristics (“critical characteristics”) needed to be market acceptable and encourage widespread adoption.

For windows, there are a range of opportunities to improve upon the current state-of-the-art with respect to total installed price, energy performance, and nonenergy characteristics that can influence technology adoption and total U.S. energy savings. These opportunities include:

- Reducing air leakage through window frames (especially for windows with sliding sashes)
- Reducing the thermal conductivity of the window frame and IGU
- Improving the performance of exposed low-e coatings (sometimes referred to as “hard” low-e coatings), by further reducing emissivity from current levels and increasing solar control abilities
- Enabling improvements in the design, configuration, installation, commissioning, and operation of the sensors and control systems for dynamic facade components and systems of components
- Developing self-powered systems for dynamic and automated facade elements as well as dynamic glazing that can independently control visible and NIR transmission at much lower prices through improvements in materials and the compatibility of those materials with high-volume throughput manufacturing methods.

This section articulates potential technology R&D opportunities that address these challenges with the current state-of-the-art, as articulated in Section 2.

#### Price and Performance Target Development

Total installed price and technology performance targets are specified for each technology area. These targets help define the potential opportunity offered by substantial energy performance improvements and suggest needed reductions in installed price for state-of-the-art high-performance windows to be cost-effective for a majority of the market. The price and performance targets were established using Scout<sup>13</sup>, a model that estimates the energy use and cost impacts of the adoption of efficient technologies in residential and commercial buildings. Scout accounts for building and equipment stocks and flows out to 2050. Energy use reductions for a given technology estimated using

<sup>13</sup>More information about Scout can be found in Appendix A, and at <https://www.energy.gov/eere/buildings/scout>.

Scout are based on the difference in performance—U-factor in the case of highly insulating windows, for example—between the incumbent or “business as usual” and the more efficient technology. These energy savings are then converted to utility bill savings based on average retail energy prices. Annual utility bill savings can then be used with a desired or “acceptable” simple payback period to determine a target total installed price for the performance level specified.

To develop the dynamic glazing and facade technology targets, a dynamic glazing model was developed for use with ResStock<sup>TM</sup> and ComStock<sup>TM</sup>.<sup>14</sup> ResStock and ComStock are bottom-up models of the U.S. residential and commercial building stocks, respectively. Both models use multiple data sources to characterize the current building stock and parameterize tens or hundreds of thousands of individual EnergyPlus<sup>TM</sup> building simulations that, taken together, compose a statistically representative sample of the entire building stock. These simulations can quantify energy use in the existing stock as well as the effect of efficiency upgrades on building energy use. The energy savings results from the individual building simulations of dynamic glazing can be aggregated and passed to Scout as relative savings percentages by building type or for the entire residential and commercial sectors. The stock-wide impacts of dynamic facades are then calculated in Scout to ensure that a common baseline is used to develop all of the price and performance targets.

The configuration of Scout influences the price and performance targets. For all of the targets in this report, a “technical potential” scenario that excludes competition between technologies is used in Scout. The technical potential scenario assumes immediate and universal national adoption of the technology being considered; excluding competition ensures that for any given technology, none of its energy savings potential is diminished because of parallel adoption of other efficient technologies. These assumptions maximize the energy savings potential for a technology, thus increasing the total installed price target. The performance and associated price targets are based on a range of assumptions in Scout that represent climate zone or national stock-wide average characteristics, including retail energy prices, window-wall ratios, building facade areas, existing window performance, and other factors. As a result, these targets represent performance and acceptable installed price for an average building in the United States. Because individual buildings vary enormously, the building-specific “acceptable” total installed prices for a given performance level might be much higher or lower than these targets.

It is important to note that Scout only includes energy savings and the resulting utility bill savings for the purpose of developing installed price targets. As discussed throughout this report, windows can improve occupant comfort, productivity, and health and well-being. These benefits are not trivial, and might be more noticeable to building occupants than performance improvements that lead to any energy savings. However, if the nonenergy benefits cannot be explicitly linked to cost savings in other areas (e.g., healthcare cost reductions from improved occupant health and well-being), they cannot be readily included in the price targets. Moreover, when compared with other building retrofits and other nonbuilding capital investments, high-performance windows must be cost-competitive if they are to be more widely adopted.

Further information about Scout and how it was used to develop the targets in this report is provided in Appendix A.

### 3.1 High-Performance Windows

Windows must provide thermal separation between the conditioned space within a building and the external environment and withstand wind-driven dynamic structural loads just like the opaque portion of the envelope, while also providing daylight and views to the outdoors. Energy use associated with windows is dominated by conduction through the IGU and frame. Although windows have seen meaningful improvements that reduce conduction losses over the past several decades [2, 30], many opportunities remain for further improvements in IGUs and frame materials. These changes can reduce energy use and improve occupant thermal comfort. In new construction or deep retrofits, especially in commercial buildings where window-wall ratios can be quite high, these improvements have the potential to offset requirements for perimeter zone HVAC, which can thus offset some or all of the cost of more advanced window systems.

Most windows today share common features to reduce thermal conductivity—a double-pane IGU, one or more low-e coatings, and a thermally improved frame. Many double-pane IGUs also replace the air between the glass with

<sup>14</sup>See: <https://resstock.nrel.gov/> and <https://comstock.nrel.gov/>.

argon gas for a small bump in insulating performance by reducing convection in the IGU cavity. Further improving the energy performance of the typical IGU usually involves adding another pane of glass to the IGU—moving to a triple-pane IGU—and switching to krypton gas. Triple-pane IGUs add weight and thickness; this requires a thicker, heavier, more robust frame to support the added weight from the IGU, which dramatically increases cost. Additional improvements in thermal performance require adding yet more glazing layers to the IGU, or switching to VIG, which is discussed further in Section 3.1.1. Modifications to the frame to improve thermal performance generally involve adding thermal breaks—inserting material with very low thermal conductivity between the exterior and interior portions of the frame to inhibit heat transfer. There might be many further opportunities to improve frame thermal performance through the development of novel materials, which are elaborated in Section 3.1.2.<sup>15</sup>

## Technology Area Targets

The installed price premium and performance target ranges for windows in 2030 are given in Table 5. The performance targets are for whole-window average U-factor, not center-of-glass. Installed price premiums for each performance level are based on utility bill savings derived from energy savings for that performance level and a selected payback period to establish cost-effectiveness. These savings estimates lead to total installed price premiums for residential buildings ranging from 2.10 \$/ft<sup>2</sup> window area for 0.17 U-factor windows (assuming a 5-year payback period) to 6.60 \$/ft<sup>2</sup> for 0.077 U-factor windows (assuming a 10-year payback period). These varying cost-effectiveness thresholds, defined using simple payback, allow for a range of financing mechanisms for residential buildings to amortize the cost of window upgrades. For commercial buildings, total installed price premiums range from 2.70 \$/ft<sup>2</sup> window area to 10.10 \$/ft<sup>2</sup> window area for 0.17 to 0.1 U-factor windows, assuming an acceptable payback range of 3 to 7 years, respectively. Price premiums are calculated by subtracting the total installed price for the performance level or technology specified from the total installed price for the incumbent. Baseline prices are 48.40 \$/ft<sup>2</sup> for residential buildings and 56.20 \$/ft<sup>2</sup> for commercial buildings. Shorter payback periods were used to develop the targets for commercial buildings given that commercial building owners and tenants might evaluate payback or return on investment across a wide range of potential deployments of capital resources, and investments in building energy efficiency must compete against these investments for the limited capital available. A survey of U.S. companies found that the median required payback period for energy efficiency technologies is 3–4 years, with the vast majority of respondents requiring payback periods of 6 years or less [31]. Publicly traded companies require even shorter payback periods, with a median response of 2–3 years [31]. Longer payback periods are shown as future policy interventions could facilitate higher market-acceptable prices or an acceptance of longer-term investments for energy efficiency or carbon mitigation. The difference in price premiums for residential and commercial buildings are a result of the difference in baseline window performance. The baseline performance of commercial buildings is modeled as approximately 0.5 U-factor, while the baseline for residential buildings is approximately 0.33 U-factor.<sup>16</sup> This baseline represents the “business as usual” case for window installations in the target year (2030), against which the higher-performing target windows are compared. As a result, per-building energy savings are higher in commercial buildings, thus supporting higher installed prices. As mentioned, further details regarding Scout and the assumptions that influence these results are provided in Appendix A.


The whole-window performance levels in Table 5 could be achieved through improvements to the frame, IGU, or likely a combination of both, but these levels do not explicitly assume specific performance contributions from any particular element of the window assembly. If the performance levels in Table 5 are achieved, the primary energy use associated with windows will be reduced by 70% in residential buildings and by 90% in commercial buildings in 2050, respectively, compared to the baseline. This enormous energy savings opportunity underlines the importance of a holistic, systems-level approach to specifying building upgrades to maximize the potential value of window performance upgrades, as discussed in Section 4.1. Figure 12 shows the installed price premiums for a range of U-factors and payback periods. All of these prices include marginal fully burdened installation labor and all other material and supply chain costs besides the window itself; strategies that reduce these ancillary costs allow for added costs for the technologies that improve window performance. Other cost-effective approaches to improving performance of windows include window attachments, where installation cost is much lower than replacing windows. Some of the most attractive options are window panels that incorporate low-e coatings or dynamic glazing, insulating automated shades and automated light-redirecting shades, or window films.

<sup>15</sup>See additional discussion in the Highest Thermal Performance Commercial Window success story.

<sup>16</sup>Baseline U-factors vary by climate zone, with lower U-factors in colder climate zones.

**Table 5. Whole-window performance and installed price premium targets are identified for 2030, along with the corresponding technical potential primary energy savings and avoided CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in 2030 and 2050 for the upper end of the performance range. The price premiums are based on two cost-effective payback period ranges (5–10 years for residential and 3–7 years for commercial buildings) and are on top of baseline prices, which are detailed in Appendix A.**

Windows								
Building Sector	Performance		Installed Price Premium		Primary Energy Savings (quads)		Avoided CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions (Mt)	
					2030	2050	2030	2050
Residential	0.17–0.077	U-Factor	2.10–6.60	\$/ft <sup>2</sup> window area	1.72	1.41	83.9	66.8
Commercial	0.17–0.1		2.70–10.10		0.89	0.64	48.0	34.9



**Figure 12. Price premiums for multiple whole-window U-factors are shown for residential and commercial buildings. The higher U-factor of windows typically installed in commercial buildings compared to residential buildings leads to greater energy savings in commercial buildings and thus substantially higher price premiums for equivalent payback periods.**

### 3.1.1 High-Performance Glazing

There are a range of approaches to improving the energy performance of existing IGUs, particularly to achieve performance that exceeds double-pane IGUs without the weight penalty of adding a third pane of glass. These approaches generally focus on minimizing heat transfer between the panes in the IGU, particularly by controlling convection by removing the air between the panes or replacing the air between the panes with another material.

Triple-pane IGUs have a lower U-factor than double-pane IGUs. Although effective at reducing heat transfer, the additional glazing layer and second spacer in a triple-pane IGU add significant weight and thickness to the finished IGU, which affects the frame as well. Alternative approaches that create two chambers in the IGU—comparable to a triple-pane IGU but without the weight and thickness penalty associated with an additional glazing layer and

spacer—would yield an IGU suitable for a much wider range of retrofit applications. The weight of a triple-pane IGU could be reduced by employing thin glass for the intermediate pane in the IGU. Recent improvements in thin glass technology, sparked by the demand for display systems such as large TVs and smartphones, have resulted in dramatic cost reductions such that submillimeter-thick glass is comparable in cost to standard double-strength glass. A traditional two-spacer system could be used between each pair of glass panes, or a single combined spacer that suspends the center glass could be developed, though any spacer system developed for this window configuration should be compatible with or amenable to integration with automated IGU manufacturing systems. A thin glass triple-glazing system could double the thermal insulating value of a window, from a nominal U-factor of 0.3 (R-3) to 0.17 (R-6). Thin glass triple-glazed assemblies (both with two spacers or a single combined spacer) with whole-window U-factors of 0.18 have been field tested in single-family, multifamily, and manufactured homes [32, 33].

VIG reduces heat transfer by eliminating the air in the space between the two panes of glass in an IGU. Although VIGs are simple in concept, they have proved extraordinarily difficult to mass produce with a method that yields market-acceptable unit prices. Creating a vacuum between the panes of glass causes the panes to be drawn together, which would create a thermal short circuit from the outer to the inner panes if they touched. A supporting structure, often small “pillars,” must be added to separate the panes. This support structure creates small thermal bridges (pathways for conduction) between the inner and outer panes and stress concentrations in the glass, which can crack the glass. Support structures that minimize thermal bridging and stress concentrations would improve energy performance and long-term durability. The two panes of glass must be joined at the perimeter with a continuous seal that can maintain a vacuum. The typical approach uses a glass frit, which creates a strong and rigid seal. When there are large temperature differences between the interior and exterior glass, differences in thermal expansion can cause a rigid joint to fail; more flexible joining methods (e.g., polymeric edge seals) have so far been inadequate for maintaining a vacuum. The high temperatures required to bond the frit to the glass can also affect tempering and damage low-e coatings. Alternative bonding materials are needed; these materials should be able to maintain a vacuum of less than 0.1 Pa (for a between-pane spacing of approximately 200  $\mu\text{m}$ ) with limited degradation for the life of the window, form a seal at temperatures below 180°C (355°F), and ideally, have low thermal conductivity.

Replacing the air or fill gas (e.g., argon, krypton) between the panes in an IGU with a solid material switches the dominant mode of heat transfer between the panes from convection (of the trapped gas) to conduction through the interpane material. For this approach to improve performance and yield an acceptable IGU, the material must be transparent, low haze (<1%), very low thermal conductivity, and stable under the conditions in the interpane space in an IGU. Aerogels might be a suitable material for this application, but several key technical challenges must be addressed. The aerogel must be produced using an approach that is scalable, compatible with existing glass coatings, and amenable to the glass handling and IGU assembly methods typically employed for IGU and window manufacturing (or compatible with alternative aerogel formation/deposition and IGU assembly approaches that have low capital costs). The aerogel itself must be robust to prevent pore collapse, and should not expand, sag, or compress over the lifetime of a typical IGU (>20 years).

### 3.1.2 Highly Insulating Window Frames


Though there have been improvements in the insulating performance of window frames, these improvements have been relatively modest compared to improvements in both the performance of IGUs and the typical performance of the opaque envelope. Window frame materials vary by application area—commercial buildings generally use aluminum frame windows and curtain walls, whereas residential (and some low-rise commercial) buildings can have windows with wood, fiber-reinforced plastic, or uPVC frames. The methods and materials that can improve the insulating performance of window frames vary depending on the primary window frame material. Frames constitute 15%–30% of the overall window area, and in the latter case, they limit the overall window U-factor. Typical window frames currently range from 1 to 0.33 U-factor, and even when combined with an IGU rated with an infinitely low U-factor, the overall U-factor of the window could not be below 0.11 [3]. Highly insulating window frames are therefore critical to improving the overall performance and energy savings potential of windows. In spite of this need, research to develop novel window frame materials and assemblies to reduce heat transfer has been limited to high-structural-performance aluminum framing (see the Highest Thermal Performance Commercial Window success story [34]).

Aluminum, fiber-reinforced plastic, and uPVC frames, as illustrated in Figure 7, are a mix of solid structural elements and voids that reduce thermal conductivity and weight. As a result, viable approaches to improving thermal

### Highest Thermal Performance Commercial Window

In 2010, Arconic was competitively awarded a cooperative agreement from BTO to pursue a high-performance commercial window. The OptiQ window system was designed and commercialized, and it incorporates a high thermal resistance thermal break in an aluminum frame that passes high structural requirements (80 lbs/ft<sup>2</sup> design pressure). OptiQ windows achieve a whole-window NFRC U-factor rating of 0.17 BTU/hr-ft<sup>2</sup> F (almost R-6).

Arconic won a subsequent competitively awarded cooperative agreement to further improve the most efficient high structural requirement window on the market, its OptiQ system. The new approach developed an even higher thermal resistant thermal break system that was bonded to the aluminum structural members. A fixed window prototype was tested in accordance with standard NFRC and American Architectural Manufacturers Association standards, and it achieved a frame thermal improvement of 20%. When combined with a typical triple-pane glazing package with two low-e surfaces, it achieved a U-factor of 0.14 BTU/hr-ft<sup>2</sup> F (R-7).



**Figure 13. Arconic OptiQ commercialized high structural and thermal performance window with thermal plot.**

Figures from Kumar [34].

performance for these frames, compared to the current state-of-the-art, involve reducing the thermal conductivity of the structural elements and minimizing convection and radiation heat transfer within the voids. Approaches that rely on frame designs and materials that are compatible with existing manufacturing methods and tooling are likely to deliver energy savings with the lowest possible incremental cost impacts. Novel window frame materials can include insulating structural foams, natural fiber composites, or other materials with especially low thermal conductivity that can also meet the structural performance requirements for windows. Novel materials with low embodied carbon or that are carbon negative and have a high potential for reuse are particularly attractive for their potential to reduce life cycle carbon emissions associated with windows. Low thermal conductivity frame materials have significant energy savings potential, but must employ low-cost feedstocks and mature or readily scaled novel manufacturing methods to achieve widespread adoption.

Aluminum frames are produced as individual frame elements (“lineals”) that are assembled into a system that typically combines exterior and interior aluminum elements with a thermal break, and then cut to length for each window. Because the frames start out as individual metal and polymer sections, to reduce radiation heat transfer, the metal pieces could be treated with a low-e coating when the surface finish (e.g., painted, anodized) is applied. Conduction heat transfer can be reduced by lengthening the thermal break or reducing the thermal conductivity of the

**Table 6. Critical Characteristics for High-Performance Windows (IGUs and Frames)**

Critical Characteristics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IGU thicknesses should be comparable to double-pane IGUs (0.6–0.75 inches for residential and 0.85–1 inches for commercial) such that they can be accommodated in existing frames manufactured for double-pane IGUs</li> <li>• IGU weight should be similar to double-pane IGUs, approximately 3 lb/ft<sup>2</sup> window area and 6 lb/ft<sup>2</sup> window area for residential and commercial windows, respectively</li> <li>• Durability (for all components) should be equivalent or superior to existing windows; multiple ASTM and American Architectural Manufacturers Association durability standards apply to various window components and complete windows</li> <li>• Novel IGU and frame components should have a pathway to compatibility with current typical manufacturing methods (e.g., automated IGU assembly).</li> </ul>

thermal break or the aluminum itself. BTO has supported recent work to develop a novel polymer foam thermal break [34]. Approaches that modify aluminum to reduce its thermal conductivity must maintain its structural properties for the resulting windows to meet structural performance requirements.

The thermal performance of fiber-reinforced plastic and uPVC frames could be improved through modifications to both the material itself and the frame assembly. Fiber-reinforced plastic and uPVC frames are manufactured using forming methods that result in a complete cross-section for the entire frame. To control radiation heat transfer by reducing emissivity, either the uPVC or resin must be modified, or a liquid-applied coating could be used. Reducing thermal conductivity could also be achieved through alternative materials compatible with the extrusion and pultrusion methods used for uPVC and fiber-reinforced plastic frames, respectively, or materials that modify existing uPVC or fiber-reinforced plastic formulations to inhibit conduction. As with any effort to modify the conductivity of aluminum, materials that reduce the thermal conductivity of uPVC or fiber-reinforced plastic must have comparable strength to satisfy window structural requirements.

Frames made from wood typically use solid wood with no thermal break. Because the frame cross-section is an uninterrupted solid or multiple solid pieces butted together (in the case of operable windows), improving thermal performance requires modifying the properties of the solid or adding a thermal break. Solid wood frame windows are a particularly lucrative market for residential window manufacturers; thus, the absence of approaches to improve thermal performance is a significant barrier to improvements in window U-factor voluntary specifications for the entire industry. Modifying wood to extend its life has been widely investigated, and various methods have been adopted for centuries. Superficially, similar approaches might be employed to modify the thermal conductivity of wood used for window frame applications. (Notably, similar modifications might also be possible for wood used for building framing to reduce wall thermal conductivity.) Although thermal breaks are common in aluminum frames to reduce overall thermal conductivity, they have not been widely applied to wood frames. While the polyamide thermal breaks used in aluminum-frame windows are likely not the right geometry for use with wood joining methods, low thermal conductivity materials could be used to develop thermal breaks with appropriate geometries for compatibility with wood-joining techniques. Alternately, structural foams could be bonded to wood frame elements using an approach similar to that developed by Arconic for commercial windows.

Table 7 summarizes the future research opportunities for IGUs and window frames discussed in this section. These opportunities for the individual technology focus areas suggest broad R&D activities that can move window price and performance in the direction of the targets articulated in Table 5. Table 6 articulates additional characteristics that are not necessarily needed to achieve the price and performance targets in Table 5, but that are important to consider when developing materials and components such that those R&D efforts yield windows that meet or exceed industry standards and customer expectations of performance and durability, and maximize their potential path to commercialization.

**Table 7. Future Research Opportunities Related to IGUs and Window Frames**

Future Research Opportunities		
Technology	Objectives	R&D Activity
Thin Highly Insulating IGUs	Reduce weight Reduce thickness Reduce thermal conductivity <sup>a</sup>	Design triple-pane IGU with thin center lite to minimize heat transfer and manufacturing cost
	Improve durability Reduce thickness	Design spacers for triple-pane IGU with only two leakage paths ("suspended" center lite)
	Reduce manufacturing cost <sup>a</sup> Improve durability	Develop thin triple-pane IGU configuration(s) that are compatible with automated IGU assembly systems
	Reduce manufacturing cost <sup>a</sup>	Explore novel methods for production of thin glass at volumes sufficient to support high adoption rates
VIGs	Reduce thermal conductivity <sup>a</sup> Improve durability Reduce manufacturing cost <sup>a</sup>	Develop mechanical pillars for VIGs, including materials, method of installation, and avoidance of fatigue cracking
		Optimization of glass strength, support geometry, support material and spacing
		Develop durable edge sealing materials that reduce mechanical stresses under thermal cycling
		Investigate low-temperature seal bonding and curing methods
Frames (all)	Reduce heat transfer <sup>a</sup>	Develop new materials, surface coatings, or material additives
	Reduce installation cost <sup>a</sup>	Develop frame systems and installation methods that minimize disruption to building occupants and do not require extended vacancies, particularly for existing curtain walls
Frames (aluminum)	Reduce thermal conductivity <sup>a</sup>	Develop novel thermal break materials or frame designs to reduce thermal conductivity
Frames (wood)	Reduce thermal conductivity <sup>a</sup>	Design novel cross-sections that maintain strength and are compatible with existing fabrication processes

<sup>a</sup> Cost and performance levels must be sufficient to achieve the overall price and performance targets for this technology area, which are given in Table 5.

## 3.2 Dynamic Facades and Glazing

In buildings in heating-dominated climates, the heating energy use reductions from solar heat gain through windows in the winter months can be substantial, as shown in Figure 3. Conversely, in climates with significant cooling seasons, solar heat gain exacts a significant cooling energy use penalty. As a result, windows with static solar heat gain coefficients (SHGCs) represent a climate-zone-specific compromise between reductions in heating energy use and increases in cooling energy use. These trade-offs are shown in Figure 3 as the energy use contribution from solar heat gain appears below zero in the heating season and above zero in the cooling season. Conversely, dynamic glazing and facade systems, which have variable solar heat gain control characteristics, can substantially reduce energy use compared to static glazings. Dynamic glazings and shading systems enable real-time management of window configuration in response to diurnal and seasonal changes in heating and cooling demand, occupancy, and available daylight. As detailed in Section 4.2, dynamic facades can also be used to provide grid benefits by enabling

changes in the timing of heating, cooling, and lighting loads and thus influencing electric load shape, peak demand, and demand-side ramp rates. In addition, photovoltaic (PV) glazing can incorporate elements of dynamic glazing with the ability to generate power from the glazing.

Currently available dynamic glazing and automated window attachments can improve energy performance compared to traditional glazing with fixed SHGC and visible light transmission (Tvis). Electrochromic dynamic glazing systems are available primarily for commercial buildings, but low availability coupled with high product and installation costs have limited demand. Thermochromic dynamic glazing avoids the additional electrical installation costs of electrochromic glazing, but no thermochromic glazing products are currently available in the U.S. Automated window attachments can offer adjustable control over daylighting and/or solar heat gain, but bringing power to the attachment system again increases installation costs compared to nonautomated systems, although self-powered and battery-powered options are now entering the market. For both dynamic glazing and automated attachments, control system design also poses a key challenge. Significant effort can be required to configure coordinated controls of multiple automated systems to achieve energy savings, peak demand reduction, and occupant comfort objectives.

### Technology Area Targets

Table 8 gives the targets for installed price premium and performance for dynamic windows and automated attachment systems with equivalent solar heat gain control functionality. These targets are set for technologies entering the market in 2030 and are based on a 10-year simple payback target. The primary energy savings associated with the indicated performance level include only heating and cooling energy savings; potential lighting energy savings derived from additional daylighting as a result of shades and glazing being optimally adjusted throughout the day are excluded. Primary energy savings increase for dynamic windows and other dynamic solar control technologies between 2030 and 2050 because the baseline window is assumed to have a static SHGC. New construction thus does not yield substantial improvements over the existing stock, and as the stock grows in the future, the energy savings potential of dynamic glazing and shading systems grows as well.

Total primary energy savings from dynamic facades in commercial buildings appear relatively limited because of the large share of commercial square footage from buildings with few windows, such as warehouses and large retail stores, which do not benefit substantially from dynamic facades. Commercial buildings with the greatest potential for energy savings from dynamic facades are those with high perimeter to floor area ratios (a high proportion of the total floor area is near the facade) and high window-wall ratios located in climates that lead to large heating and/or cooling loads. As with any high-performance window upgrade, existing buildings with single glazing and non-thermally-improved window frames will see much greater savings from a dynamic facade upgrade than buildings with newer, somewhat better performing windows. The savings potential for commercial buildings with these characteristics, such as medium and large offices and schools, median annual heating and cooling energy savings can approach 20% when compared to typical currently installed windows, with some buildings able to realize 40% savings. Compared to window replacement with an equivalent high-performance frame and static solar control properties, dynamic facades can yield additional annual energy savings of up to 10%.

**Table 8. Dynamic window and facade performance and installed price premium targets for 2030, as well as corresponding primary energy savings and avoided CO<sub>2</sub> emissions potential in 2030 and 2050. These targets apply to any dynamic window technology or other technology that provides an equivalent solar heat gain attenuation range and are inclusive of any additional nonglazing installation costs (e.g., electrical connections or site-specific controls configuration). These price premiums should be added to baseline window prices when evaluating the competitiveness of new dynamic windows or equivalent technologies.**

Dynamic Windows								
Building Sector	Performance		Installed Price Premium		Primary Energy Savings (quads)		Avoided CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions (Mt)	
					2030	2050	2030	2050
Residential	0.05/ 0.65	SHGC (active/ inactive)	6.50	\$/ft <sup>2</sup> window area	1.29	1.23	58.6	53.4
Commercial			29.20		0.35	0.37	14.8	14.3

Price premiums range from 1.30 to 6.50 \$/ft<sup>2</sup> window area for payback periods ranging from 3 to 15 years for residential buildings and from 3.50 to 11.80 for payback periods between 3 and 10 years for commercial buildings. Market-acceptable installed price premiums will depend on the performance of a given technology, the energy savings potential for a given building, and the financial requirements of the building owner. These price premiums should be added to the baseline prices given in Appendix A when comparing prices with other high-performance window technologies. Although the installed prices in Table 8 are required to achieve a 10-year payback at the target performance level, market-acceptable payback based on energy cost savings is not the exclusive determinant of widespread adoption for dynamic glazing and shading technologies. Instead, the parameters in the critical characteristics table define additional features, functionality, or characteristics that these technologies should seek to incorporate to broaden their potential value proposition and satisfy prospective customer expectations. Note that in some locations, narrower or higher SHGC ranges than that included in the target might be better suited to local climate conditions or building occupancy patterns. Also, Figure 18 illustrates the potential for dynamic glazing to deliver electric load reductions during peak periods, which could provide additional utility bill savings for building owners.

### 3.2.1 Reducing Manufacturing Costs

Dynamic glazing is typically manufactured using high-cost and often low-throughput methods, which negatively impacts product availability and pricing. Novel approaches that rely on low-cost, high-throughput production methods could reduce product costs and expand availability, though new electrochromic processing methods must also produce adequate performance and durability characteristics as compared to incumbent technologies. In addition, these new approaches must not rely on formulations with expensive materials, precursors, catalysts, or intermediate processing steps, as these might significantly reduce or even offset the product cost improvements gained from the substitution of a lower-cost, higher-throughput manufacturing method.

Transition metal oxides represent the current state-of-the-art in electrochromic glazing, generally relying on a tungsten-based formulation produced using a physical vapor deposition method [35]. More recently, plasmonic electrochromism has been found in nanostructured transparent conducting oxides such as tin-doped indium oxide [36] as well as aluminum-doped zinc oxide nanocrystalline films [37]. The underlying mechanism should also apply to tungsten oxides as well [36], but it has not been demonstrated empirically. Electrochromic polymers and reversible metal electrodeposition systems can be fabricated from abundant materials using low-cost methods [35] including roll-to-roll deposition on flexible substrates [38], but they face other significant barriers for building energy efficiency applications, including minimized faradaic loss and adequate cycling durability<sup>17</sup> (adequate control of irreversible reactions), high transparency in the clear state, as well as potential switching in the NIR or visible and NIR ranges [35, 39]. If future work can address these challenges, polymer electrochromic materials might offer an additional low-cost alternative to novel high-performance and lower-cost metal oxide formulations.

In general, novel approaches likely maximize cost savings potential by being compatible with current glass coating and IGU manufacturing processes. These requirements include production rates and processing conditions, so these methods can then transfer readily to existing float glass production facilities that are already part of the window supply chain. Electrochromic windows are currently produced at dedicated sites instead of being integrated into products already in use in established manufacturing facilities. Ideally, a solution that can allow fabrication of dynamic windows to be broadly placed throughout present manufacturing channels will have the highest probability of reducing cost and accelerating diffusion into the market.

### 3.2.2 Increasing Spectral Selectivity

Current state-of-the-art dynamic glazing technologies attenuate both visible and NIR wavelengths. Decoupling switching in the visible and NIR ranges would enable independent control of glare (tinting) while admitting some solar heat gains (NIR switching) in the winter, or restricting some solar heat gains and allowing in daylight in the summer, particularly for buildings that are occupied during daylight hours [40]. Ideally these systems would have a wide operating range for SHGC (0.01–0.7) and T<sub>vis</sub> (0.0–0.6). State-of-the-art technologies based on metal oxides and reversible metal electrodeposition are now approaching these wide operating ranges. In cooling-dominated

<sup>17</sup>Durability is evaluated for dynamic glazing with ASTM 2141, which requires enduring high temperature, high ultraviolet exposure, and 50,000 device cycles, concurrently.

climates, decoupled NIR switching is not especially valuable, but in climate zones with large seasonal temperature swings, fully decoupled Tvis and solar heat gain control is valuable [40]. Nanocrystalline transparent conducting oxide films, particularly tin-doped indium oxide and aluminum-doped zinc oxide, have been demonstrated to have electrochromic properties with NIR-only switching [35, 37]. These materials show fast response times, and aluminum-doped zinc oxide has also shown good cycling durability [37]. As noted in Section 3.2.1, additional work is needed to identify viable low-cost manufacturing methods for these materials that achieve the required nanostructure. To get visible light control with these materials, a separate automated attachment system or glazing layer that switches in the visible wavelengths (e.g., suspended particle device glazing) would be required. In the future, if similar low-cost processing methods can be developed for chemistries that show switching in the visible or NIR spectra, a sandwich system with separate visible- and NIR-controlling electrochromic layers might be viable. Thermochromic glazing with NIR control has been demonstrated at the lab scale using vanadium dioxide nanoparticles (<50 nm). In addition, recent work has demonstrated semi-decoupled control of visible and NIR wavelengths in a single electrochromic coating, where at low voltages, switching is primarily in the NIR range; as voltage is increased, switching begins to occur strongly in both the NIR and visible ranges [41]. The study by DeForest et al. [40] shows that semi-decoupled electrochromic systems deliver greater total energy savings across the United States compared to NIR-only or coupled visible and NIR switching systems, which are better suited to northern and southern climates, respectively. More generally, features such as fully decoupled transmission NIR, visible, and even communications wavelengths on a single chromogenic pane might not yield increased energy savings, but would improve occupant comfort and broaden the value proposition for dynamic glazing systems.

### 3.2.3 Wired Systems

Automated attachment, PV glazing, and electrochromic glazing systems face additional challenges with respect to installation effort, commissioning, and cost. In general, installation of these systems requires two trades to visit the site, one to install the hardware itself and one for the electrical connection. Battery-operated dynamic technologies eliminate the need for additional electrical work, but require regular battery maintenance. Systems that have an integrated power system would reduce installation and construction complexity while also avoiding additional ongoing maintenance costs. These systems can use small PV cells surface-mounted to the frame, in series with the electrochromic system or on protruding structures anchored to the frame or attachment system (if externally mounted), to provide electricity for state-change operations [40]. For future electrochromic systems that can provide complete privacy (fully opaque or  $T_{vis} = 0$ ), particularly for residential applications, energy storage will also need to be integrated into the frame assembly to power the system at night. Any storage and PV system will require careful sizing to ensure continuous operation during extended periods of low solar radiation. Finally, for these systems to have long-term durability, attention should be devoted to design for repairability, as minor electrical faults in the glazing or attachment power system should not create a requirement for major facade disassembly or reconstruction. Thermochromic glazing can deliver dynamic operation without requiring power, but thermochromic materials face many unique challenges, which are addressed by Lee et al. [42].

PV can be integrated into the IGU with novel approaches. The most expensive components of PV panels are the glass and the transparent conductors (tantamount to low-e layers) that already compose IGUs [43]. There are few barriers to PV integration into spandrel glass. However, durability, aesthetics (color neutrality), integration, and efficiency remain challenging for vision glass PV and are the focus of current research efforts. There are two main types of static PV glazing for vision glass: wavelength-selective [44] and non-wavelength-selective [45]. Wavelength-selective designs selectively convert nonvisible solar energy (ultraviolet and infrared) to maintain maximum Tvis. Wavelength-selective technologies rely on organic materials such as polymers and small molecules that have NIR-selective absorption. The ultraviolet portion of the spectrum makes up only a small fraction of the solar spectrum, yielding a maximum theoretical power conversion efficiency of 2.5%. Though ultraviolet PV glazing has been demonstrated to power an integrated electrochromic device [46], it is not appropriate for large-scale electricity generation.

Current commercial IGU-integrated designs are non-wavelength-selective, relying on the visible portion of the spectrum but only absorbing a fraction of the incident visible light. There are a number of non-wavelength-selective technologies in development, including thin film absorbers (amorphous silicon, copper indium gallium sulfide/selenide, and metal halide perovskites), dye-sensitized cells, and luminescent concentrators. The amount of light absorbed and converted to electricity is limited by the need to maintain adequate Tvis. Current non-wavelength-

selective PV designs thus suffer from the fundamental trade-off between power conversion efficiency and  $T_{vis}$ . The advent of switchable PV windows [47, 48], a third type of window PV technology, circumvents this fundamental trade-off by switching from a visibly transparent state (high  $T_{vis}$ ) to a darkened state (low  $T_{vis}$ ) in a manner similar to thermochromic glazing. Dynamic PV glazing allows for increased power conversion efficiency in the colored state without sacrificing  $T_{vis}$  during off hours. The technology uniquely combines higher power conversion efficiency PV with the energy-saving benefits of dynamic glazing in a single system. Dynamic PV glazing is still in its early stages, and durability and switching temperature must be optimized before commercialization of switchable designs will be realized. If these PV systems generate additional electricity, it could be used in an independent DC power system to operate other dynamic facade components, or if significant additional generation is expected, the additional installation cost required to integrate the glazing PV into the building electrical system should be offset by the value of the electricity generated.

### 3.2.4 Improving Dynamic Facade Component Sensors, Controls, and System Integration

Automatic control of dynamic facade components requires a complex balance between solar control and daylighting to maximize energy savings and occupant comfort. Currently available automated controls combine heuristic rules and setpoint schedules that require considerable configuration effort for each new installation. Control methods from other industries are being investigated for application in the building sector to address this complex optimization problem. Model predictive control (MPC) can use thermal and daylighting models of dynamic glazing and models of room thermal response; HVAC, lighting, and thermal energy storage parameters; and occupant preferences to produce optimal control based on forecast performance over a specified time horizon (e.g., 24 hours). For GEB objectives, electricity prices and distributed energy resource forecasts can be combined with dynamic facade control algorithms to minimize utility costs [49], but work remains to develop the required models and algorithms for grid-coordinated operation. Fundamental work has been conducted to build open-source models for dynamic glazing and the workflow to enable routine implementation of MPC [50, 51, 52, 53]. Control can be achieved autonomously without real-time data exchange or integration with HVAC and lighting systems. Adaptive models using sensor inputs, user feedback, or machine learning algorithms can be used to improve energy efficiency performance and user satisfaction over the life of the installation.

These dynamic glazing and automated attachment systems face additional challenges with respect to the costs to integrate them into centralized building management or control systems. In both residential and commercial building applications, significant advancements are needed to facilitate straightforward, reliable, low-effort system integration for dynamic facade components. When these components are installed, the labor effort required to configure them for coordinated operation should be minimized. Needed improvements include networking and communication protocols, sensor node naming conventions, sensor integration, data exchange, and hierarchy of control. Once operating, improved monitoring, state verification, and automated fault detection and diagnosis tools are needed to ensure that the facade systems are operating as designed. As an alternative to automated control of dynamic facade components, existing manual facade elements could be operated by building occupants in a manner that reduces energy use. The development of control strategies for manual facade operation would then enable software or hardware systems (e.g., push notifications to mobile phones) that prompt building occupants to adjust manual facade components—lower or raise shades, open or close windows. Such solutions might be more cost-effective than fully automated systems, especially in existing buildings. Once these systems are developed, research should also be conducted to empirically validate predicted energy savings based on occupants' deviation from prompted operation (e.g., windows left open, shades remaining closed).

Automated dynamic glazing and facade control systems and their supporting hardware must also be developed with attention to cybersecurity considerations, because these devices are likely to be left in near-default configurations once installed and initially commissioned, potentially with limited active effort to install updates and patches or conduct other cybersecurity-related maintenance. In the future, these systems might represent a large number of network-connected devices, which would present an appealing target for use in attacks on other systems [54], as well as an opportunity to cause widespread disruption to building operations.

Table 10 summarizes the future research opportunities for dynamic glazing and dynamic facades discussed in this section. These opportunities suggest broad R&D activities that can move product price and performance in the direction of the targets articulated in Table 8. Table 9 articulates additional characteristics that are not necessarily needed to achieve the price and performance targets in Table 8, but that are important to consider when developing

materials and components such that those R&D efforts yield dynamic glazing and facade systems that meet or exceed industry standards and customer expectations. Any improvement in energy or nonenergy (increased comfort and productivity) performance must be matched with proven durability. Standard testing (ASTM 2141) should be balanced and validated with real-world field testing.

**Table 9. These critical characteristics define the additional performance or functionality needed from dynamic glazing, not necessarily for energy savings, but to yield glazing that is appealing to architects and accepted by building occupants.**

Critical Characteristics (Dynamic Glazing)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broad dynamic range for <math>T_{sol}</math> and <math>T_{vis}</math> (e.g., 60:1 between minimum and maximum tint states)</li> <li>• For adequate glare control, switching time to <math>T_{vis} &lt; 0.03</math> or fully opaque/translucent state of <math>&lt; 3</math> min for a large window (e.g., <math>1.5 \times 2.75</math> m) at operating temperatures of <math>-20</math>–<math>80</math> °C</li> <li>• <math>K_e</math> or LSG (<math>T_{vis}/SHGC</math>) <math>&gt; 2</math> in inactive (clear) state (this criterion does not apply for systems where NIR and visible switching are independent)</li> <li>• Low power consumption for switching and maintaining the switched state (<math>&lt; 3</math> W/m<sup>2</sup> or <math>&lt; 72</math> Wh/m<sup>2</sup> per day) with low voltage power supply (3–5 V DC)</li> <li>• Neutral color (e.g., clear, gray) in both the inactive and switched (blocking) states</li> <li>• Continuous tinting or multiple intermediate tint states</li> <li>• Proven durability performance that meets or exceeds third-party testing (ASTM 2141) for <math>&gt; 50,000</math> switching cycles under harsh accelerated environmental testing.</li> </ul>	

**Table 10. Future Research Opportunities Related to Dynamic Glazing and Facades**

Future Research Opportunities		
Technology	Objectives	R&D Activity
Dynamic Glazing	Reduce total installed price <sup>a</sup>	Develop novel materials compatible with fabrication methods suited to existing float glass production processes
	Increase energy savings potential <sup>a</sup>	Investigate novel materials that can independently attenuate visible or NIR wavelengths
	Broaden value proposition	Develop PV materials with properties complementary to dynamic glazing
Dynamic Facades	Reduce total installed price <sup>a</sup>	Achieve fully encapsulated, self-powered systems
	Reduce total installed price <sup>a</sup> Increase energy savings potential <sup>a</sup>	Develop simplified sensor and control architectures that optimize energy savings and occupant comfort
	Broaden value proposition	Develop novel control methods for grid-integrated operation
		Investigate required communications and data exchange protocols to support grid-integrated operation

<sup>a</sup> Cost and performance levels must be sufficient to achieve the overall price and performance targets for this technology area, given in Table 8.

### 3.3 Visible Light Redirection

Visible light redirection or “daylighting” systems increase the usability of available natural light to illuminate interior spaces. Commercialized daylighting systems include interior and exterior light shelves, louvers, and films adhered

to the glass itself. These systems typically apply to clerestory windows or the upper part of the main windows, while the remaining window area is unimpeded to maintain exterior views. Visible light redirection systems also include technologies that capture light at the roof or facade and redirect it to interior spaces that do not have windows. When these technologies are combined with lighting sensors and controls and, ideally, with dimmable lamps or luminaires, they can significantly reduce the lighting energy use in some types of commercial buildings by substantially increasing the floor area with adequate illumination from available daylight alone. Moreover, daylighting has been cited as a mechanism to improve health and productivity [19, 55, 56], and labor costs far exceed typical energy costs for most organizations [57].<sup>18</sup>

### Technology Area Targets

The performance and installed price targets for visible light redirection and daylighting systems that can reduce lighting energy use available in 2030 are given in Table 11, along with technical potential primary energy savings for these technologies at the indicated performance level in 2030 and 2050. The target installed price assumes a 5-year simple payback; for payback periods ranging from 3 to 10 years, installed prices for visible light redirection systems range from 2.20 to 7.40 \$/ft<sup>2</sup> window area. The installed price does not include any window costs, because it is assumed that the daylighting system is added onto existing windows.

The installed price in Table 11 also assumes that the daylighting system covers the entire surface area of all windows. If the system applies to only a fraction of the window area or only some of the windows in a building, the installed price per unit daylighting system area would increase accordingly, so long as the indicated performance level is achieved. For example, if the system can achieve 40% lighting energy savings covering only the top third of all the windows in a building, the corresponding total installed price could be 11.10 \$/ft<sup>2</sup> area. The installed price target includes any required sensors and control systems, as well as installation and commissioning of those systems, to achieve the indicated performance level consistently for the entire operating lifetime of the system. The installed price target does not include cost savings derived from longer lamp lifetimes associated with reductions in annual lamp operating hours, though the already long lifetimes of solid-state lighting likely reduces the net present value of the avoided lighting costs. Other nonenergy cost savings—such as potential health or productivity benefits—are not factored into the installed price target, though they might be substantially greater than the energy cost savings alone [57]. The indicated energy savings and corresponding energy cost savings embedded in the total installed price do not implicitly require any particular floor plate depth; a 40-foot floor plate is a reasonable target for visible light redirection, though technologies that rely on mechanisms not influenced by floor plate depth need not adhere to this guideline.

**Table 11. Installed price and performance targets for visible light redirection technologies available in 2030, as well as technical potential primary energy savings and avoided CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in 2030 and 2050. Energy savings and performance objectives for these technologies are based on lighting energy use reductions.**

Visible Light Redirection/Daylighting								
Building Sector	Performance		Installed Price		Primary Energy Savings (quads)		Avoided CO <sub>2</sub> Emissions (Mt)	
					2030	2050	2030	2050
Commercial	40%	Lighting Energy Savings	3.70	\$/ft <sup>2</sup> window area	0.22	0.22	7.3	6.4

Visible light redirection devices intended to reduce lighting energy use in buildings have been explored for many decades [55], but they have found limited commercial adoption because of several challenges related to both the technologies themselves and the supporting infrastructure required to realize consistent lighting energy savings. Light redirection systems installed in pilot projects have demonstrated significant lighting energy savings [59], but designers and building operators face multiple barriers to replicating these savings [60]. Correctly designing and commissioning the lighting control system to deliver expected lighting energy savings and operate in a manner that is acceptable to building occupants is not trivial. The difficulty of achieving the expected energy savings and

<sup>18</sup>Notably, the most direct study of the implications of daylight on individual cognitive performance or productivity focused on students in a classroom setting [58].

thus realizing any potential operational cost savings limits the acceptability of the additional design, equipment, and installation costs of these systems. Improved software and simulation tools could facilitate appropriate system design and commissioning while reducing design effort and associated costs, but existing tools are generally not approachable for inexperienced users [60].

With respect to visible light redirection devices themselves, glare and aesthetics are persistent challenges. Systems that allow transmission of downward sunlight cause glare and thermal discomfort. Installing a secondary shade to prevent discomfort reduces the efficiency of the daylight redirecting device. Moreover, the patterns of redirected sunlight can be nonuniform and produce high contrasts of bright sunlight and shadowed areas on the ceiling and walls. Some lighting designers and building occupants find that this nonuniformity detracts from the overall design and are therefore reluctant to employ daylight redirection technologies. For retrofit applications, sidelighting redirection technologies might not perform well because of low ceiling heights, inappropriate ceiling surfaces for light reflection (e.g., extensive exposed mechanical systems), existing blinds that block the light redirection system when closed, and inadequate control system infrastructure to support appropriately configured lighting controls [59]. Interior walls can also limit or eliminate daylighting potential in office settings with extensive perimeter offices. Understanding the energy savings contributions from these complementary design choices could lead to overall improvements in light redirection system design and implementation.

Technologies that do not depend on sidelighting for visible light redirection have the potential to be effective for spaces with low or otherwise incompatible ceilings and for windowless interior spaces. These capabilities are critical to maximizing the lighting energy savings potential from utilizing available ambient light, particularly for retrofit applications where these building characteristics are not easily changed. These technologies should be developed to minimize the number and size of roof or facade penetrations, maximize visible light transmission, minimize heat transmission, minimize color change of the incoming light, and minimize total installed prices. The cost of any light transmission conduits should also be extremely low per unit length, and light decay in the conduits should be minimized to allow for long and indirectly routed runs. Systems should perform well with both direct and diffuse solar radiation to maximize lighting energy savings. Light concentrators that use fiber optic conduits generally do not have sufficiently low prices for the daylight provided; alternative approaches that leverage findings from solar PV research, digital projection technologies, and other research areas might be fruitful.

Table 13 summarizes the future research opportunities for daylighting and visible light redirection systems discussed in this section. These opportunities suggest broad R&D activities that can move product price and performance in the direction of the targets articulated in Table 11. Additional research needs, particularly related to institutional technology adoption barriers, integrated daylighting and lighting controls, and nonenergy effects of daylighting, are articulated by Thomson et al. [60]. Table 12 articulates additional characteristics that are not necessarily needed to achieve the price and performance targets in Table 11, but that are important to consider when developing materials and components such that those R&D efforts yield daylighting and visible light redirection systems that meet or exceed industry standards and customer expectations of durability, and maximize occupant acceptance of and comfort and productivity benefits from these systems.

**Table 12. Critical Characteristics of Daylighting and Visible Light Redirection Technologies**

Critical Characteristics
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain instantaneous daylight glare probability <math>&lt;0.35</math></li> <li>• Redirect no direct solar radiation toward occupants' viewing positions</li> <li>• Provide spatial daylight autonomy <math>sDA_{300,50} \geq 55\%</math> and <math>sDA_{300,20} \geq 80\%</math> throughout a generic 40-foot floor plate without partitions and with daylight from only one side</li> <li>• Ensure that the visible spectrum of the redirected light is similar to that of the transmitted light through the window to avoid color differences on interior surfaces</li> <li>• Need minimal additional installation requirements relative to typical window products (e.g., blinds, films)</li> <li>• Need no additional maintenance requirements relative to typical window products</li> <li>• Demonstrate power consumption <math>&lt;1 \text{ W/m}^2</math> clerestory window area at low voltage (3–5 V DC); self-powered or passive operation preferred</li> <li>• Establish compatibility with existing manual or automated shading systems.</li> </ul>

**Table 13. Future Research Opportunities Related to Daylighting and Visible Light Redirection Systems**

Future Research Opportunities		
Technology	Objectives	R&D Activity
Visible Light Redirection	Increase energy savings potential <sup>a</sup> Reduce total installed price <sup>a</sup>	Develop software to simplify design for lighting savings and occupant comfort while simplifying commissioning
	Increase energy savings potential <sup>a</sup> Increase size of applicable market	Develop software for sensor configuration to ensure adequate glare control
		Develop technologies that redirect light to interior spaces or otherwise do not require sidelighting
	Increase size of applicable market	Investigate novel light redirection materials with greater control over directional distribution of light

<sup>a</sup> Cost and performance levels must be sufficient to achieve the overall price and performance targets for this technology area, given in Table 11.

### 3.4 Systems-Level Performance Evaluation and Characterization of Windows

The modeling tools, window evaluation facilities, and technical capabilities developed by DOE for the windows industry have had a pivotal role in the R&D, design, and manufacturing of high-performance windows, as well as their rating and certification. Looking forward, the impact of these tools, infrastructure, and expertise can be expanded by developing capabilities that enable systems-level assessment of window technologies. As discussed in Section 4.1, a systems-level approach to new construction and retrofit project planning and execution has the potential to help architects and engineers recognize the benefits of specifying a high-performance envelope. In addition, modifications to modeling and simulation tools could facilitate assessment of GEB performance for dynamic facades, including determining the GEB potential for an individual building and integrating GEB value into the overall assessment of the envelope with other building systems when specifying a project. Together, adding these types of capabilities to modeling tools will enable them to support many of the activities described in Section 4, which are specifically intended to broaden the value proposition of the novel technologies described in this section and help accelerate their market adoption.

## 4 Integration

Beyond developing novel window materials and systems, and supporting tools and infrastructure, other actions can help broaden the related value proposition. Identifying, quantifying, and articulating the additional value streams or benefits associated with windows can help accelerate their adoption. Tweaking traditional approaches to building project procurement, design, and construction can help fully value the building end uses served with implementing a high-performance building envelope, improving occupant comfort, increasing usable floor space, and reducing HVAC system costs. Building envelope components with dynamic or time-varying properties could enable the provision of electric grid services, which could lead to direct remuneration or be used as part of a strategy for increasing the value of variable renewable energy generation. In addition to expanding the value proposition of building envelope materials and systems themselves, incorporating technologies, manufacturing methods, and engineering and business practices from other industries could represent innovations in the buildings industry that can be employed to improve performance or reduce total installed prices. In the buildings industry, these innovations could improve repeatability or precision in manufacturing or installation; reduce inventory, customer acquisition, or installation labor costs; or enable cheaper, simpler, site-specific customization for high-performance building envelope retrofits.

### 4.1 Systems-Level Approach

#### 4.1.1 Building Construction and Retrofit with a Systems-Level Approach

Window features that can deliver energy savings also affect building occupants and the operation of major building subsystems, including space conditioning, ventilation, and lighting. Taking a whole-building systems-level approach ensures that the interdependencies of these major building subsystems are reflected throughout a building's development—from design to occupancy—to ensure that trade-offs in capital cost, operating cost, and other nonfinancial criteria are accurately accounted for in the specification of these systems to achieve the desired indoor environment. This approach should also capture differences in equipment and envelope component lifetimes in the operating costs. Using a systems-level approach could improve the adoption of energy-efficient envelope components and assemblies by showing early in the construction process the various impacts—cost and otherwise—of meeting building indoor environment targets with, for example, a code-minimum envelope and a large space-conditioning system (heating, cooling, and ventilation) compared to a high-performance envelope and a smaller space-conditioning system. Although the climate conditions in the United States make it more difficult than in Europe to completely eliminate space-conditioning equipment by specifying a high-performance envelope [61], such an envelope can still offer substantial co-benefits for building owners, tenants, and individual occupants by better managing factors that influence occupant comfort. As noted by Gladden [57], labor costs dwarf typical utility costs in commercial buildings, so even small or uncertain improvements in employee productivity from improved thermal comfort, adequate outdoor views, and access to natural light might offset high-performance envelope component costs.

Software tools that can clarify the value proposition and trade-offs in the specification of the building envelope and related building systems during the design phase can help communicate the value of high-performance envelopes to decision makers. These tools should be able to highlight these trade-offs at a glance. Ideally, these tools could incorporate both quantitative factors (such as capital and operating costs) as well as semiquantitative or qualitative factors (such as construction budget and schedule risk as well as occupant comfort and productivity). These tools must fit into the existing workflows of architects, designers, and engineers such that the effort for them to obtain these systems-level insights is extremely low, and indeed, adds value to their workflow and provides insights that they can translate into value metrics for their clients. Critically, the software tools that are appropriate for the workflows employed by large firms for high-value, high-profile projects might be substantially different from the tools that are appropriate for smaller organizations that do not have the labor or overhead (i.e., room in their budget) to devote significant time to learning or using them. In these cases, tools that require less intervention or manual tuning to provide actionable insights—or even decision support tools that involve only simplified trade-off calculations—might be appropriate.

Incorporating a systems-level approach into business processes for new construction and retrofit of existing buildings, particularly in the commercial sector, can accelerate adoption of high-performance windows. For new commercial buildings, in the current typical practice, energy-efficient features are often considered relatively late in the

design process, which adds significant cost and risk to incorporating those features [62]. Energy efficiency objectives should be incorporated early in the project life cycle to minimize capital cost; using a holistic, systems-level design approach, these objectives can be met using an optimal combination of high-performance envelope technologies and upgrades to other building subsystems to maximize operating cost savings and other cost-adjacent factors such as employee productivity. In existing buildings, a similar focus on energy efficiency at the outset of retrofit projects can help ensure that energy efficiency is incorporated into buildings with the lowest possible capital cost and schedule risk, while ensuring that the value proposition provided by energy-efficient envelope technologies and other components is integral to the retrofit design. In general, performance-based procurement—where performance requirements, including energy performance, are determined upfront and incorporated into the request for proposals and contract selection process—can achieve the objective of incorporating energy efficiency early in the design-build process, though there might be other strategies that achieve similar results and might be easier for some organizations to adopt [63]. Utilities can also use their incentive programs to promote the use of performance-based procurement by incorporating performance-based criteria into their programs, thus signaling to building owners that those criteria are central to receiving incentive funds [63]. Using this kind of incentive program structure also opens a performance-based pathway that encourages a systems-level approach to achieving utility program goals. These performance-based programs should also require post-occupancy measurement and verification, though different levels of measurement and verification will be appropriate depending on the size of the building and the value of the incentives offered.

#### 4.1.2 Incorporating New Technologies With Advanced Building Construction Approaches

Although drop-in replacement window components and systems might offer the most obvious route to commercialization, because they simply improve upon the performance of the current typical or state-of-the-art product, technologies and approaches that rethink the configuration of and methods for fabricating and installing the envelope assembly might offer more substantial energy savings. New retrofit methods can leverage a systems-level approach to increasing nonenergy benefits as well, improving occupant comfort, health, well-being, and productivity. Using novel approaches to assemblies or combinations of multiple components might reduce production costs, improve performance, and reduce errors by, for example, completing assembly in a controlled factory environment. Combining multiple control layers for air, moisture, and heat—as well as structural functions into fewer layers and components—could reduce complexity in factory and on-site construction, thus reducing cost and potentially improving performance, or providing an additional benefit that could justify incorporating a high-performance technology that is not otherwise required. Rethinking approaches for assemblies to simplify effort and improve flexibility or adaptability could be particularly beneficial for retrofit applications, which tend to require a high degree of customization because of the enormous variation in existing buildings; these variations add significant cost, quality, and performance challenges to retrofit projects, all of which inhibit envelope retrofit adoption.

Tools, materials, components, and platforms developed for other applications might be able to be directly applied to windows components or might offer insights into how challenges specific to envelope construction can be addressed with new approaches. BTO's Advanced Building Construction (ABC) initiative takes this approach to developing technologies and methods that improve the cost and scalability of deep energy retrofits [64].<sup>19</sup> For example, a wide range of advanced manufacturing methods might be relevant to buildings, including advanced robotics, automation, and lean production methods. Manufacturing methods that reduce the complexity and cost of customization could be particularly relevant for retrofits because of the wide variation in facade configurations between buildings. Additive manufacturing (i.e., 3D printing) is a method well suited to customization for project-specific parts, unique geometries that are difficult to fabricate using traditional manufacturing methods, and components or molds that do not need to be replicated many times. Additive manufacturing for buildings-related applications is often first thought to be a method for the direct deposition of material to build up whole envelopes, as in ORNL's Additive Manufacturing Integrated Energy demonstration [65]; however, additive manufacturing might have greater impact in envelope component applications, such as forms for precast concrete facade sections, as shown in Figure 14. These forms can increase the quality of facade sections [66], which could contribute to reducing air leakage for finished facades, both in retrofits and new construction. Printed molds might also enable more complex form geometries, which could provide more effective passive shading to reduce solar heat gain through windows and increase the appeal of facade retrofits. Direct deposition of novel materials that incorporate multiple functionalities, such as low-thermal-

<sup>19</sup>See: <https://www.energy.gov/eere/buildings/what-advanced-building-construction-initiative>.

conductivity structural materials that also manage air and moisture transport, could help justify the additional cost of additive manufacturing compared to traditional on-site construction methods, while also offering substantially higher dimensional precision than those methods. The continued advancement of computer vision hardware and image processing algorithms for manufacturing and various software applications could be applied to data collection for retrofits by simplifying dimensioning for retrofit parts. Image processing combined with additively manufactured inserts, for example, could be used in place of shims to quickly position windows in rough openings for installation while also providing a snug, potentially airtight fit. Printable materials with appropriate coefficients of thermal expansion will be needed for compatibility with typical window frames and structural framing materials. There are likely many additional areas where computer vision, image processing, or additive manufacturing can be used, particularly for envelope retrofits where building-specific customization adds substantial cost and risk. Further work is needed to identify envelope energy savings opportunities that are feasible with currently available products and to identify areas where novel materials, software tools, or printing capabilities would facilitate additional energy efficiency improvements for building envelopes.



**Figure 14. Additive manufacturing has been demonstrated successfully for precast concrete forms of building facades. Avenues to employ advanced manufacturing techniques, such as additive manufacturing, for energy-efficient window-to-facade integration merit additional investigation.**

Photos courtesy of ORNL.

In addition to image processing, other software and computational methods used in other industries could enable component, subsystem, and whole-building designs that improve energy efficiency. At the component level, topology optimization could be applied to some window components [67]. In general, topology optimization describes a method used to identify the optimal geometry for a structural component subject to specific loads while minimizing weight and/or the material required. Topology optimization could be used to optimize the geometry of window frame and curtain wall components to reduce thermal transport while meeting structural requirements, such as in the work of Lee et al. [68] applying topology optimization for curtain wall mullions. For whole-building and subsystem design, artificial intelligence, including machine learning, might find applications. Although machine learning can be extremely expensive to apply to any single project, high-volume decisions or design actions that are relatively repetitive but require extensive labor effort could be initial areas where machine learning might offer cost reduction opportunities. For example, machine learning might be appropriate in providing actionable design decision guidance, particularly with respect to incorporating a systems-level approach into design workflows. Machine learning could be used to automatically investigate alternative envelope design approaches to improve efficiency and performance while simultaneously meeting other envelope performance and system cost requirements. These capabilities would be particularly valuable for smaller firms that traditionally do not have adequate staff resources to investigate many potential design alternatives for each project. Throughout the project design process, there might be similar opportunities to increase the adoption of energy-efficient envelope components and designs using artificial intelligence methods. Applications of artificial intelligence in building design and construction are currently being explored, though not generally with the aim of increasing envelope performance or building energy efficiency more generally; further work is needed to identify these specific opportunities and evaluate their feasibility.

## 4.2 Grid-interactive Efficient Buildings

In line with BTO's focus on energy efficiency, goals for window technologies have historically included aggregate metrics such as national energy savings, reducing end-use intensity, and driving down prices. A limitation of these energy savings metrics is that they do not distinguish the varying value of energy; energy used at different times and locations will vary in cost and impacts according to the fuel used, market structures, and technological constraints. These differences are particularly pronounced in the electricity system, where supply must balance demand instantaneously at every moment in time. In order to better address the spatiotemporal variations in the value of energy savings and to prepare for a future where building and grid operations could be closely coordinated, BTO has developed a new strategy for GEB, which complements the office's continuing focus on energy efficiency. The GEB strategy includes both connected and controllable technologies that might reduce electricity use at times when energy is more costly or carbon-intensive, as well as nonconnected technologies that increase the capacity of the building to alter operations.

To help inform the building research community, BTO has published a series of technical reports that discuss its GEB strategy and evaluate opportunities for demand flexibility from buildings [5, 69, 70, 71, 72]. The *Overview of Research Challenges and Gaps* report [5] serves as an introduction to these technical reports and is intended to provide background on core concepts related to the GEB strategy. It addresses how flexible building loads can be integrated and controlled to benefit consumers, the electric grid, and society more broadly. The *Windows and Opaque Envelope* GEB report details the technology opportunities and R&D opportunities specifically relevant to providing demand-side flexibility with windows and opaque envelope technologies [69].

Complementing these GEB reports, the following subsections discuss: (1) the mechanisms by which buildings can provide demand flexibility that is beneficial to the electric grid, (2) the relevance of passive and active window technologies to electric grid operations, and (3) the specific window technologies that can deliver passive benefits or active responses to control signals to meet forecast or real-time electric grid operational needs.

### 4.2.1 Grid Services and Dynamic Building Operations

High-performance windows, particularly as part of a high-performance building envelope, are a key enabler for other end uses to provide grid services. In addition, dynamic glazing and facades have the potential to facilitate expanded grid service provision from heating, cooling, and lighting systems. The need for demand flexibility from buildings depends on the market and grid conditions at any given time. Requests for flexible operation could be on only a few days per year (e.g., reliability-based demand response), or on a daily, hourly, or even continuous basis. Typical grid services can be delivered by buildings via four different mechanisms: efficiency, load shedding, load shifting, and load modulation (i.e., frequency regulation or voltage support). The ability of window and facade technologies to deliver these services hinges on the existence of the necessary communications infrastructure to connect utilities directly to the end-use loads or the transparent facade's device-specific or whole-building energy control systems.

Energy efficiency and demand response are the most mature and established demand flexibility programs for buildings. In addition to overall energy savings, efficiency plays an important role in supporting grid reliability by decreasing peak demand and easing strain on the transmission and distribution system. Demand response is the main form of demand flexibility used today, though it is fairly limited in scope. The majority of demand response programs are generally focused on reducing peak demand through shedding or shifting—through direct load control (by utilities/demand aggregators) or behavioral load control programs in which utility customers make a decision to reduce their load in response to price signals.

The performance of both current demand response programs and demand flexibility from buildings more generally is heavily dependent on the heating and cooling loads of the building, and thus, the energy performance of the transparent facade. Currently, the vast majority of demand response in residential and commercial buildings is thermostat or air-conditioner compressor control—when the utility alters an indoor setpoint or reduces air-conditioner compressor cycling, the action has implications on the thermal comfort of the occupants. Buildings with high-performance windows and opaque envelopes have more capacity to provide demand flexibility while maintaining occupant comfort. With more advanced controls to enable more sophisticated grid service provision, not only will passive window performance upgrades contribute to comfort and demand response capacity, but dynamic windows that alter daylighting and solar heat gain in real time can be actively managed to co-optimize occupant comfort and productivity with grid service provision and corresponding remuneration.

Beyond demand response, building envelope technologies are able to engage directly in electricity capacity markets. Two independent system operators (ISOs) that operate electricity capacity markets allow the bidding of energy efficiency measures into their market, including building shell upgrades such as improved insulation [73]. Capacity markets exist in some but not all deregulated electricity markets as a contingency, so that grid operators can ensure that sufficient electrical generation capacity exists. For both ISO New England (ISO-NE) and PJM, capacity resources bid 3 years in advance and can be either demand-side resources or electricity generators. In ISO-NE's auction for 2016, 4.25% of the total capacity market was energy efficiency, and another 3.3% of the capacity market was composed of demand response and distributed generation. In PJM's 2016–2017 auction, energy efficiency was a much smaller contribution, representing 0.64% of the capacity, with other demand-side resources composing another 7.3% of the capacity market. Although the study reporting on these capacity market advancements [73] did not provide a breakdown of the specific energy efficiency measures bid into the markets, it is likely that most of the demand response and a portion of the energy efficiency markets are dependent upon windows and envelope upgrades. During an internal ISO-NE audit of energy efficiency capacity performance, energy efficiency savings were found to be much more reliable than any other capacity market product, providing 120% of what was bid in summer months (and even more in winter months). Demand response resources came in second with 95.3% availability of the total bid. By contrast, supply-side generation is assumed to have 94.1% availability and peaking plants 80% availability [73]. With several years of participation in electricity markets, system operators are gaining confidence that energy efficiency and demand response resources are real and reliable for capacity markets. Because building envelope components can potentially bid as energy efficiency resources as well as enhance demand response capabilities when coupled with advanced HVAC control, remuneration from electricity markets provides an additional quantifiable value for transparent facade retrofits.

#### 4.2.2 Co-Benefit of High-Performance Windows: Energy Resilience


Energy resilience describes the ability of building systems to predict and prepare for, withstand, recover rapidly from, and adapt to adverse events that affect the delivery of energy-based services such as heating, cooling, lighting, refrigeration and other energy end uses. High-performance windows generally reduce heating and cooling energy use, and thus increase the time from when an interruption occurs to when the building becomes uninhabitable because of temperature conditions. Figures 15 and 16 illustrate the effect of a high-performance building envelope (higher insulation, lower air leakage, and improved windows) on occupant protection following a utility service interruption in the winter and summer, respectively. In the winter, increased envelope performance beneficially increases indoor temperatures and reduces temperature variations compared to a typical building, maintaining a temperature difference of up to 30°F. During a summer interruption, a high-performance envelope again reduces temperature variations, which reduces peak temperatures compared to a typical building, but peak outdoor temperatures are generally lower than peak indoor temperatures in all four building envelope cases considered. These results show that the impacts of static high-performance building envelopes on resilience can vary by climate zone and season. Energy efficiency and load flexibility can impact building energy resilience in both complementary and conflicting ways. As such, the interactions between efficiency, flexibility, and energy resilience must be considered holistically. In the future, BTO might develop performance targets for window technologies specific to their contribution to resilience.

#### 4.2.3 GEB-Relevant Window Technologies


Windows and attachments are crucial to increasing building capacity to shed or shift load. All transparent facade technologies that improve energy performance also have the potential to improve demand flexibility. In addition to passive and nonautomated technologies, dynamic window and facade technologies can actively change their heat transfer characteristics specifically in response to grid needs. Some of these technologies are already on the market and some are laboratory scale, but both passive and active window technologies can help manage thermal and lighting conditions in buildings to provide demand flexibility. In this section, currently commercialized and novel window technologies are reviewed with regard to how they might enable demand flexibility from buildings.

##### *Passive High-Performance Window Technologies*

In general, high-performance transparent facade technologies that effectively manage heat transfer through high thermal resistance, effective air sealing, and appropriate solar heat gain control for the climate will reduce energy use. Technologies with these characteristics will also reduce peak electricity demand, because these peak periods



**Figure 15. Indoor temperature trends compared to the ambient temperature for a single-family detached home with varying building envelope performance levels following a utility service outage modeled on January 27. As envelope performance increases, interior temperatures remain higher and more stable, even several days after service ceases.**  
Figure derived from ORNL analysis [69].




**Figure 16. Indoor temperature trends compared to the ambient temperature for a single-family detached home with varying building envelope performance levels following a utility service outage modeled on July 23. As envelope performance increases, interior temperatures become somewhat more stable and peak temperatures are reduced, but minimum temperatures increase, because the building is less coupled with ambient temperature trends—both unfavorable and favorable.**  
Figure derived from ORNL analysis [69].

are typically driven by thermal loads. This peak-period demand reduction capability does not require dynamic or time-varying operation and is an inherent feature of correctly installed high-performance transparent facades. Technologies that lower the thermal load of the building include external devices for shading the building, internal

devices that block solar heat gain through windows, window coatings that reflect solar energy, and other envelope measures [74].

Several studies have estimated the impact of building envelope improvements on peak electricity demand. Two simulations in Hong Kong, a hot and humid climate, estimate energy savings at the annual peak between 37% and 47% from passive envelope measures [75, 76]. In a study in Greece, external awnings shading a building were found to reduce the cooling load of the building by 30% [77]. The effect of a high-performance opaque envelope on summer electricity demand was recently quantified by researchers at ORNL using a building physics simulation of two different single-family detached homes.<sup>20</sup> The “typical” building had equipment upgraded to the 2012 International Energy Conservation Code, but with duct leakage and an envelope and windows representative of typical existing homes. The “high-performance” building had similar equipment, reduced duct leakage compared to the “typical” home, and better-than-code envelope and windows. Average cooling season (June 12–September 17) electricity demand results for two International Energy Conservation Code climate zones are illustrated in Figure 17. These results show that demand is similar during the early morning hours for both the typical and high-performance homes, but throughout the peak period, increased insulation and improved solar control reduces electricity demand dramatically. Average cooling season peak period (12–6 p.m.) energy use reductions observed across modeled climate zones<sup>21</sup> ranged from 20% to 47%, with the largest peak reductions in hotter climate zones.



**Figure 17. Simulation of a residential single-family detached home with varying levels of insulation reveals that improved windows (and increased insulation) from current typical existing building performance to slightly above current code levels yields dramatic reductions in electricity demand throughout the peak period during the cooling season.**

Figure derived from ORNL analysis [69].

### Active, Dynamic Window Technologies

Dynamic transparent facade technologies have the potential to provide additional demand flexibility beyond currently available static windows and fixed or manually operated window attachments. In addition, these dynamic technologies can actively manage occupant thermal comfort, daylighting, and optical comfort (glare) by modulating solar heat gain and admission of light. Active, dynamic window technologies can generally be divided into dynamic glazing and automated attachments.

<sup>20</sup>This ORNL research was conducted for the purposes of this report, and the results are not currently published elsewhere.

<sup>21</sup>The analysis included single-family detached homes simulated in all major International Energy Conservation Code climate zones.

## Dynamic Glazing

Dynamic glazing refers to a suite of window technologies that can change the transmittance of visible light, solar heat gain, or both. Section 3.2 discusses these technologies in detail; this section highlights some of the most promising technologies in the context of demand flexibility. The most technologically mature of available dynamic glazing formulations are electrochromic windows, which change transmittance properties when a voltage is applied.


There are currently several major manufacturers of electrochromic glass on the market, but multiple barriers have thus far prevented widespread adoption. Cost is primary among these, with commercially available electrochromic windows retailing for 50–100 \$/ft<sup>2</sup> compared to conventional window prices from 15 \$/ft<sup>2</sup> [78]. Other concerns include the relatively long time period necessary to switch window tint level (5–12 minutes [79]) and the fact that most electrochromic windows do not independently modulate infrared and visible light, so a window switched to minimize solar heat gain will also reduce available daylight from the window. This might be less desirable for occupants who value daylight, but more importantly, this can have implications for lighting electricity demand, because indoor lighting levels might have to be increased if daylight is reduced. PV glazing that combines power generation with dynamic solar control has the potential to reduce peak demand by reducing cooling requirements while simultaneously generating electricity during peak hours [47]. It should also be noted that electrochromic windows are not generally designed to facilitate demand flexibility or maximize energy savings; often building owners purchase electrochromic windows to avoid attached shades and maximize views to the outdoors.

In simulation results, electrochromic windows have been shown to reduce peak cooling electricity demand between 5 and 7 W/m<sup>2</sup> in 10 North American cities, compared to static solar heat gain control glazing [80], and another simulation showed that electrochromic glazing can reduce solar radiation gains up to 88.9% compared to code-minimum glazing [81]. A separate laboratory experiment similarly found that electrochromic windows could save energy in cooling-dominated climates, with savings between 6 and 30 kWh/ft<sup>2</sup> [82]. Peak cooling loads in a full-scale testbed were reduced 25%–58% with electrochromic windows, compared to spectrally selective low-e windows [83]. Figure 18 shows simulation results for a summer day in California; these results show that reductions in lighting and cooling system energy use (potentially enabled with dynamic glazing) can yield substantial reductions in peak electricity demand. In the example illustrated, peak demand is reduced by 7 GW, or approximately 30%. PV glazing that incorporates dynamic switching comparable to electrochromic glazing could further enhance the peak period benefits by reducing peak electricity demand and simultaneously generating additional electricity to offset other building loads contributing to peak period electricity demand.

Several other dynamic glazing technologies exist beyond electrochromics. Liquid crystal switching can be thermally, optically, or electrically activated and switched in milliseconds, but only controls thermal energy in the visible spectrum, thus neglecting valuable NIR control [84]. Another promising new technology is the electrodeposition of metals in a solution of aqueous electrolytes, which is quick and reversible. Limitations include a narrow temperature band in which the technology operates and the difficulty of evenly dispersing the metals [85, 86]. Phase change materials store large amounts of energy in the transition between states, and a paraffin wax phase-change-material layer between glass panels has been proposed as a way of absorbing solar heat gain as latent energy. Phase-change-material applications might be limited in windows because they are nominally opaque and only transparent after periods of heat gain (e.g., midday) and have large volumetric changes during the phase transition (up to 10%) [87]. Gasochromic windows quickly change optical properties in the presence of oxygen, which is pumped in between layers of glass, and simulation shows they might reduce HVAC loads up to 25%–35% compared to single-pane glass [88], but they represent a risk for hydrogen explosion and need to be continually monitored [89]. Recently, pneumatically activated light modulation has been tested, which changes properties in a window layer in response to pressure, but it is unclear whether this impacts only the visible light spectrum or also solar heat gain [90]. Ghosh and Norton [91] provide a comprehensive overview of existing glazing technologies and their thermal and optical properties.

## Automated Attachments

Similar to static attachments, automated attachments seek to shield sections of the glazing system, and thus the building interior, from direct solar radiation. They utilize sensors, controls, and small motors to enable adjusting the position of the attachments in response to internal and external light conditions and occupant requests. Automated attachments can provide demand flexibility by moderating thermal energy demand via solar heat gain to reduce



**Figure 18. A simulation of electricity demand from a south-facing office space on a June day in Los Angeles shows that, compared to a manually operated blind, electrochromic glazing and MPC for the glazing and lighting can reduce electricity demand for cooling by up to 40% and almost entirely eliminate lighting electricity use throughout the daylight hours.**

Figure adapted from Gehbauer et al. [6].


electric heating and cooling needs [92]. Automated attachments can be internal to the building (e.g., roller blinds) or mounted on the facade. External attachments provide superior solar control to interior attachments, but can be more difficult and costly to install and maintain. Predictive control of automated attachments has some advantages over predictive thermal control, because the performance of the former is dependent on the known trajectory of the sun, especially for window attachments. The attachment positioning could then be altered to minimize solar heat gain to reduce cooling (perhaps at the expense of daylighting) as needed during a period of high demand. AERC is developing energy performance ratings for automated attachments and aiming to begin certifying products in this category in 2022. Kunwar et al. [93] provide an overview of existing automated shading techniques. Studies to date have found that window attachments can reduce cooling needs by 16%–30%, but this is highly dependent upon the climate zone and the control strategy [92, 14, 94, 95].

### Control Strategies

A range of control strategies, including classical control hierarchies, could facilitate load shifting or shedding using active, dynamic transparent facade components. Classical control strategies include having a schedule of setpoints, perhaps altering comfort ranges during peak electricity rates. Another classical control strategy would be to allow the building's internal temperature to float within an acceptable range of thermal comfort. A classical control strategy for natural ventilation would be to have window operation schedules that make use of thermal delay from thermal mass and reduce peak cooling demand. The strategy pre-cools the mass by natural ventilation during the nighttime, and prevents the mass from over-warming by closing windows during the day.

Moving beyond classical controls, a range of new data-driven techniques are being actively utilized. Figure 19 illustrates a possible sensor suite and control system architecture for coordinated operation of HVAC, lighting, and

dynamic facade technologies in a building. Machine learning algorithms help calibrate and analyze sensor data and predict and optimize controls. MPC is another data-driven technology and the subject of active research, having origins outside the building sector. For MPC, a model forecasts the behavior of the building then provides an optimal sequence of events to maximize building performance. Although MPC is becoming increasingly popular and has been shown to be up to 25% more efficient than simple night setback when used with HVAC controls, it is still expensive and complex to implement [96]. Fundamental work has been conducted to explore the additional demand flexibility enabled with MPC with dynamic facades and precooling strategies with thermal mass [49], as well as optimal window positions and operations for wind-driven natural ventilation [97].



**Figure 19. Demand flexibility enabled by dynamic transparent facade technologies is substantially increased with coordinated control of HVAC, lighting, and dynamic facade systems, especially when implemented with predictive controls.**

Figure courtesy of LBNL.

## 5 Market Transformation and Implementation


To realize the energy savings potential of novel technologies developed for windows, these technologies must be brought to market by companies that can market, sell, distribute, and support them. For technologies that involve fundamental changes in design or construction practices, even if those changes ultimately reduce labor effort, complexity, or total installed price, significant effort might be required to bring these changes to market. Technologies that can be used as drop-in replacements for existing components, materials, or systems might have a lower barrier to market entry because they fit in an existing market segment, but these technologies must still be taken from mid-stage development to a commercial product by resolving technical and nontechnical risks related to volume production, developing an appropriate go-to-market strategy, and investing in adequate marketing, sales, and distribution channels to reach the targeted market(s).

In general, DOE and BTO seek to invest in technologies that show potential for significant energy savings if technical challenges and market barriers currently limiting efficiency or precluding technology commercialization, scale-up, and widespread market adoption are addressed. To that end, BTO seeks to lower barriers to private-sector investment, commercialization, and scale-up of next-generation, energy-efficient technologies. There are two primary types of barriers to BTO's R&D transition and long-term energy savings objectives—technology development and commercialization barriers, and market adoption barriers. Technology development and commercialization barriers can include access to appropriate technology testing, validation, and demonstration capabilities; the cost and structure of capital and access to capital; expertise in manufacturing and production, particularly when new techniques must be developed; and an adequate understanding of building industry and end customer needs, willingness to pay, and appropriate sales channels. Market adoption barriers include building owners' access to capital and awareness of novel window technologies, market valuation of window upgrades and ease of capital recovery, confidence in energy savings estimates for window upgrades, and building construction industry practices that affect prices and installation quality. These barriers are collectively synergistic, because factors that act to inhibit market adoption of novel energy efficiency technologies create an environment in which original equipment manufacturers are reluctant to pursue development of those novel technologies for fear that they will not be able to recover their costs through revenue from product sales. BTO works with private-sector entities, such as efficiency advocates, utilities, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), state and local governments, and others, to attempt to remove these barriers.

### 5.1 Technology Development Pathway

To ultimately achieve energy savings in residential and commercial buildings from novel window component and system R&D, early-stage, high-risk projects must transition to private-sector R&D and commercialization. R&D projects funded by BTO are structured to enable private-sector transitions when appropriate. In general, private-sector capital for R&D competes with other potential uses of that capital that can deliver shareholder value. Long-term potential market impact derived from R&D successes presents investment risk, thus the overall risk profile of any R&D project (as well as the risk presented by projects within a BTO subprogram research portfolio) should be minimized. Projects should be designed particularly to reduce schedule and labor effort (time to market) and technical risks. Material synthesis and product form factors should be compatible with existing traditional manufacturing methods as much as is practicable—ideally relying on methods that have relatively low initial capital costs, which will reduce the total capital exposure (before first sale) for a private-sector entity. BTO investigates manufacturing methods or scale-up, where again the focus is on novel processes or practices, particularly where they have the potential to reduce the capital or operating costs of volume manufacturing. Supporting systems (e.g., software; application programming interfaces, protocols, and standards; modeling) can also be critical areas for BTO investment when they enable R&D, manufacturing, or adoption of novel windows. Regardless of the scope, projects should incorporate industry engagement as much as possible to ensure private-sector relevance upon completion. This work might include input from product manufacturers as well as other building industry entities (e.g., component manufacturers, vendors and sales channel partners, architects, contractors, and installers). In some cases, input from these other entities might have greater impact on R&D project relevance than direct input from potential manufacturers. Input from these entities should flesh out the value proposition of the eventual functionalities or capabilities offered by a project to build the case for private-sector commercialization.

Researchers can leverage existing resources and industry knowledge to accelerate private-sector commercialization of newly developed technologies. Figure 20 illustrates the technology commercialization process; throughout this process, researchers should seek to address technical and market risks that might preclude commercialization. For university and national lab researchers, institutional technology transfer offices or teams might offer resources for collaborating with industry or pursuing a spin-off as a new venture. Researchers should investigate building industry pain points related to the envelope and seek to align their projects to strategies that can address those points. Researchers should also explore established sales channels and typical market dynamics for their targeted application areas such that they understand the value proposition of existing products and other product attributes that might be valued by customers and channel partners.



**Figure 20. Commercialization process driven from early-stage research.**

Figure adapted from DOE TRL Guide [98] by Christopher Schwing, NREL.

The building construction and products industry in the United States is a mature market that has been slow to change and adopt new practices and materials. Productivity in the buildings sector has remained persistently low, even as other industries have dramatically increased their productivity in the past few decades [99, 100]. Building construction sector R&D investment hovers around 0.5% of the total market [99], which lags behind typical investment rates in most other sectors, particularly those with high levels of innovation [99]. Even with increased federal R&D investment in building technologies in recent years, broader industry investment has remained low [99, 101]. Given these conditions, business model or business practice innovation—possibly in concert with the deployment of novel technology developments—might have a larger effect on market transformation than from the development of novel technologies alone. In the solar PV market, novel financing models have enabled broader access to distributed rooftop solar, which when coupled with component and business practice innovations, significantly reduces the total installed price of distributed solar PV systems. Replicating this success might not be as readily achieved for window improvements or upgrades, because these changes, even those that have an aesthetic element, are not perceived as “advanced technology” [102]. However, in general, the buildings industry presents significant low-hanging fruit with respect to driving novel technology adoption through system and business process and practice innovation.

## 5.2 Facilitating Technology Adoption With Market Transformation Partners

Once high-performance, energy-efficient window technologies are made commercially available, they must generally achieve market adoption at scale to create sufficient demand to minimize production costs and maximize profitability. Prevailing construction and building retrofit market conditions and adjacent factors can create significant barriers to technology uptake. These barriers can be financial (e.g., adequate access to capital, appropriate financing mechanisms), knowledge-related (e.g., awareness of correct installation practices for novel technologies among contractors

and installers), or implementation-related (e.g., the extended disruptiveness of many envelope upgrades). These barriers can be reduced or circumvented through a range of voluntary actions, marketing and information sharing strategies, and policy interventions, including many initiatives that are currently being explored or tested.

Product prices, available financing mechanisms and their costs, and an absence of appropriate market valuation for energy efficiency upgrades all present financial barriers to the adoption of high-performance window technologies. Similar to most new technologies, new energy-efficient windows are likely to have high prices at market introduction. The high capital costs of these technologies might limit demand and thus hinder the business justification for manufacturing at scale, which is typically needed to reduce unit costs and thus the price faced by consumers. For all building types, market valuation typically does not reflect energy-efficiency-related upgrades. The appraisal process generally does not capture energy performance or efficiency upgrades, which has a downstream effect on building valuation and therefore mortgage lending and capital recovery from upgrades [103, 104]. There is, however, an opportunity to revitalize home and building facades that could improve curb appeal and result in real increases in market value. Capturing these benefits for a given building would likely involve a major renovation that incorporates system-level perspectives, including full envelope and window upgrades and integration, along with potential downsizing of mechanical equipment, which could offer economic benefits [105].

Today, these connections to real estate market value improvement have not been established. On top of the limited valuation of these upgrades, in the residential sector, consumers face comparatively high interest rates for energy efficiency improvement loans [102]. Consumers might be unable or unwilling to take on moderate-interest debt to finance energy efficiency upgrades, particularly because they are often dubious about the true energy savings potential of upgrades. Consumers might also be unsure whether they can expect to be net cash positive, especially following upgrades that are pitched to them by companies with a vested interest in earning their business [102, 106]. In spite of these financing challenges, residential [102] and commercial [103] properties with higher energy performance have lower default rates. Though these data show that energy performance can reduce risks for private capital, accounting for these efficiency upgrades does not appear to be widespread among lenders.

Even if building owners and building construction industry members become aware of novel, high-performance windows and opaque envelope integrated solutions, and if they have access to appropriate and acceptable mechanisms for financing potential envelope upgrades, there still remain additional practical barriers to the implementation of these novel window/wall integrated assemblies. Because of the complexity and assembled-on-site nature of the opaque envelope, in particular, component manufacturers generally do not provide performance guarantees or otherwise make claims regarding the performance of finished building envelopes that incorporate their products. Different installers might be responsible for different stages of facade assembly and window installation; no single entity among product manufacturers, contractors, or installers generally takes responsibility for the energy performance of the finished facade. As a result, there can be a significant difference between the specified and as-built performance of the envelope, and at no point during construction will defects that affect energy performance be intentionally identified and corrected.

In addition, in typical retrofits—especially for the opaque envelope—the required teardown and reconstruction of the facade is disruptive for building occupants and might even preclude occupancy, thereby adding significant costs (e.g., lost rents, relocation) for occupants or building owners. Conversely, window and opaque envelope retrofits often provide multiple nonenergy benefits, including improved aesthetics, improved occupant comfort and productivity, and reduced ambient noise intrusion. Although these nonenergy benefits can be accrued with any type of window retrofit to some extent, both the energy and nonenergy benefits are larger for higher efficiency windows, while the incremental cost of choosing high-performance windows is minimal compared to the overall project cost. Therefore, although nonenergy benefits might drive the building owner to pursue the upgrade, it is critical to inform the owner of the efficiency benefits that will be lost (and likely never regained) by choosing code-minimum windows.

Private-sector market entities—including building material suppliers, window manufacturers, and the construction industry—could develop programs that encourage system-level assessment of window upgrades in conjunction with other building subsystems to encourage holistic implementation. BTO is willing to provide technical assistance to support the development of such programs, but industry is in the best position to lead these efforts, which can incorporate industry-driven standards, certification, and verification. Industry engagement might also result in pursuit of much more comprehensive retrofit projects, which can increase overall construction industry revenue and

value; reduce energy costs and increased property values for building owners; and reduce energy use and lower peak electricity demand across the United States.

Direct and indirect financial incentives available from municipalities and utilities can be incorporated as part of the valuation of prospective upgrades. In many cases, these programs offer incentives for specific upgrades based on the total energy savings or emissions reduction impact of individual upgrades across a region or operating territory. More comprehensive upgrades appropriate for an individual building, particularly envelope component upgrades, often have limited overlap with available incentives. As a result, building owners frequently eschew the system-level retrofit strategy discussed here and in Section 4.1 in favor of approaches that minimize capital costs and only include individual upgrades that align with available incentives. BTO will help provide technical support to stakeholders to enable system-level tools and approaches.

### 5.2.1 Financing

Significant recent developments in business models and associated financing mechanisms for residential rooftop solar have increased interest in developing novel financing mechanisms for building energy efficiency investments (particularly in the retrofit market) as a way of reducing customer acquisition costs, increasing quality and customer confidence in the finished product, and lowering capital barriers (particularly for residential customers). In some cases, rooftop solar financing programs include the most cost-effective building energy efficiency measures so that they can be packaged to derive a better return on investment. Packaging a major facade upgrade with high-performance windows would derive greater savings and could increase property values. Property-assessed clean energy (PACE) programs were developed to alleviate the capital burden of energy efficiency retrofits. PACE programs tie financing for retrofits to the property, which can then be transferred to subsequent owners if the upgrading owner does not retain the property long enough to repay the loan [107]. Recent challenges with the execution of residential PACE programs can be remedied in part through careful program design and oversight [107]. Commercial PACE programs can also benefit from thoughtful program structure and lessons learned from residential PACE programs [108].

Building-specific retrofit solutions supported by detailed energy models can benefit both the residential and commercial markets; the modeling results are used to determine guaranteed energy savings, and financing can be developed around those savings [102]. This approach is similar to that used in residential rooftop solar financing. Particularly for the residential sector, these packages can also incorporate warranties and maintenance contracts that help engender homeowner confidence in installation quality and reduce the maintenance effort for the homeowner [102]. Third-party entities might emerge to both execute and finance these packages (as has occurred in the solar industry), because the guaranteed energy savings derived from the energy modeling used for project selection and customization might enable securitization, creating new energy efficiency investment vehicles. These upgrades could also be financed through an energy savings performance contract executed by an energy service company, where the energy service company amortizes the efficiency upgrades against the anticipated energy savings [109]. Regardless of the financing instrument, incorporating energy efficiency upgrades into property appraisals would ensure that those upgrades are perceived by buyers as comparable to aesthetic upgrades. This would also enable efficiency upgrades with long payback periods to be explicitly captured in the value of the property, thus enabling capital recovery at the time of sale. Incorporating energy expenditure risk assessment into mortgage underwriting could also help improve the ability of owners to absorb the cost of efficiency upgrades. In addition, BTO can support the technical development needs of stakeholders seeking to enable these financial product and market changes.

### 5.2.2 Window Market Awareness

Challenges arising from information asymmetry (faced by building owners/consumers and by architects, engineers, contractors, and installers) can be addressed by several means, including enhanced labeling and recognition programs, readily accessible data resources, and enhanced training programs for contractors and code enforcement officials. The NFRC was established through congressional authority, and today it provides a critically needed energy performance evaluation basis for residential window policies. DOE helped ensure this by providing direct financial support and technical support through the national laboratories to the NFRC. The ENERGY STAR recognition program (administered previously by DOE and now by the Environmental Protection Agency) has played a key role in getting consumers to buy energy-efficient windows [110]. The current market share of low-e glass is more than 85% in the residential sector because of these successful programs. Window attachments can also have a significant effect

on building energy use, but until recently, no energy-related rating or standards existed for window attachments. DOE helped establish AERC as a voluntary rating council for energy-efficient window attachments. The purpose of AERC is to develop a comprehensive energy rating, labeling, and certification program for window attachments. AERC is run as an independent nonprofit organization that serves the public interest by providing accurate and credible information about the energy performance of window attachments.<sup>22</sup>

While the commercial fenestration market has seen increases in low-e glass and thermally improved frame market share, it still lags behind the residential market. The commercial market is more complex than the residential market; commercial windows often involve detailed purchasing contracts, and the market includes a wide range of product types, from factory-built punched opening windows to site-fabricated curtain wall systems. As a result, the NFRC residential program could not be simply applied to commercial windows. NFRC established a sophisticated commercial window rating program with significant support from DOE, yet market acceptance has been low. NFRC is currently reassessing its program and is in the process of incorporating improvements and trying to find ways to reduce technical burden for the industry. To better understand the commercial market for not only window energy performance and window R&D, but to assist stakeholders in pursuing market transformation, NFRC is leveraging commercial windows market data to investigate the potential impacts of higher-performance commercial window upgrades in collaboration with LBNL and NREL and with support from DOE. A full range of policy strategies could be pursued by stakeholders to accelerate the adoption of low-e and other high-performance window features in the commercial sector if there were increased transparency of the energy performance of commercial fenestration.


### 5.2.3 Whole-Building Market Awareness

Beyond window component policies driven from foundational energy performance metrics, much more effort could be pursued to increase windows' prominence in whole-building policy schemes. Residential home energy performance evaluated through Home Energy Score (shown in Figure 21), for example, might also provide valuable comparative information for consumers, though these scores do not separately capture window performance. These scoring systems also do not capture the nonenergy benefits of a high-performance envelope, which might be critical to creating market pull for envelope upgrades. Energy auditing and disclosure measures enacted in several municipalities can provide information to buyers and prospective tenants regarding energy performance of properties, and thus might have the potential to influence the resale or rental value of otherwise comparable properties [111]. Providing these data in a form that is readily understandable and in a location that minimizes or eliminates effort to obtain the data are critical to achieving the desired effect [111]. For commercial buildings, these factors could be addressed by prominently displaying whole-building performance grades based on audit data near the building entrance or, for all building types, providing the relevant score in property search tools [103].

For the building construction industry, improving awareness of novel window-integrated envelope technologies could come through a variety of channels. Existing mechanisms for publicizing new products—trade shows, publications, social media, and company websites—continue to be relevant. Additional opportunities to expose building owners and, indirectly, the construction industry to new technologies might be through energy audits, which could be accompanied by upgrade suggestions that incorporate novel materials and methods when envelope upgrades are appropriate. BTO's integration teams support field studies to validate the performance of innovative transparent facade products. BTO also investigates, in collaboration with utility and energy efficiency nonprofit partners, case studies that incorporate nonenergy benefits such as comfort, aesthetics, and effect on property valuation. These studies could also be used to build confidence among the architecture, engineering, and construction industry in specifying and installing novel products. Field and validation study results will be most impactful if they are made available through channels already regularly accessed by the industry and should be presented such that the results are easily interpreted. These results can also be further supported by simultaneously providing guidance on how to incorporate novel materials into typical construction practices.

Installation quality can also be improved by incorporating fault-tolerant characteristics into novel window technologies, protecting against improper installation and possibly improper system assembly configuration. Furthermore, proper installation not only ensures long-term moisture durability and energy performance, but also reduces air leakage. Such benefits are not often factored into the value proposition of replacing windows. While these changes may not explicitly incentivize investment in envelope energy efficiency, by creating conditions in which the building

<sup>22</sup>See: <https://aercenergyrating.org/>



## Recommended Improvements

**REPAIR NOW.** The Home Energy Score model did not identify any cost-effective repairs. Please ask your assessor for more information.

**REPLACE LATER.** These improvements will help you save energy when it's time to replace or upgrade.

- Windows: Pick ones with an ENERGY STAR label to save **\$403** / year

**Figure 21. Home Energy Score reports can be used to highlight improvement opportunities for homeowners with specific actionable feedback on what retrofits can deliver energy savings, including window performance improvements. Similar building performance evaluations for commercial buildings can provide valuable insights to building owners, and disclosure of these data or similar information about building energy performance can also provide useful information to prospective tenants in both the residential and commercial sectors.**

Figure is from a sample Home Energy Score report; reports include much greater detail on all of the components in a home that relate to energy use.

construction industry and building owners and tenants all perceive incentives or value in improving building energy performance, window upgrades will be adopted alongside other efficiency measures. BTO is interested in working with stakeholders to increase the actual and perceived value proposition for window replacements, going beyond energy efficiency and utility bill savings to include nonenergy benefits.

## 5.3 Stakeholder Engagement in Technology Implementation

BTO is interested in working with any and all stakeholder organizations and entities that can help accelerate the R&D, deployment, and widespread adoption of novel, affordable, high-impact window technologies. Different stakeholders can serve different roles in the technology development and market transformation process depending on their constituencies and access to capital, as well as their ability to convene other stakeholders, coordinate with other stakeholders, and directly conduct technology R&D. Table 14 includes an array of possible supporting activities for stakeholders.

BTO will help industry and stakeholders invest in advanced window solutions that range from moderate improvements—such as the installation of window attachments—to new window installation. Greater rates of existing window replacement with ENERGY STAR-compliant products can offer tremendous savings. Pursuing the next generation of windows that provide net positive energy contributions to buildings through increased passive heating and electricity generation, while being highly thermally resistant comparable to existing walls, can offer major contributions to carbon emission reductions.

**Table 14. Stakeholders that interface with energy efficiency and buildings can help accelerate R&D and the widespread market adoption of innovative, high-performance, affordable windows outlined in this report. Windows have not always gained attention from energy efficiency advocates; these possible activities are based on general energy efficiency policy strategies and the IEA Envelope Roadmap [30].**

Stakeholder	Suggested Supporting Activities
Governments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Invest in and manage a portfolio of R&amp;D projects comprising the high-priority technology areas identified in Section 3</li> <li>• Conduct field validation studies of high-performance window systems and validate electric grid economic benefits and remuneration opportunities</li> <li>• Pursue wide availability of commercial fenestration performance metrics</li> <li>• Demonstrate potential by implementing high-performance technologies into government buildings, including as part of deep energy retrofits</li> <li>• Establish and support public-private sector initiatives that help drive greater investment into advanced window solutions</li> <li>• Develop system-level tools that increase the benefit and value of high-performance window systems, possibly including nonenergy benefits</li> <li>• Fund market transformation activities and infrastructure to support regional, utility, and NGO programs to increase awareness about the opportunity for upgrading windows</li> <li>• Support programs that help researchers build their understanding of window market needs from multiple perspectives (e.g., manufacturers, architects, vendors)</li> <li>• Support the development of new financing programs</li> </ul>
Nonprofits/NGOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convene state and local partners to build knowledge infrastructure around the value of high-performance envelopes</li> <li>• Demonstrate novel building envelope technologies to build manufacturer and consumer awareness of energy savings potential and other benefits</li> <li>• Investigate actions that could increase market demand for innovative windows</li> <li>• Adopt window performance criteria as part of high-performance window programs (e.g., require commercial NFRC-rated windows to be disclosed as part of whole-building performance qualification)</li> </ul>
Manufacturers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pursue investment in earlier-stage R&amp;D with federal risk sharing and low-TRL offtake</li> <li>• Work with researchers and academia to build capacity around R&amp;D program structure to manage risk and maximize project spinoff or offtake</li> <li>• Establish, in collaboration with partners, system-level benefit sales tools</li> </ul>
Architects, Engineers, and Builders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand use of life-cycle costing and work with clients to promote life-cycle costing when evaluating new construction and deep retrofit projects to fully assess system-level benefits</li> <li>• Develop full-value assessments including energy and nonenergy benefits to reduce the likelihood of “value engineering” resulting in the downgrading of window design performance</li> </ul>

National Laboratories	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide advanced component evaluation equipment and facilities that provide enabling capabilities to the windows industry</li> <li>• Pursue novel technology and material research in the areas described in Section 3</li> <li>• Engage manufacturers, architects, engineers, and builders early in the development of new technologies</li> <li>• Collaborate with manufacturers and industry partners on transitioning research successes from lab-scale to production-ready technologies</li> <li>• Conduct comprehensive research on the energy performance and durability of novel high-performance envelope materials and assemblies to build industry confidence</li> <li>• Support NGOs, utilities, manufacturers, and others to ensure scientifically rigorous methods are employed in system-level tools and serve as neutral third party for the consumer's interest</li> <li>• Collaborate with stakeholders on market transformation activities such as information campaigns, technology challenges, adoption challenges, and other creative approaches to accelerate the adoption of value-added window solutions</li> </ul>
Researchers/Academia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pursue novel technology and material research in the areas described in Section 3</li> <li>• Collaborate with manufacturers and industry partners on transitioning research successes from lab scale to being production ready</li> <li>• Leverage professional societies, trade associations, and NGOs to share research findings and follow-on development opportunities</li> <li>• Engage manufacturers, architects, engineers, and builders early in the development of new technologies</li> <li>• Conduct long-term field validation of technologies in actual buildings to evaluate performance and capture quantitative and qualitative nonenergy impacts</li> </ul>
Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with local and state partners to identify opportunities for energy efficiency and peak demand reduction</li> <li>• Offer broad-based programs for whole-window and wall retrofits, as well as integrated facades that combine electric lighting, controls, and dynamic solar control</li> <li>• Investigate actions that could increase market demand for innovative windows.</li> </ul>

## References

- [1] U.S. Energy Information Administration (2021). *Annual Energy Outlook 2021*. Washington, D.C. URL: <https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/aeo/>.
- [2] National Research Council (2001). *Energy Research at DOE: Was It Worth It? Energy Efficiency and Fossil Energy Research 1978 to 2000*. Washington, D.C.: The National Academies Press. DOI: [10.17226/10165](https://doi.org/10.17226/10165).
- [3] Selkowitz, Stephen, Hart, Robert, and Curcija, Charlie (2018). “Breaking the 20 Year Logjam to Better Insulating Windows.” In: *ACEEE 2018 Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings*, 1–16. DOI: [10.20357/B76K5K](https://doi.org/10.20357/B76K5K).
- [4] Lee, Eleanor S. et al. (2017). *Demonstration of Energy Efficient Retrofits for Lighting and Daylighting in New York City Office Buildings*. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. URL: <https://eta-publications.lbl.gov/sites/default/files/nyc-living-lab-final-report.pdf>.
- [5] Neukomm, Monica, Nubbe, Valerie, and Fares, Robert L. (2019). *Grid-interactive Efficient Buildings Technical Report Series: Overview of Research Challenges and Gaps*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Energy. URL: <https://www1.eere.energy.gov/buildings/pdfs/75470.pdf>.
- [6] Gehbauer, Christoph, Lee, Eleanor S., and Wang, Taoning (Manuscript in preparation). *An Evaluation of the Demand Response Potential of Integrated Dynamic Window and HVAC Systems*.
- [7] Ducker Worldwide (2016). *ENERGY STAR Window & Door Tracking Program*.
- [8] Langevin, Jared, Harris, Chioke B., and Reyna, Janet L. (2019). “Assessing the Potential to Reduce U.S. Building CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions 80% by 2050.” *Joule* 3 (10): 2403–2424. DOI: [10.1016/j.joule.2019.07.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joule.2019.07.013).
- [9] American Architectural Manufacturers Association (2016). *AAMA 2015/2016 U.S. Market Size Report*.
- [10] U.S. Census Bureau (2019). *American Housing Survey - Home Improvement Costs - Owner-occupied Units*.
- [11] Burns, Erika and Vasami, Ralph (2019). *Certification and Rating of Attachments for Fenestration Technologies*. February. U.S. Department of Energy, 1–32. DOI: [10.2172/1525321](https://doi.org/10.2172/1525321).
- [12] U.S. Energy Information Administration (2016). *2012 Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey (CBECS)*. Table B6. URL: <https://www.eia.gov/consumption/commercial/data/2012/#b6-b10>.
- [13] U.S. Department of Energy (2014). *Windows and Building Envelope Research and Development: Roadmap for Emerging Technologies*. Washington, D.C. URL: <https://www.energy.gov/eere/buildings/downloads/research-and-development-roadmap-windows-and-building-envelope>.
- [14] Cort, Katherine A. et al. (2018). *Testing the Performance and Dynamic Control of Energy-Efficient Cellular Shades in the PNNL Lab Homes*. DOI: [10.2172/1477792](https://doi.org/10.2172/1477792).
- [15] Rissman, Jeffrey and Kennan, Hallie (2013). *Low-Emissivity Windows Introduction*. Washington, D.C.: American Energy Innovation Council. URL: <http://americanenergyinnovation.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/Case-Low-e-Windows.pdf>.
- [16] Carmody, John et al. (2007). *Residential Windows: A Guide to New Technologies and Energy Performance*. 3rd. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- [17] Carmody, John et al. (2004). *Window Systems for High-Performance Buildings*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- [18] Andersen, M., Mardaljevic, J., and Lockley, S. W. (2012). “A framework for predicting the non-visual effects of daylight-Part I: Photobiology-based model.” *Lighting Research and Technology* 44 (1): 37–53. DOI: [10.1177/1477153511435961](https://doi.org/10.1177/1477153511435961).
- [19] Figueiro, Mariana G. et al. (2017). “The impact of daytime light exposures on sleep and mood in office workers.” *Sleep Health* 3 (3): 204–215. DOI: [10.1016/j.sleh.2017.03.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sleh.2017.03.005).
- [20] Heschong, Lisa, Wright, Roger L., and Okura, Stacia (2002). “Daylighting impacts on human performance in school.” *Journal of the Illuminating Engineering Society* 31 (2): 101–114. DOI: [10.1080/00994480.2002.10748396](https://doi.org/10.1080/00994480.2002.10748396).
- [21] Curcija, D. Charlie et al. (2013). *Energy Savings from Window Attachments*. U.S. Department of Energy. URL: [https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2013/11/f5/energy\\_savings\\_from\\_windows\\_attachments.pdf](https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2013/11/f5/energy_savings_from_windows_attachments.pdf).
- [22] Zirnheld, Hayes, Bridgeland, Brett, and Keuhn, Phil (2015). *Energy Savings from Window Shades*. Rocky Mountain Institute. URL: [https://rmi.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/EnergySavingsFromWindowShades\\_FinalWebReport.pdf](https://rmi.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/EnergySavingsFromWindowShades_FinalWebReport.pdf).
- [23] Hunt, Walter E. and Cort, Katherine A. (2020). *Evaluation of Exterior Shades at PNNL Lab Homes and Occupied Field Sites*. DOI: [10.2172/1785962](https://doi.org/10.2172/1785962).

- [24] Nicol, J. Fergus (2001). “Characterising Occupant Behaviour in Buildings: Towards a Stochastic Model of Occupant Use of Windows, Lights, Blinds, Heaters and Fans.” In: *Seventh International IBPSA Conference*, 1073–1078.
- [25] Reinhart, C. F. (2001). *Daylight availability and manual lighting control in office buildings: Simulation studies and analysis of Measurement*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Technical University of Karlsruhe.
- [26] Rubin, Arthur I., Collins, Belinda L., and Tibbott, Robert L. (1978). *Window Blinds as a Potential Energy Saver—A Case Study*. Washington, D.C.: National Bureau of Standards. URL: <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/Legacy/BSS/nbsbuildingscience112.pdf>.
- [27] Bickel, Stephen, Phan-Gruber, Emily, and Christie, Shannon (2013). *Residential Windows and Window Coverings: A Detailed View of the Installed Base and User Behavior*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Energy.
- [28] Llordés, Anna et al. (2013). “Tunable near-infrared and visible-light transmittance in nanocrystal-in-glass composites.” *Nature* 500 (7462): 323–326. DOI: [10.1038/nature12398](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12398).
- [29] McCall, James et al. (2019). *Cost Modelling for Energy Efficient Window Replacements*. Golden, CO: National Renewable Energy Laboratory. URL: <https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy19osti/70967.pdf>.
- [30] International Energy Agency (IEA) (2013). *Technology Roadmap — Energy efficient building envelopes*. URL: <https://www.iea.org/reports/technology-roadmap-energy-efficient-building-envelopes>.
- [31] Institute for Building Efficiency (2011). *Energy Efficiency Indicator Survey*. Milwaukee.
- [32] Hunt, Walter E., Rosenberg, Samuel I., and Cort, Katherine A. (2021). *Evaluation of Thin Triple-Pane Windows in the PNNL Lab Homes*. DOI: [10.2172/1811300](https://doi.org/10.2172/1811300).
- [33] “Innovative Market Pathways to Promote Adoption of High-Performance Insulating Windows” (2020). In: *2020 ACEEE Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings*.
- [34] Kumar, Sneha (2018). *Novel Thermal-Break Development Enabling Breakthrough R7-Architectural Windows*. U.S. Department of Energy. URL: [https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2016/04/f30/33390\\_Kumar\\_040616-1405.pdf](https://www.energy.gov/sites/default/files/2016/04/f30/33390_Kumar_040616-1405.pdf).
- [35] Wang, Yang, Runnerstrom, Evan L., and Milliron, Delia J. (2016). “Switchable Materials for Smart Windows.” *Annual Review of Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering* 7 (1): 283–304. DOI: [10.1146/annurev-chembioeng-080615-034647](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-chembioeng-080615-034647).
- [36] Garcia, Guillermo et al. (2011). “Dynamically modulating the surface plasmon resonance of doped semiconductor nanocrystals.” *Nano Letters* 11 (10): 4415–4420. DOI: [10.1021/nl202597n](https://doi.org/10.1021/nl202597n).
- [37] Garcia, Guillermo et al. (2013). “Near-Infrared Spectrally Selective Plasmonic Electrochromic Thin Films.” *Advanced Optical Materials* 1 (3): 215–220. DOI: [10.1002/adom.201200051](https://doi.org/10.1002/adom.201200051).
- [38] Jensen, Jacob and Krebs, Frederik C. (2014). “From the Bottom Up - Flexible Solid State Electrochromic Devices.” *Advanced Materials* 26 (42): 7231–7234. DOI: [10.1002/adma.201402771](https://doi.org/10.1002/adma.201402771).
- [39] Beaujuge, Pierre M. and Reynolds, John R. (2010). “Color control in pi-conjugated organic polymers for use in electrochromic devices.” *Chemical Reviews* 110 (1): 268–320. DOI: [10.1021/cr900129a](https://doi.org/10.1021/cr900129a).
- [40] DeForest, Nicholas et al. (2017). “A comparative energy analysis of three electrochromic glazing technologies in commercial and residential buildings.” *Applied Energy* 192: 95–109. DOI: [10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.02.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.02.007).
- [41] Kim, Jongwook et al. (2015). “Nanocomposite Architecture for Rapid, Spectrally-Selective Electrochromic Modulation of Solar Transmittance.” *Nano Letters* 15 (8): 5574–5579. DOI: [10.1021/acs.nanolett.5b02197](https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.nanolett.5b02197).
- [42] Lee, Eleanor S. et al. (2014). *A Pilot Demonstration of Electrochromic and Thermochromic Windows in the Denver Federal Center, Building 41*. Berkeley, CA: Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. URL: [https://www.gsa.gov/cdnstatic/GPG\\_Electrochromic\\_Thermochromic\\_Windows\\_03-2014.pdf](https://www.gsa.gov/cdnstatic/GPG_Electrochromic_Thermochromic_Windows_03-2014.pdf).
- [43] Song, Zhaoning et al. (2017). “A technoeconomic analysis of perovskite solar module manufacturing with low-cost materials and techniques.” *Energy and Environmental Science* 10 (6): 1297–1305. DOI: [10.1039/c7ee00757d](https://doi.org/10.1039/c7ee00757d).
- [44] Traverse, Christopher J. et al. (2017). “Emergence of highly transparent photovoltaics for distributed applications.” *Nature Energy* 2 (November): 1–12. DOI: [10.1038/s41560-017-0016-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41560-017-0016-9).
- [45] Sun, J. and Jasieniak, J. J. (2017). “Semi-transparent solar cells.” *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics* 50 (9): aa53d7. DOI: [10.1088/1361-6463/aa53d7](https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6463/aa53d7).
- [46] Davy, Nicholas C. et al. (2017). “Pairing of near-ultraviolet solar cells with electrochromic windows for smart management of the solar spectrum.” *Nature Energy* 2 (8): 17104. DOI: [10.1038/nenergy.2017.104](https://doi.org/10.1038/nenergy.2017.104).

- [47] Wheeler, Lance M. et al. (2017). “Switchable photovoltaic windows enabled by reversible photothermal complex dissociation from methylammonium lead iodide.” *Nature Communications* 8 (1). DOI: [10.1038/s41467-017-01842-4](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-01842-4).
- [48] Lin, Jia et al. (2018). “Thermochromic halide perovskite solar cells.” *Nature Materials* 17 (3): 261–267. DOI: [10.1038/s41563-017-0006-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41563-017-0006-0).
- [49] Gehbauer, Christoph et al. (2019). *An assessment of the load-modifying potential of MPC-controlled dynamic facades within the California context*. California Energy Commission EPC-14-066, Task 6.5 Report.
- [50] Lee, Eleanor S. et al. (2019). *High-Performance Integrated Window and Façade Solutions for California*. California Energy Commission.
- [51] Nouidui, Thierry Stephane, Wetter, Michael, and Zuo, Wangda (2012). “Validation of the window model of the Modelica Buildings library.” In: *Proceedings of the Fifth National Conference of IBPSA-USA*. Madison, WI, 529–536.
- [52] Blum, David H. and Wetter, Michael (2017). “MPCPy: An Open-Source Software Platform for Model Predictive Control in Buildings.” In: *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of International Building Performance Simulation (IBPSA)*. San Francisco, CA, 1381–1390. URL: [https://simulationresearch.lbl.gov/sites/all/files/mpcpy\\_pub.pdf](https://simulationresearch.lbl.gov/sites/all/files/mpcpy_pub.pdf).
- [53] Wetter, Michael et al. (2014). “Modelica Buildings library.” *Journal of Building Performance Simulation* 7 (4): 253–270. DOI: [10.1080/19401493.2013.765506](https://doi.org/10.1080/19401493.2013.765506).
- [54] Kolias, Constantinos et al. (2017). “DDoS in the IoT: Mirai and other botnets.” *Computer* 50 (7): 80–84. DOI: [10.1109/MC.2017.201](https://doi.org/10.1109/MC.2017.201).
- [55] Leslie, R. P. (2003). “Capturing the daylight dividend in buildings: Why and how?” *Building and Environment* 38 (2): 381–385. DOI: [10.1016/S0360-1323\(02\)00118-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0360-1323(02)00118-X).
- [56] Alrubaih, M. S. et al. (2013). “Research and development on aspects of daylighting fundamentals.” *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 21: 494–505. DOI: [10.1016/j.rser.2012.12.057](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2012.12.057).
- [57] Gladden, Chris (2018). *Stationary Concentrator Daylighting System*. URL: [https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2018/06/f52/313110\\_Gladden\\_050218-1400.pdf](https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2018/06/f52/313110_Gladden_050218-1400.pdf).
- [58] Plympton, Patricia, Conway, Susan, and Epstein, Kyra (2000). “Daylighting in Schools: Improving Student Performance and Health at a Price Schools Can Afford.” In: *American Solar Energy Society Conference*, 10. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.01.009>.
- [59] U.S. General Services Administration (2014). *Integrated Daylighting Systems*. URL: [https://www.gsa.gov/cdnstatic/GPG\\_Findings\\_015-Integrated\\_Daylighting.pdf](https://www.gsa.gov/cdnstatic/GPG_Findings_015-Integrated_Daylighting.pdf).
- [60] Thomson, Gregory D. et al. (2021). “Achieving Integrated Daylighting and Electric Lighting Systems: Current State of the Art and Needed Research.” *Energies* 14 (13): 3833. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3390/en14133833>.
- [61] Wright, Graham S. and Klingenberg, Katrin (2014). *Climate-Specific Passive Building Standards*. Technical Report. Golden, CO: National Renewable Energy Laboratory. URL: <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy15osti/64278.pdf>.
- [62] Heymer, Ben (2018). *Accelerate Performance*. URL: [https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2018/06/f52/222109\\_Heymer\\_043018-1400.pdf](https://www.energy.gov/sites/prod/files/2018/06/f52/222109_Heymer_043018-1400.pdf).
- [63] Henry, Sandra et al. (2017). *Taking a Performance-based Approach to Building Procurement*. Seventhwave.
- [64] U.S. Department of Energy (2019). *What is the Advanced Building Construction Initiative?* URL: <https://www.energy.gov/eere/buildings/what-advanced-building-construction-initiative>.
- [65] Oak Ridge National Laboratory (2018). *AMIE Demonstration Project*. URL: <https://web.ornl.gov/sci/eere/amie/>.
- [66] Hendrixson, Stephanie (2018). “3D-Printed Tooling Offers Durability for Precast Concrete.” *Additive Manufacturing*. URL: <https://www.additivemanufacturing.media/articles/3d-printed-tooling-offers-durability-for-precast-concrete>.
- [67] Bruggi, Matteo and Cinquini, Carlo (2011). “Topology optimization for thermal insulation: an application to building engineering.” *Engineering Optimization* 43 (11): 1223–1242. DOI: [10.1080/0305215X.2010.550284](https://doi.org/10.1080/0305215X.2010.550284).
- [68] Lee, Adam D. et al. (2018). “Optimizing the architectural layouts and technical specifications of curtain walls to minimize use of aluminium.” *Structures* 13 (November 2017): 8–25. DOI: [10.1016/j.istruc.2017.10.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2017.10.004).

- [69] Harris, Chioke B. (2019). *Grid-interactive Efficient Buildings Technical Report Series: Windows and Opaque Envelope*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Energy. URL: <https://www1.eere.energy.gov/buildings/pdfs/75387.pdf>.
- [70] Roth, Amir (2019). *Grid-interactive Efficient Buildings Technical Report Series: Whole-Building Controls, Sensors, Modeling and Analytics*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Energy. URL: <https://www1.eere.energy.gov/buildings/pdfs/75478.pdf>.
- [71] Nubbe, Valerie and Yamada, Mary (2019). *Grid-interactive Efficient Buildings Technical Report Series: Lighting and Electronics*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Energy. URL: <https://www1.eere.energy.gov/buildings/pdfs/75475.pdf>.
- [72] Goetzler, Bill, Guernsey, Matt, and Kassuga, Theo (2019). *Grid-interactive Efficient Buildings Technical Report Series: Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC); Water Heating; Appliances; and Refrigeration*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Energy. URL: <https://www1.eere.energy.gov/buildings/pdfs/75473.pdf>.
- [73] Neme, Chris and Cowart, Richard (2014). *Energy Efficiency Participation in Electricity Capacity Markets – The US Experience*. URL: <https://www.raponline.org/knowledge-center/energy-efficiency-participation-in-electricity-capacity-markets-the-us-experience/>.
- [74] Sadineni, Suresh B., Madala, Srikanth, and Boehm, Robert F. (2011). “Passive building energy savings: A review of building envelope components.” *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 15 (8): 3617–3631. DOI: [10.1016/j.rser.2011.07.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2011.07.014).
- [75] Cheung, C K, Fuller, R J, and Luther, M B (2005). “Energy-Efficient Envelope Design for High-Rise Apartments.” *Energy and Buildings* 37 (1): 37–48. DOI: [10.1016/j.enbuild.2004.05.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2004.05.002).
- [76] Chan, K.T. and Chow, W.K. (1998). “Energy impact of commercial-building envelopes in the sub-tropical climate.” *Applied Energy* 60 (1): 21–39. DOI: [10.1016/S0306-2619\(98\)00021-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0306-2619(98)00021-X).
- [77] Balaras, C.A. et al. (2000). “Potential for energy conservation in apartment buildings.” *Energy and Buildings* 31 (2): 143–154. DOI: [10.1016/S0378-7788\(99\)00028-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7788(99)00028-6).
- [78] Cheng, Wei (2018). “Photodeposition of Electrochromic Metal Oxide Films.” *Chem* 4 (4): 659–660. DOI: [10.1016/j.chempr.2018.03.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chempr.2018.03.014).
- [79] Casini, Marco (2018). “Active dynamic windows for buildings: A review.” *Renewable Energy* 119: 923–934. DOI: [10.1016/j.renene.2017.12.049](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2017.12.049).
- [80] Dussault, Jean-Michel and Gosselin, Louis (2017). “Office buildings with electrochromic windows: A sensitivity analysis of design parameters on energy performance, and thermal and visual comfort.” *Energy and Buildings* 153: 50–62. DOI: [10.1016/j.enbuild.2017.07.046](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2017.07.046).
- [81] Lin, Yaolin and Yang, Wei (2017). “Solar energy model and thermal performance of an electrochromic dome-covered house.” *Energy for Sustainable Development* 39: 82–90. DOI: [10.1016/j.esd.2017.05.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esd.2017.05.001).
- [82] Piccolo, Antonio et al. (2018). “Energy performance of an electrochromic switchable glazing: Experimental and computational assessments.” *Energy and Buildings* 165: 390–398. DOI: [10.1016/j.enbuild.2017.12.049](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2017.12.049).
- [83] Fernandes, Luis L. et al. (2017). *Electrochromic Window Demonstration at the John E. Moss Federal Building, 650 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California*. U.S. General Services Administration.
- [84] Oh, Seung-Won, Kim, Sang-Hyeok, and Yoon, Tae-Hoon (2018). “Self-shading by optical or thermal control of transmittance with liquid crystals doped with push-pull azobenzene.” *Solar Energy Materials and Solar Cells* 183: 146–150. DOI: [10.1016/j.solmat.2018.04.019](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.solmat.2018.04.019).
- [85] Alcaraz, Geoffrey Kirk A. et al. (2018). “Thermally-stable dynamic windows based on reversible metal electrodeposition from aqueous electrolytes.” *Journal of Materials Chemistry C* 6 (8): 2132–2138. DOI: [10.1039/C7TC05222G](https://doi.org/10.1039/C7TC05222G).
- [86] Hernandez, Tyler S. et al. (2018). “Bistable Black Electrochromic Windows Based on the Reversible Metal Electrodeposition of Bi and Cu.” *ACS Energy Letters* 3 (1): 104–111. DOI: [10.1021/acsenergylett.7b01072](https://doi.org/10.1021/acsenergylett.7b01072).
- [87] Goia, Francesco and Boccaleri, Enrico (2016). “Physical–chemical properties evolution and thermal properties reliability of a paraffin wax under solar radiation exposure in a real-scale PCM window system.” *Energy and Buildings* 119: 41–50. DOI: [10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.03.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.03.007).
- [88] Feng, W. et al. (2016). “Gasochromic smart window: optical and thermal properties, energy simulation and feasibility analysis.” *Solar Energy Materials and Solar Cells* 144. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.solmat.2015.09.029>.

- [89] Chan, Chih-Chieh et al. (2010). "Preparation and characterization of gasochromic Pt/WO<sub>3</sub> hydrogen sensor by using the Taguchi design method." *Sensors and Actuators B: Chemical* 145 (2): 691–697. DOI: [10.1016/j.snb.2010.01.021](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.snb.2010.01.021).
- [90] Hinz, K. et al. (2018). "Pneumatically adaptive light modulation system (PALMS) for buildings." *Materials & Design* 152: 156–167. DOI: [10.1016/j.matdes.2018.04.044](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matdes.2018.04.044).
- [91] Ghosh, Aritra and Norton, Brian (2018). "Advances in switchable and highly insulating autonomous (self-powered) glazing systems for adaptive low energy buildings." *Renewable Energy* 126: 1003–1031. DOI: [10.1016/j.renene.2018.04.038](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2018.04.038).
- [92] Lee, Eleanor S. et al. (2015). "Integrated control of dynamic facades and distributed energy resources for energy cost minimization in commercial buildings." *Solar Energy* 122 (November): 1384–1397. DOI: [10.1016/j.solener.2015.11.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.solener.2015.11.003).
- [93] Kunwar, Niraj, Cetin, Kristen S., and Passe, Ulrike (2018). "Dynamic Shading in Buildings: a Review of Testing Methods and Recent Research Findings." *Current Sustainable/Renewable Energy Reports* 5 (1): 93–100. DOI: [10.1007/s40518-018-0103-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40518-018-0103-y).
- [94] Perino, Marco and Serra, Valentina (2015). "Switching from static to adaptable and dynamic building envelopes: A paradigm shift for the energy efficiency in buildings." *Journal of Facade Design and Engineering* 3 (2): 143–163. DOI: [10.3233/FDE-150039](https://doi.org/10.3233/FDE-150039).
- [95] Firląg, Szymon et al. (2015). "Control algorithms for dynamic windows for residential buildings." *Energy and Buildings* 109: 157–173. DOI: [10.1016/j.enbuild.2015.09.069](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2015.09.069).
- [96] Olsthoorn, Dave et al. (2017). "Abilities and limitations of thermal mass activation for thermal comfort, peak shifting and shaving: A review." *Building and Environment* 118: 113–127. DOI: [10.1016/j.buildenv.2017.03.029](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2017.03.029).
- [97] Yoon, Nari et al. (2020). "Optimization of Window Positions for Wind-Driven Natural Ventilation Performance." *Energies* 13 (10). DOI: [10.3390/en13102464](https://doi.org/10.3390/en13102464).
- [98] U.S. Department of Energy (2011). *U.S. Department of Energy Technology Readiness Assessment Guide*. U.S. Department of Energy. URL: [https://www.directives.doe.gov/directives-documents/400-series/0413.3-EGuide-04a/@\\_images/file](https://www.directives.doe.gov/directives-documents/400-series/0413.3-EGuide-04a/@_images/file).
- [99] Slaughter, Sarah, Thomas, Douglas, and Chapman, Robert (2014). "USA – Characteristics, Impacts, and Future Directions." In: *R&D Investment and Impact in the Global Construction Industry*. Routledge, 261–283.
- [100] McKinsey Global Institute (2017). *Reinventing Construction: A Route To Higher Productivity*. McKinsey Global Institute, 168. URL: <http://www.mckinsey.com/industries/capital-projects-and-infrastructure/our-insights/reinventing-construction-through-a-productivity-revolution>.
- [101] National Research Council (1988). *Building for Tomorrow: Global Enterprise and the U.S. Construction Industry*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press. DOI: [10.17226/806](https://doi.org/10.17226/806).
- [102] Berman, Mark et al. (2013). *Expert Meeting Report: Energy Savings You Can Bank On*. U.S. Department of Energy.
- [103] Zhu, Cindy et al. (2018). "Raising the Rent Premium: Moving Green Building Research Beyond Certifications and Rent." In: *ACEEE 2018 Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings*. ACEEE.
- [104] Alschuler, Elena et al. (2016). "Appraising Green: Show me the Market Value." In: *Proceedings of the 2016 Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings*, 1–12.
- [105] Less, Brennan and Walker, Iain (2015). *Deep Energy Retrofit Guidance for the Building America Solutions Center*. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. URL: <https://www.osti.gov/servlets/purl/1248926>.
- [106] Doyle, Victoria (2012). *The Role of Appraisals in Energy Efficiency Financing*. U.S. Department of Energy. URL: <http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy12osti/54329.pdf>.
- [107] U.S. Department of Energy (2016). *Best Practice Guidelines for Residential PACE Financing Programs*. Technical Report. Washington, D.C., 1–14.
- [108] Leventis, Greg et al. (2018). *Lessons in Commercial PACE Leadership: The Path from Legislation to Launch*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Energy.
- [109] U.S. Department of Energy (2018a). *Energy Savings Performance Contracting*. URL: <https://www.energy.gov/eere/slsc/energy-savings-performance-contracting>.
- [110] Thorne, Jennifer and Egan, Christine (2002). "The EnergyGuide Label: Evaluation and Recommendations for an Improved Design." In: *Proceedings of the 2002 Summer Study on Energy Efficiency in Buildings*, 357–370.

- [111] Palmer, Karen and Walls, Margaret (2017). “Using information to close the energy efficiency gap: a review of benchmarking and disclosure ordinances.” *Energy Efficiency* 10 (3): 673–691. DOI: [10.1007/s12053-016-9480-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12053-016-9480-5).
- [112] U.S. Energy Information Administration (2018). *Residential Demand Module of the National Energy Modeling System: Model Documentation 2018*. Washington, D.C., 187. URL: [https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/aeo/nems/documentation/archive/pdf/m067\(2018\).pdf](https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/aeo/nems/documentation/archive/pdf/m067(2018).pdf).
- [113] U.S. Energy Information Administration (2017). *Commercial Demand Module of the National Energy Modeling System: Model Documentation*. Technical Report. Washington, D.C., 187. URL: [https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/aeo/nems/documentation/commercial/pdf/m066\(2017\).pdf](https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/aeo/nems/documentation/commercial/pdf/m066(2017).pdf).
- [114] U.S. Department of Energy (2018b). *Status of State Energy Code Adoption*. URL: <https://www.energycodes.gov/adoption/states> (visited on 11/19/2019).
- [115] Dutta, Ranojoy (2018). “Modeling an Electrochromic Window Using a Multi-Criteria Control Strategy.” In: *2018 Building Performance Analysis Conference and SimBuild*. Chicago, IL: ASHRAE.
- [116] Wilson, Eric et al. (2017). *Energy Efficiency Potential in the U.S. Single-Family Housing Stock*. NREL/TP-5500-68670. National Renewable Energy Laboratory. DOI: [10.2172/1414819](https://doi.org/10.2172/1414819).
- [117] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (2017). *Window Technology Pathways Analysis Spreadsheet 2-15-2017*. Washington, D.C. URL: <https://www.energystar.gov/sites/default/files/asset/document/Window%20Technology%20Pathways%20Analysis%202.15.17.xlsx>.

## Appendix A Establishing Technology Performance and Price Targets

This appendix outlines the methodology by which technology price and performance targets are established for the window technology categories in Section 3. Price and performance targets are based on future impacts calculated using Scout, a software tool that estimates U.S. energy use, carbon dioxide emissions, and operating cost impacts of building energy conservation measures (ECMs).

### Approach for Establishing Technology-Level Targets

Prospective technology targets are limited to unit-level total installed price and energy performance. Lifetime, a third key technology parameter, is kept consistent with comparable baseline technologies. In the context of defining these goals, “baseline” refers to the business-as-usual scenario or characteristics of the typical incumbent technology or product. Goals for technology cost and performance at market entry are set through the following process:

1. Set the desired market entry year
2. Set the segment(s) of baseline energy use to which the technology applies<sup>23</sup>
3. Set a desired energy performance value or range for the technology at market entry
4. Set a cost-effectiveness threshold for the technology at market entry
5. Determine the unit-level installed cost that satisfies the cost-effectiveness threshold, given the above parameter values.

In this report we use total installed price instead of product cost (which is used in some other BTO-funded R&D opportunity reports) because of the substantial contribution of installation labor and other costs to the total price of windows seen by building owners. Given that project price is often identified as a barrier to adoption of high-performance windows and window retrofits more generally, we emphasize the importance of price, not cost, to realizing widespread market adoption.

### Scout

Prospective technology definitions corresponding to the technology areas identified in Section 3 were created and assessed using Scout [8],<sup>24</sup> an open-source software tool developed by BTO for estimating the national energy use, carbon dioxide emissions, and operating cost impacts of building-related ECMs. Scout simulates the impact of one or more ECMs on baseline case projections of national building energy use through 2050. Baseline case data are drawn from the EIA Annual Energy Outlook.<sup>25</sup> ECMs are defined primarily by the segment of baseline energy use they apply to, their market entry and exit years, and their installed price (or cost), energy performance, and lifetime.

Individual ECM energy savings impacts are derived from a unit-level comparison of the ECM’s energy performance with that of a comparable baseline case technology. Scout estimates ECM impacts under two different technology adoption scenarios: (1) a technical potential scenario, where an ECM captures its entire applicable baseline energy use segment(s) on market entry and retains a complete sales monopoly in subsequent years, and (2) a maximum adoption potential scenario, where an ECM only captures the portion of its baseline energy segment associated with new construction, equipment replacement/retrofit at end of life or wear out, and a small fraction of elective replacements in advance of end of life. Given a portfolio of ECMs that apply to the same baseline energy use segments, Scout can apportion overlapping segments across competing ECMs [112, 113].<sup>26</sup> In addition to overall energy impact, Scout also assesses the cost-effectiveness of individual ECMs under multiple financial metrics.

Baseline data in Scout include energy use, equipment/technology installed stock size, building stock size and growth, and technology cost, performance, and lifetime. These data are mostly derived from the EIA’s Annual Energy Outlook. The Annual Energy Outlook data are, in turn, derived from the National Energy Modeling System. For this

<sup>23</sup> Although goals are communicated at the sector level (residential versus commercial), sector-level goals combine outcomes from all of the major building types that compose each sector.

<sup>24</sup> See: <https://scout.energy.gov>

<sup>25</sup> See: <https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/aeo>

<sup>26</sup> Based on the technology choice models for residential and commercial buildings used in the National Energy Modeling System.

report, the 2021 Annual Energy Outlook provided most of the required input data apart from technology price and performance.

Baseline technology definitions for the building envelope are derived from a combination of sources. For windows, the baseline technology represents the incumbent that would be adopted in the absence of higher-performing alternatives. Total installed prices are derived from RSMeans building construction databases.<sup>27</sup> Technology performance is based on current International Energy Conservation Code and ASHRAE building codes adopted in various regions, accounting for lag in code adoption by states [114] and with a projection applied to future improvements in codes based on trends in window performance improvements in past code revisions and expert judgment regarding the potential for further technology performance improvements along the current trajectory in the codes. For residential windows, the current ENERGY STAR performance specification and the regional sales shares of ENERGY STAR-qualified windows are also incorporated into the baseline performance definition.

## Dynamic System Simulation with ResStock and ComStock

Because dynamic facades yield energy savings that are highly time dependent, Scout alone could not fully capture the intra-day interactions between heating, cooling, and lighting system operation and the configuration of the dynamic glazing. Energy savings were thus provided as inputs to Scout from an electrochromic glazing model in EnergyPlus. This model defined an electrochromic glazing system based on the model proposed by Dutta [115]. The glazing was configured with four states, where the two intermediate states were defined as having evenly spaced SHGC and  $T_{vis}$  between the fully bleached and fully tinted states. The glazing used three control parameters—glare index, incident solar radiation, and outdoor dry bulb temperature. These controls were prioritized such that tinting is allowed when the outdoor temperature is above 50°F, then if the glare index exceeds 24, the glazing switches to its darkest state, and finally if the solar radiation exceeds 63 W/m<sup>2</sup>, the lightest possible darkened state that ensures transmitted radiation does not exceed the threshold is selected. These control thresholds and prioritization were selected from among many different configurations modeled as they increase heating energy savings without significantly reducing cooling energy savings. This controls approach is not intended to represent current typical installed dynamic facade controls, which might be highly customized to unique building characteristics and building owner and occupant preferences. This approach is also not “optimal” in that it does not necessarily maximize energy savings, but is a reasonable compromise between occupant visual and thermal comfort and energy savings achieved with relatively simple controls to ensure tractable modeling. As discussed in Section 3.2.4, for real-world installations of dynamic facade technologies, advanced sensors and controls have the potential to increase energy savings compared to the current state-of-the-art while also better accommodating occupant comfort.

ResStock and ComStock were used to obtain national energy savings estimates for the modeled electrochromic glazing. These savings estimates were input to Scout as separate heating and cooling energy savings by building type. Further details about ResStock can be found in Wilson et al. [116] and on the ResStock website<sup>28</sup>; details about ComStock can be found on the ComStock website<sup>29</sup>.

## Window Technology Goal Definitions

Technologies included in the windows ECM definitions encompass the primary opportunities for energy efficiency: windows, dynamic glazing and shading, and daylight redirection. The ECMs were applied to both residential and commercial buildings except in the case of daylight redirection, which is limited to commercial buildings. These ECMs are intentionally defined generically to encompass a wide range of potential technology- or component-specific approaches to achieving the performance and installed price targets for that technology type. Product lifetimes were set equal to the baseline or typical existing technologies for each ECM.

The windows ECM encompasses the entire window package—sash, frame, and IGU. Performance is characterized by R-value to represent the overall insulating performance of the package, thus the specified targets can be achieved

<sup>27</sup> See: <https://www.rsmeans.com>; based on RSMeans data, baseline total installed prices are \$48.40/ft<sup>2</sup> for residential windows and \$56.20/ft<sup>2</sup> for commercial windows.

<sup>28</sup> See: <https://resstock.nrel.gov>

<sup>29</sup> See: <https://comstock.nrel.gov>

through improvements to the frame, IGU, or both. Currently available windows vary widely in their rated performance [117] and installed price; this target was established with awareness of the limitations of currently available approaches for improving R-value.

Dynamic windows and window attachments are represented by a single ECM, generically describing any glazing or shading system that can reject a variable fraction of the solar spectrum that contributes to heating in response to detected or incident solar radiation. These systems include electrochromic and thermochromic glazing and automated attachments. Current electrochromic systems typically have a SHGC range of 0.35 to 0.4, from about 0.05 to between 0.4 and 0.45 SHGC. To increase energy savings by capturing additional passive solar heating, the target SHGC range was increased to 0.6, yielding a nominal upper bound of 0.65 SHGC. The dynamic facade ECM also includes energy savings from a modest reduction in heat transfer through the window frame.

The daylight redirection ECM includes a variety of approaches for drawing visible light into the core of a building from glazing at the facade. Many of these technologies could apply to both residential and commercial buildings, but this ECM focuses on commercial buildings because of their occupancy hours and floor plate depths that typically exceed natural daylight penetration. Lighting energy savings from daylighting can vary widely by application, but have been observed to average around 30% [59]. Seeking to improve performance beyond the current state-of-the-art, this ECM sets the nominal performance level to 50% by aiming for improvements in efficacy and redirection penetration depth.

The indicated price for daylight redirection for commercial buildings assumes that the light redirection system is applied to the entire glazed area in a building. It is likely that a daylighting system would be applied to only clerestory windows or the top portion of windows. A technology that applies to only half of the total glazed area, for example, could have a market-acceptable installed price of double that shown in Table 11. Although the lighting penetration depth yielded by a daylighting system is not prescribed in this target, penetration depths will affect the total lighting energy savings, so technologies that yield greater depths have higher efficacy and will yield greater savings, thus increasing the market-acceptable installed price.

Total installed price targets were developed for each ECM based on the performance targets previously articulated. Simple payback was used as the financial metric for this report to establish the goals for each individual technology area, corresponding to a particular ECM. Total installed prices are evaluated for payback periods ranging from 3 to 10 years. These payback periods are significantly shorter than the typical lifetimes of windows, but using much longer payback periods could lead to excessively high prices, which can inhibit adoption. The goals defined for this report are based on the technical potential scenario and do not account for competition between ECMs. As a result, the energy savings are maximized for each ECM, and so the installed price or installed price premium is maximized, because simple payback is based on operating energy cost savings. These assumptions are consistent with a future in which the technologies articulated in this report are widely adopted. Energy savings from these window technologies might be reduced if next-generation, high-performance HVAC technologies are aggressively adopted, because those technologies would reduce heating and cooling energy use that could otherwise be offset by high-performance transparent facades. Regardless, advanced transparent facade technologies will still enable long-term reductions in energy use for existing buildings and reduce trade-offs between improving access to light and views enabled by increased glazed area and ensuring occupant thermal and visual comfort.

## Limitations

An important limitation of this goal-setting methodology is its reliance on a limited valuation of ECM costs and benefits that is based only on installed price and operating energy cost savings from performance gains. This valuation excludes potential changes in nonenergy operating costs, which are difficult to assess for new-to-market or future technologies. Moreover, this approach excludes other potentially important benefits that are challenging to assess quantitatively, such as improved occupant comfort, employee productivity, or employee health. In a strictly payback-focused decision frame, these factors cannot be readily included. It is also not clear whether consumers can readily incorporate these nonquantitative factors into their decisions, and without that information, any additional benefits might not merit inclusion in a goal-setting context.

Among the various window technologies reflected in this report, many must meet various other performance requirements that might affect or be affected by their energy performance but are not directly captured in Scout ECM

definitions. These factors can include code-mandated requirements (e.g., window structural performance) or relate to consumer acceptance or market viability (e.g., glare control with visible light redirection). Though these factors might not directly influence energy performance, they nonetheless remain important to incorporate into a complete assessment of the viability and relevance of novel technology R&D.

The representation of operating cost savings arising from window performance improvements in Scout necessarily pools savings across wide swaths of the existing and projected future building stock. As a result, the total installed price or price premium targets reflect a stock-wide average. Although this target is appropriate given BTO's focus on national energy savings (not savings within individual buildings), it obscures the potential for higher-priced technologies to enter the market in existing buildings that have poorly performing windows. These buildings could see much larger energy savings than are reflected in the Scout analysis, and if simple payback is an appropriate metric for a given project, the total installed price for window (and/or attachment) retrofits could be much higher than this report's target while still realizing a customer-acceptable payback period.

