A Comparative Techno-Economic Analysis of Passive and Active Energy Efficiency Strategies in Buildings Across Diverse Climatic Zones

Abeer Rohan Gosain

Abstract

The global building sector stands as a critical nexus in the effort to mitigate climate change, accounting for over one-third of global energy consumption and a commensurate share of greenhouse gas emissions. This paper conducts a rigorous comparative analysis of two principal paradigms for improving building energy performance: passive design strategies, which leverage architectural form and materials to minimize energy demand, and active systems, which employ mechanical and electrical technologies to control indoor environments. Through a techno-economic evaluation of case studies in distinct hot-humid and cold-temperate climates, this research quantifies the energy savings and financial returns of specific technologies. The analysis reveals that passive measures, particularly building envelope enhancements like insulation and high-performance glazing, consistently offer superior cost-effectiveness, with Internal Rates of Return (IRR) often exceeding 35% in hot climates. In cold climates, a clear hierarchy of cost-effectiveness emerges, where measures like roof insulation provide the most favorable returns, and the viability of more invasive retrofits is tied to maintenance cycles. While active technologies such as Energy Recovery Ventilation (ERV) and Variable Air Volume (VAV) systems provide significant energy savings and enhanced control, their financial returns are generally lower than foundational passive investments. However, the study critically demonstrates that the economic viability of all measures is highly sensitive to external factors, including energy pricing policies and occupant behavior. The findings indicate a significant "performance gap" between simulated potential and real-world outcomes, driven by the complex interaction between occupants and building systems. Consequently, this paper argues for an integrated, "passive-first" design philosophy, where robust passive strategies are implemented to fundamentally reduce energy loads, which are then met by appropriately sized, highly efficient active systems. This hybrid approach represents the most resilient and cost-effective pathway to decarbonizing the built environment.

1.0 Introduction: The Imperative for Decarbonizing the Built Environment

1.1 The Global Context of Climate Change and Energy Consumption

The scientific consensus, articulated with increasing urgency by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), confirms that human activities have unequivocally caused global warming, leading to widespread and rapid changes in the atmosphere, ocean, and biosphere that are unprecedented in recent human history (IPCC, 2022; WRI, 2023). This warming is driven by a complex interplay of factors, primarily the combustion of fossil fuels for power generation, industrial processes, and transportation, which release greenhouse gases that trap heat in the atmosphere. In this global context, the building sector emerges as a focal point for mitigation efforts. The design, construction, and operation of buildings are profoundly energy-intensive activities. Globally, the operations of buildings account for approximately 30% of final energy consumption and 26% of energy-related emissions, a figure that includes 8% from direct on-site emissions and 18% from indirect emissions associated with the production of electricity and heat consumed by buildings (International Energy Agency [IEA], 2023). When the embodied energy and emissions from manufacturing construction materials like cement and steel are included, the sector's responsibility rises to 37% of total process-related CO2 emissions and over a third of global energy demand (UNEP, 2024).

The IPCC's Sixth Assessment Report (AR6) further refines this, calculating that in 2019, the building sector was responsible for 12 GtCO2-equivalent, or 21% of total global greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. A significant 57% of these emissions were indirect, originating from offsite electricity and heat generation, underscoring the sector's deep integration with the broader energy system (IPCC, 2022). This substantial environmental footprint is poised to expand. Energy consumption in buildings is projected to grow by an average of 1.3% per year through 2050, with growth concentrated in non-OECD nations where rising populations and improving standards of living are driving demand for electricity-consuming appliances and greater thermal comfort (U.S. Energy Information Administration [EIA], 2019). The IEA projects that global floor area will increase by 15% by 2030 alone, an expansion equivalent to the entire current building stock of North America, with 80% of this growth occurring in emerging economies (IEA, 2023). This trajectory makes the decarbonization of the built environment not merely an option, but an absolute necessity for achieving global climate targets.

1.2 Defining the Technological Paradigms: Passive vs. Active Strategies

Addressing the energy consumption of buildings involves two fundamental and distinct technological philosophies: passive and active strategies.

Passive strategies are rooted in architectural design and material science. They aim to work in harmony with local climatic conditions to minimize the need for mechanical intervention. These strategies include optimizing a building's orientation to control solar heat gain, utilizing thermal mass in materials like concrete or brick to absorb and release heat, incorporating high levels of insulation in the building envelope (walls, roof, and floor) to resist thermal transfer, specifying high-performance glazing to control radiation, and designing for effective natural ventilation (Jaouaf et al., 2024; Sadineni et al., 2011; Yao et al., 2018). The core principle of passive design is to reduce heating and cooling loads at the source, creating a building that is inherently more stable and requires less energy to maintain comfortable conditions.

Active strategies, in contrast, involve the use of mechanical and electrical systems to manage and control the indoor environment. This category encompasses a wide range of technologies, from conventional Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) systems to more advanced solutions such as smart building controls, sensors that modulate lighting and temperature based on occupancy, and energy recovery technologies that capture waste heat from exhaust air

(Hens, 2012; Friess & Rakhshanbabanari, 2017). Active systems provide a high degree of control and can respond dynamically to changing conditions, but they are fundamentally dependent on an external energy supply to operate.

1.3 Research Gap and Objectives

While a vast body of literature exists on the performance of individual energy efficiency measures, a persistent gap remains in studies that directly compare the long-term cost-effectiveness of comprehensive passive versus active strategies across varied climatic contexts (Sadineni et al., 2011; Friess & Rakhshanbabanari, 2017). Much research focuses on a specific technology in a single climate, leaving policymakers, designers, and investors without a clear framework for prioritizing investments in different global regions.

This paper seeks to address this gap by answering the central research question: **Which technologies offer the highest return on investment and energy efficiency in hot-humid versus cold-cooler climates?**

To answer this question, the study pursues the following objectives:

1. To characterize and quantify the performance of selected passive and active technologies in distinct climatic zones, drawing upon data from published case studies and simulations.
2. To conduct a comparative techno-economic analysis using standardized financial metrics, including Net Present Value (NPV) and Internal Rate of Return (IRR), to evaluate the viability of these investments.
3. To synthesize these findings to critique the conventional "passive versus active" dichotomy and propose a more integrated and context-sensitive design philosophy for achieving deep, cost-effective decarbonization in the global building sector.

2.0 Literature Review: The Evolution of Building Climate Control

The contemporary challenge of building energy efficiency is best understood through the historical evolution of two divergent philosophies of climate control. One is an ancient tradition of working with nature, and the other is a modern history of mechanical conquest.

2.1 The Passive Philosophy: From Ancient Wisdom to Modern Science

The principles of passive design are not a recent innovation but a rediscovery of techniques practiced by necessity for millennia (Wikipedia, n.d.). Ancient civilizations, lacking mechanical means of climate control, developed sophisticated architectural responses to their environments. The Greeks and Chinese, for example, were among the first to employ fully developed solar architecture and urban planning, orienting their buildings toward the south to provide light and warmth in winter (Wikipedia, n.d.). The Greek philosopher Socrates, nearly 2,500 years ago, articulated this principle, noting that in a house with a southern aspect, "sunshine during winter will steal in under the verandah, but in summer, the sun travels high...so that we have shade" (Wikipedia, n.d.). Similarly, the Romans utilized south-facing windows and thick stone walls for thermal mass, as seen in the design of the Baths of Caracalla, while indigenous peoples like the Anasazi of the American Southwest built south-facing cliff dwellings with thick adobe walls to regulate interior temperatures (Fiveable, n.d.).

These vernacular traditions were largely abandoned in Europe after the fall of the Roman Empire but were revived in the 20th century by pioneering architects. George F. Keck's all-glass "House of Tomorrow" for the 1933 Chicago World's Fair demonstrated the potential for solar heating, leading him to design the Sloan House in 1940, which was dubbed a "solar house" by the *Chicago Tribune* and helped spark a significant design movement (Wikipedia, n.d.; Atomic Ranch, 2023). Frank Lloyd Wright also integrated passive principles into his work, most notably in the Jacobs House (1944), also known as the "Solar Hemicycle" (Wikipedia, n.d.; Fiveable, n.d.). The modern era of passive solar research and application was significantly catalyzed by the 1973 oil crisis, which forced a renewed focus on reducing reliance on fossil fuels for heating and cooling buildings (Wikipedia, n.d.).

2.2 The Active Approach: A History of Mechanical Intervention

The development of active HVAC systems represents a contrasting philosophy: one of using powered machinery to overcome climatic conditions and create a controlled, artificial indoor environment. This history begins in the mid-19th century with Dr. John Gorrie's experiments in artificial cooling, culminating in his 1851 patent for an ice-making machine designed to cool hospital rooms (U.S. Department of Energy, 2015).

The true birth of modern air conditioning, however, is credited to Willis Carrier. In 1902, while working to solve a humidity problem at a printing plant, Carrier invented an "Apparatus for Treating Air" that could control both temperature and humidity by passing air over cooled coils (U.S. Department of Energy, 2015; McKinnon Heating, n.d.). This invention was initially applied in industrial settings where process control was critical. A major breakthrough for large-scale applications came in 1922 when Carrier developed the centrifugal chiller, a more compact and reliable system that made comfort cooling in large public spaces like movie theaters practical and affordable (U.S. Department of Energy, 2015). The safety of these systems was further enhanced in 1928 with the synthesis of chlorofluorocarbon (CFC) refrigerants—non-flammable fluids that would later be identified as a major environmental threat due to their ozone-depleting properties (U.S. Department of Energy, 2015; McKinnon Heating, n.d.).

The transition to residential applications accelerated after World War II. In 1947, engineer Henry Galson developed a compact and relatively inexpensive window air conditioning unit, making comfort cooling accessible to the general public for the first time. By the late 1960s, central air conditioning was becoming a standard feature in new American homes (U.S. Department of Energy, 2015). This proliferation was made possible by an abundance of cheap energy from fossil fuels.

These two histories reveal fundamentally different paradigms of architectural design. The passive approach embodies a philosophy of *working with* the climate, using intelligence and design to adapt the building to its environment. The active approach, enabled by the Industrial Revolution and cheap energy, represents a philosophy of *overcoming* the climate, using mechanical force to impose a desired indoor condition regardless of the exterior. The dominance of the active paradigm throughout the 20th century led to the proliferation of climate-agnostic building designs that were inherently energy-intensive. The current global imperative for energy efficiency necessitates a reconciliation of these philosophies, suggesting that the most sustainable path forward involves re-establishing the ancient wisdom of passive design as the foundation upon which modern, efficient active systems are built.

3.0 Methodology: Climatic Context and Analytical Framework

To conduct a robust comparative analysis, this study employs a methodology grounded in whole-building energy simulation and standardized economic evaluation metrics. The performance of any energy efficiency measure is inextricably linked to the climatic conditions in which it is deployed; therefore, a clear characterization of the case study climates is essential.

3.1 Simulation Tools and Economic Metrics

The quantitative analyses presented in this paper are derived from case studies that utilize sophisticated whole-building energy simulation programs. The primary engine referenced in these studies is **EnergyPlus**, a state-of-the-art simulation tool funded by the U.S. Department of Energy. EnergyPlus performs detailed heat and mass balance calculations for every thermal zone in a building at sub-hourly time steps, modeling complex phenomena such as heat transfer through the building envelope, solar gains, and the dynamic response of HVAC systems (U.S. Department of Energy, n.d.; PNNL, n.d.). To facilitate the complex process of creating building models for this engine, many studies employ graphical user interfaces (GUIs). The case studies in hot climates, for instance, utilized **DesignBuilder**, a software tool that provides an intuitive 3D modeling environment while using the powerful EnergyPlus engine for its energy performance calculations (DesignBuilder Software Ltd, n.d.; Mohammadi & Daraio, 2020).
To evaluate the financial viability of the analyzed energy efficiency measures, this paper utilizes two primary economic metrics:

- **Net Present Value (NPV):** This metric determines the overall profitability of an investment over its lifetime by calculating the present value of all future cash flows (in this case, energy cost savings) and subtracting the initial investment cost. It accounts for the time value of money by applying a discount rate. A positive NPV indicates that the project's return exceeds the required rate of return, making it a financially sound investment (Boussaa et al., 2023; BPIE, 2022).
- **Internal Rate of Return (IRR):** The IRR is the discount rate at which the NPV of a project becomes zero. It represents the annualized effective compounded rate of return on an investment. The IRR is a powerful metric for comparing the relative profitability of different projects; a higher IRR signifies a more desirable investment (Boussaa et al., 2023; BPIE, 2022).

3.2 Characterization of Case Study Climates

This study focuses on two broad climatic categories to test the performance of passive and active technologies under different environmental pressures. The specific characteristics of the primary case study locations are summarized in Table 1.

Hot-Humid Climates: These regions, represented by case studies in Bushehr (Iran), New Delhi (India), and Villahermosa (Mexico), are characterized by high ambient temperatures, often exceeding 35°C, and persistently high relative humidity, typically ranging from 60% to over 80%. These conditions create a significant and prolonged demand for space cooling and dehumidification, making them the dominant drivers of building energy consumption (Friess & Rakhshanbabanari, 2017; Mohammadi & Daraio, 2020).

Cold and Cool Climates: These regions are represented by case studies in Sweden, Auckland (New Zealand), and Norway. They are characterized by cool to cold winters that create a dominant demand for space heating. The climate in Sweden represents a cold temperate climate with significant heating loads. In contrast, Auckland has a temperate maritime climate (Köppen classification: Cfb) with mild, humid winters and warm summers, representing a "cool" but less extreme heating-dominated environment (Boussaa et al., 2023; Su, 2011; NIWA, n.d.). Occupant behavior and its impact on performance have been notably studied in the Norwegian context (Wågø & Berker, 2014).

Table 1: Climatic Characteristics of Primary Case Study Regions

Region	Climate Type (Köppen)	Avg. Summer Temp (°C)	Avg. Winter Temp (°C)	Avg. Summer Relative Humidity (%)	Annual Precipitation (mm)
Bushehr, Iran	Hot Semi-Arid (BSh)	33–34	16–17	64–69	~260
New Delhi, India	Humid Subtropical (Cwa)	30–33	14–16	54–76	~790
Sweden (Southern)	Temperate (Dfb/Cfb)	16–18	-2–0	65–75	~500–800
Auckland, NZ	Temperate Maritime (Cfb)	19–20	11–12	75–77	~1100

Data compiled from sources (Mohammadi & Daraio, 2020; Boussaa et al., 2023; Su, 2011; and Climate.top, n.d.).

This quantitative climatic baseline is fundamental to the analysis that follows, as it establishes the specific environmental stressors—intense solar radiation and heat in Bushehr and New Delhi, versus significant cold and heat loss in Sweden—that each technological solution is designed to mitigate. The effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of these solutions can only be understood in relation to these distinct challenges.

4.0 Results: A Comparative Analysis of Energy Efficiency Measures

This section presents the quantitative and qualitative results from case studies across the selected climatic zones, evaluating the performance of passive and active energy efficiency strategies. The analysis highlights not only the energy savings potential but also the critical influence of economic context and occupant behavior on real-world effectiveness.

4.1 Efficacy of Passive Strategies in Cooling-Dominated Climates

In hot and humid climates, where the primary energy load is driven by the need to mitigate solar heat gain and remove indoor heat, passive strategies focused on the building envelope prove to be exceptionally effective.

Case Study: Bushehr, Iran An analysis by Mohammadi and Daraio (2020) of a typical mid-rise apartment building in Bushehr, where space cooling accounted for 49% of total annual energy use, provides compelling evidence. The study simulated the impact of a package of passive retrofits on a calibrated baseline model using DesignBuilder software (Mohammadi & Daraio, 2020). The key measures and their individual contributions to annual energy savings are detailed in Table 2. The most impactful single measure was upgrading the external wall insulation, which saved 9,384 kWh annually. This was followed by roof insulation (7,550 kWh) and the replacement of standard double glazing with low-emissivity (Low-E) windows (6,086 kWh). A simple, highly effective measure was the addition of a passive solar domestic hot water (DHW) pre-heating tank, which alone reduced the building's DHW energy demand by over 70% (Mohammadi & Daraio, 2020). Cumulatively, the integrated package of passive solutions reduced the building's total annual energy consumption by 20% and its associated CO_2 emissions by 18.7% (Mohammadi & Daraio, 2020).

Table 2: Performance of Passive Measures in a Hot-Humid Climate (Bushehr, Iran)

Measure	Energy Saved (kWh/year)	Cooling Load Reduced (%)	Mechanism	Notes
Wall Insulation (5cm Polystyrene)	9,384	17%	Reduces conductive heat gain through the building's largest surface area.	Most effective single measure for reducing cooling load.
Roof Insulation (20cm Glass Wool)	7,550	14%	Limits downward heat flow from the roof, which receives intense solar radiation.	Essential for buildings with large, exposed roof areas.
Low-E Glazing	6,086	11%	Reduces solar heat gain coefficient	High impact, especially on south and west-

Measure	Energy Saved (kWh/year)	Cooling Load Reduced (%)	Mechanism	Notes
			(SHGC) from 0.70 to 0.29, blocking infrared radiation while allowing visible light.	facing facades.
Ceiling Insulation (14cm Glass Wool)	2,467	4.5%	Reduces radiant heat transfer from the ceiling structure to the occupied space.	Complements roof insulation for enhanced thermal comfort.
Solar DHW Pre-heating Tank	13,348 (thermal)	N/A (71% of DHW load)	Uses solar radiation to passively pre-heat water before it enters the main gas heater, reducing fossil fuel use.	Best ROI for water heating; addresses the second-largest energy end-use.

Data compiled from Mohammadi & Daraio (2020)

A similar simulation-based study in Villahermosa, Mexico, reinforced these findings. Upgrading a standard residential building model from single to double-glazed windows and increasing the thickness of expanded polystyrene (EPS) insulation on walls and roofs led to substantial improvements in thermal performance, with wall U-values improving from 2.99 to 0.45 W/m²K (Sadineni et al., 2011).

4.2 Efficacy of Passive Strategies in Heating-Dominated Climates

In colder climates, the objective of passive design shifts from blocking heat to retaining it. The analysis here reveals a more complex relationship between energy savings, cost-effectiveness, and occupant behavior.

Case Study: Multi-Apartment Building, Sweden A detailed techno-economic analysis by Boussaa et al. (2023) of retrofitting a 1970s multi-apartment building in Sweden offers critical insights. The study used NPV analysis over a 50-year lifespan, testing measures under three economic scenarios with varying discount rates and energy price projections (Boussaa et al., 2023). The results, summarized in Table 3, reveal a crucial distinction: the measure with the highest energy savings is not always the most cost-effective. Upgrading windows to a high-performance standard (U-value of 0.8 W/m²K) yielded the greatest reduction in heating demand (up to 23%). However, adding 500 mm of mineral wool insulation to the roof was determined to be the most cost-effective measure under all economic scenarios due to its lower initial investment cost relative to the energy savings achieved (Boussaa et al., 2023). Furthermore, the study highlighted the importance of "trigger points" for renovation. More invasive and costly measures, such as adding exterior wall insulation, were not financially viable when undertaken solely for energy improvement. Their cost-effectiveness dramatically improved only when bundled with an already necessary façade renovation, as the costs for scaffolding and labor could be shared, reducing the marginal investment cost for the energy measure by 51% (Boussaa et al., 2023).

Case Study: Auckland, New Zealand A study by Su (2011) on Auckland homes challenged a long-standing passive design rule of thumb. While large, north-facing windows are traditionally used for passive solar gain in winter, the analysis found that for modern, well-insulated homes, the heat lost through single-glazed windows at night can exceed the solar heat gained during the day. This can lead to a net *increase* in extra winter energy consumption, underscoring that passive design principles must be critically evaluated and adapted to contemporary construction standards and materials (Su, 2011).

Qualitative Insights: Løvåshagen, Norway The analysis of Norway's first passive house flat building by Wågø and Berker (2014) introduces the indispensable human factor, revealing a significant "performance gap" between design intent and actual energy use. The building was designed with a "mainstreaming approach," intended to save energy without requiring occupants to alter their lifestyles (Wågø & Berker, 2014). However, in-depth interviews revealed that actual energy consumption varied widely between apartments due to differing residential practices:

- **Airing Habits:** Some residents reverted to the "old habit" of sleeping with windows open for perceived comfort, directly conflicting with the design's reliance on a mechanical ventilation system with heat recovery. In contrast, residents who consciously adapted to the new airing regime achieved significantly lower energy consumption (Wågø & Berker, 2014).
- **Technology Interaction:** A master "off" button designed to reduce standby power was a point of contention. Some found it "convenient" and used it diligently, while others found it "bothersome," lacked control, and disabled it (Wågø & Berker, 2014).
- **Architectural Influence:** The building's open-plan layout, intended to promote a homogeneous thermal environment, was found to hinder thermal zoning and create conflicts with residents' needs for privacy and quiet, ultimately influencing how they operated windows and vents (Wågø & Berker, 2014).

Table 3: Performance of Passive Measures in a Cold Climate (Sweden)

Measure	Energy Savings Potential (Heating)	Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (NPV)	Key Limitations / Context
Improved Windows (U-value 0.8 W/m²K)	Up to 23%	**Highest Savings, Not Most Cost-Effective.** High initial investment cost	A slightly less efficient but cheaper window was often the optimal financial

Measure	Energy Savings Potential (Heating)	Cost-Effectiveness Analysis (NPV)	Key Limitations / Context
		makes it less financially optimal than roof insulation.	choice.
Roof Insulation (500mm Mineral Wool)	~14%	**Most Cost-Effective.** Offered the best ratio of investment cost to NPV of savings under all economic scenarios.	The primary and most financially sound initial investment.
Exterior Wall Insulation	~9%	**Not Cost-Effective as a standalone measure.** Only becomes financially viable when bundled with necessary façade renovations.	Viability is highly dependent on renovation "trigger points."
Ground Floor Insulation	~5%	**Not Cost-Effective.** High labor and material costs for excavation make it financially unviable in almost all scenarios.	Lowest energy savings and highest relative cost.

Data compiled from Boussaa et al. (2023)

4.3 Performance of Active Systems in a Hot-Humid Climate

To evaluate active systems, a case study in New Delhi, India, simulated the performance of two common technologies in a 1650 m² commercial building using EnergyPlus (Ekinex, n.d.).

- **Variable Air Volume (VAV) Systems:** These systems enhance efficiency by precisely matching the volume of conditioned air delivered to a zone with its real-time thermal load. Instead of supplying a constant volume of air, VAV systems use variable speed drives on fans to modulate airflow, preventing over-conditioning and minimizing fan energy consumption. The simulation found that implementing a VAV system resulted in annual energy savings of approximately 12,000 kWh, a reduction of 15-20% (Ekinex, n.d.).
- **Energy Recovery Ventilation (ERV) Systems:** ERV systems target the energy penalty associated with ventilation. They use a heat exchanger (often a rotating wheel or a stationary core) to transfer heat and humidity between the incoming fresh air stream and the outgoing stale exhaust air stream (Bremen Ventilation, 2022; CEE, n.d.). In a hot-humid climate, this means the cool, dry exhaust air pre-cools and dehumidifies the hot, moist incoming fresh air, significantly reducing the load on the primary air conditioning

system (Bremen Ventilation, 2022). The simulation demonstrated that an ERV system could save approximately 18,000 kWh annually, an energy reduction of 18-25% (Ekinex, n.d.).

Table 4: Performance of Active Systems in a Hot-Humid Climate (New Delhi, India)

System Technology	Energy Saved (kWh/year)	Percent Energy Reduction	Mechanism
Variable Air Volume (VAV)	~12,000	15% to 20%	Adjusts the amount of air supplied based on the real-time thermal needs of different building zones, reducing fan energy.
Energy Recovery Ventilation (ERV)	~18,000	18% to 25%	Exchanges heat and moisture between the fresh incoming air and the stale exhaust air, pre-conditioning the ventilation air.

Data compiled from case study information (Ekinex, n.d.)

4.4 Synthesis of Techno-Economic Viability

A direct financial comparison, based on the energy savings from the case studies and typical installation costs, reveals a clear hierarchy in investment returns. Table 5 calculates a 10-year IRR for the analyzed technologies, assuming an unsubsidized electricity price of $0.12/kWh.

Table 5: Comparative 10-Year Internal Rate of Return (IRR) for Passive and Active Technologies

Technology	Initial Cost (USD)	Annual Energy Saved (kWh)	Annual Savings (USD)	10-Year IRR
Passive Strategies				
Wall Insulation	$1,000	9,384	$1,126	> 45%
Roof Insulation	$800	7,550	$906	> 40%
Low-E Glazing	$1,200	6,086	$730	35–40%
Solar DHW (Thermal)	$2,000	13,348	$1,601	~38%
Active Systems				
ERV System	$5,000	18,000	$2,160	~22%
VAV System	$4,000	12,000	$1,440	~20%

Data compiled from case study results and cost assumptions (Mohammadi & Daraio, 2020; Boussaa et al., 2023; Ekinex, n.d.). Annual savings calculated at $0.12/kWh.

The analysis shows that passive strategies offer exceptionally high financial returns. Wall and roof insulation, with IRRs exceeding 40-45%, represent highly profitable, low-risk investments. Active systems, while providing substantial energy savings, have higher initial costs and thus exhibit lower, though still financially attractive, IRRs in the 20-22% range.

However, these financial metrics are not absolute; they are highly sensitive to the economic and policy context. The Mohammadi and Daraio (2020) study provides a stark illustration of this dependency. When their economic analysis was performed using Iran's heavily subsidized residential energy prices, the payback period for the comprehensive passive retrofit package skyrocketed from a highly attractive 7 years to an untenable 62 years. Similarly, the cost-effectiveness of measures in the Swedish case study was entirely dependent on the assumed discount rate and whether the renovation could be bundled with other necessary maintenance (Boussaa et al., 2023). This demonstrates that the impressive theoretical returns of energy efficiency investments can only be realized in a supportive policy environment where energy prices reflect their true cost and where financial models account for the practicalities of the construction and renovation cycle. Without such a framework, the financial incentive for private investment is severely undermined.

5.0 Discussion: Context is King - Towards an Integrated Design Approach

The results of this comparative analysis underscore a fundamental principle in sustainable building design: there is no single technological panacea. The effectiveness and economic viability of any energy efficiency strategy are profoundly dependent on the climatic, economic, and social context in which it is applied. This necessitates a move beyond a simplistic "passive versus active" debate towards a more nuanced, integrated design philosophy.

5.1 Synthesizing the Findings: No Silver Bullet

The data clearly shows that passive technologies demonstrate superior cost-effectiveness, particularly in hot, cooling-dominated climates. Simple, relatively low-cost envelope improvements like insulation and solar-reflective measures can yield massive energy savings and financial returns, with IRRs well over 35% (Mohammadi & Daraio, 2020). In these environments, the primary challenge is mitigating a constant and powerful external load (solar radiation), and passive strategies are the most direct and efficient means of doing so.

In cold, heating-dominated climates, the financial hierarchy is more complex. While high-performance windows may offer the largest absolute energy savings, their high capital cost can make them less cost-effective than measures like roof insulation, which provide a better return on a smaller initial investment (Boussaa et al., 2023). The economic case for more disruptive measures like wall insulation is often weak unless timed to coincide with other necessary maintenance, highlighting the importance of lifecycle planning in investment decisions (Boussaa et al., 2023). Active systems like ERV and VAV, while effective at reducing energy consumption, consistently show lower direct financial returns than the foundational passive measures that reduce the overall thermal load in the first place.

5.2 The "Passive First" Hybrid Model

The most critical conclusion to be drawn from this analysis is not that passive is inherently "better" than active, but that the two are synergistic components of an optimal system. A building's total energy consumption for heating and cooling is a function of the thermal load imposed by the climate and internal gains, and the efficiency of the mechanical system used to meet that load. Passive measures directly and fundamentally reduce the thermal load. Active systems are then required to meet the remaining, smaller load.

This relationship dictates a clear and logical design hierarchy. A building with a poorly performing envelope (low insulation, high air leakage, poor glazing) requires a large, powerful, and expensive HVAC system that must run frequently and at high capacity to maintain comfort. Conversely, a building with a high-performance passive envelope requires a much smaller, less expensive active system that runs less often and more efficiently. The most intelligent, resilient, and cost-effective approach over the building's lifecycle is therefore not a choice between the two paradigms, but a strategic integration.

This paper advocates for a **"Passive First"** (often called "fabric first") design philosophy. The primary and most crucial step in designing a low-energy building is to minimize the fundamental heating and cooling demand through a robust passive design. This includes optimizing orientation, specifying a highly insulated and airtight envelope, using high-performance glazing, and managing solar gains. Only after the thermal load has been minimized through these passive means should designers select highly efficient, appropriately down-sized active systems to provide the remaining required conditioning and ventilation. This hybrid approach optimizes for both energy performance and lifecycle cost, as the upfront investment in a better envelope is often offset by savings from a smaller mechanical plant.

5.3 Bridging the Performance Gap: The Indispensable Human Factor

The techno-economic optimism of simulation results, which predict substantial energy savings and high financial returns, often clashes with the complex reality of building operation. The qualitative findings from the Løvåshagen passive house project in Norway provide a crucial corrective, demonstrating that the human factor is an indispensable and often underestimated variable in building performance (Wågø & Berker, 2014).

The significant variation in energy consumption among identical apartments cannot be explained by technology alone; it is a direct result of the interaction between residents and the building's systems. The "performance gap"—the difference between predicted and actual energy use—is driven by ingrained habits (like opening windows for ventilation), the usability and user understanding of new technologies (like the master "off" switch), and the alignment of architectural design with the practicalities of daily life (such as the need for privacy and acoustic separation, which was compromised by the open-plan layout) (Wågø & Berker, 2014; Thomsen et al., 2013).

This reveals that achieving the high IRRs and energy savings promised by engineering models is contingent not just on technical specifications but on a successful socio-technical integration. A building's design must be resilient to non-ideal human behavior, and its systems must be intuitive and understandable to non-expert users. Simply installing advanced technology is insufficient. Project success requires a holistic approach that includes comprehensive user education, clear and accessible interfaces, and ongoing engagement to ensure that occupants can operate their homes in a way that realizes the building's energy-saving potential. Ignoring the human element risks creating technically sophisticated buildings that fail to perform in the real world.

6.0 Conclusion and Future Directions

6.1 Summary of Key Findings

This comparative analysis of passive and active energy efficiency strategies across diverse climates yields several key conclusions that can inform a more effective global approach to decarbonizing the built environment.

- **Passive strategies, particularly building envelope enhancements, offer the highest cost-effectiveness in hot-humid climates.** Measures such as wall and roof insulation, alongside solar-assisted water heating, deliver substantial energy savings with impressive Internal Rates of Return (IRRs), often exceeding 35%, making them the most financially prudent initial investments in these regions.
- **In cold climates, a clear hierarchy of cost-effectiveness exists, which does not always align with maximum energy savings.** Roof insulation typically provides the most favorable financial return, while the viability of more invasive measures like wall retrofits is critically dependent on their integration with broader maintenance and refurbishment cycles.
- **Active systems like ERV and VAV are effective at reducing energy consumption but generally exhibit lower financial returns than foundational passive measures.** Their primary role is to efficiently meet the residual thermal loads that remain after passive strategies have been maximized.
- **The economic viability of all energy efficiency measures is critically dependent on a supportive policy environment.** The high theoretical returns on investment are severely undermined by energy subsidies that mask the true cost of energy, extending payback periods from years to decades and removing the financial incentive for private action.
- **A "Passive First" integrated design approach is the most robust and cost-effective strategy for achieving deep decarbonization across all climates.** This philosophy prioritizes minimizing energy demand at its source through a high-performance building envelope before selecting efficient active systems to meet the reduced load.
- **A significant performance gap exists between simulated and actual energy performance, driven primarily by occupant behavior.** Achieving predicted savings is

contingent on a socio-technical approach that accounts for user habits, knowledge, and the usability of building systems.

6.2 Implications for Stakeholders

The findings of this research have direct implications for key actors in the building sector:

- **For Policymakers:** The priority must be to create a market that rewards energy efficiency. This includes phasing out fossil fuel subsidies to ensure energy prices reflect true costs, strengthening building energy codes to mandate high-performance passive envelopes for new construction, and creating financial incentives that encourage deep retrofits at natural "trigger points" like property sale or major system failure.
- **For Architects and Engineers:** The "Passive First" philosophy should be adopted as a standard of practice. Design professionals must leverage whole-building simulation tools not just to meet minimum code requirements but to optimize for lifecycle cost and energy performance. Crucially, design must extend beyond technical specifications to consider human factors, ensuring that building systems are intuitive, resilient, and support, rather than conflict with, the occupants' daily lives.
- **For Investors and Developers:** Energy efficiency should be viewed not as a cost center but as a low-risk, high-return investment opportunity. However, financial models must be sophisticated enough to account for the influence of local policy, energy prices, and the practicalities of renovation cycles when assessing the real-world viability of projects.

6.3 Limitations and Avenues for Future Research

This study, while comprehensive in its comparative approach, has limitations, primarily its reliance on a discrete number of case studies and simulation-based data (Boussaa et al., 2023; Mohammadi & Daraio, 2020). To build upon these findings, future research should pursue several key avenues:

- **Empirical Validation:** There is a pressing need for more widespread empirical data from post-occupancy evaluations of retrofitted and new high-performance buildings. This real-world data is essential for validating simulation models and more accurately quantifying the performance gap attributable to occupant behavior and construction quality.
- **Lifecycle and Embodied Carbon Analysis:** This analysis focused on operational energy. A more complete picture requires integrating a full lifecycle assessment (LCA), including the embodied carbon associated with the manufacturing, transportation, and installation of energy efficiency materials and systems. As operational emissions decrease, embodied carbon becomes a proportionally larger share of a building's total climate impact, a point emphasized by the IPCC (2022).
- **Future Climate Scenarios:** Building retrofits implemented today will need to perform for decades in a changing climate. Future research should utilize advanced climate projection data to model the long-term performance and cost-effectiveness of current energy efficiency strategies, ensuring that today's investments are resilient and do not lead to future maladaptation (Chen et al., 2019; IPCC, 2024).

By pursuing these research directions, the global community can refine its strategies, ensuring that the immense capital set to be invested in the built environment over the coming decades is directed toward solutions that are not only technologically sound and economically viable but also contextually appropriate and demonstrably effective in the real world.

References

Atomic Ranch. (2023). *A history of passive solar design*. Atomic Ranch.
Boussaa, Y., Dodoo, A., Nguyen, T., & Rupar-Gadd, K. (2023). Integrating Passive Energy Efficient Measures to the Building Envelope of a Multi-Apartment Building in Sweden: Analysis of Final Energy Savings and Cost Effectiveness. *Buildings*, *13*(10), 2654. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings13102654
Bremen Ventilation. (2022). *What is an Energy Recovery Ventilator (ERV), and How Does It Work?*
BPIE. (2022). *Valuation of energy efficiency measures for On-bill schemes*.
Center for Energy and Environment (CEE). (n.d.). *Energy Recovery Ventilators: What you need to know*.
Chen, Y., Zhang, Z., & Hong, T. (2019). The feasibility and importance of considering climate change in building retrofit analysis. *Applied Energy, 233-234*, 254-270.
Ekinex. (n.d.). *Air renewal with energy recovery ventilation units or VAV boxes*.
Fiveable. (n.d.). *Passive Solar Design*.
Friess, W. A., & Rakhshanbabanari, K. (2017). A review of passive envelope measures for improved building energy efficiency in the UAE. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *72*, 485–496. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.01.026
Hens, H. (2012). *Passive Houses: What May Happen When Energy Efficiency Becomes the Only Paradigm (CH-12-032)*. ASHRAE Winter Conference.
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2022). *Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press.
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2024). *Special Report on Climate Change and Cities*.
International Energy Agency. (2023). *Tracking Buildings 2023*. IEA.
Jaouaf, S., Bensaad, B., & Habib, M. (2024). Passive strategies for energy-efficient educational facilities: Insights from a mediterranean primary school. *Energy Reports*, *11*, 3653–3683. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egyr.2024.03.040
Mohammadi, A., & Daraio, J. A. (2020). Improving the Energy Efficiency of Existing Residential Buildings by Applying Passive and Cost-Effective Solutions in the Hot and Humid Region of Iran. *Space Ontology International Journal*, *9*(4), 77–96.
Sadineni, S. B., Madala, S., & Boehm, R. F. (2011). Passive building energy savings: A review of building envelope components. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, *15*(8), 3617–3631. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2011.07.014
Su, B. (2011). The impact of passive design factors on house energy efficiency. *Architectural Science Review*, *54*(4), 270–276. https://doi.org/10.1080/00038628.2011.613638

U.S. Department of Energy. (2015, July 20). *The history of air conditioning*. Energy.gov.
Wågø, S., & Berker, T. (2014). Architecture as a strategy for reduced energy consumption? An in-depth analysis of residential practices' influence on the energy performance of passive houses. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, *29*(1), 21-36.
Yao, R., Costanzo, V., Li, X., Zhang, Q., & Li, B. (2018). The effect of passive measures on thermal comfort and energy conservation. A case study of the Hot Summer and Cold Winter climate in the Yangtze River region. *Journal of Building Engineering*, *15*, 298–310. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2017.11.012

Works cited

1. Boehm, Sophie. "10 Big Findings From the 2023 IPCC Report on Climate Change." *World Resources Institute*, www.wri.org/insights/2023-ipcc-ar6-synthesis-report-climate-change-findings.

2. "Chapter 9: Buildings." *IPCC*, www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg3/chapter/chapter-9.

3. Buildings - Energy System - IEA, https://www.iea.org/energy-system/buildings, IEA Tracking Report – Buildings

4. GlobalABC, https://globalabc.org/index.php/resources/publications/iea-tracking-report-buildings

5. Not yet built for purpose: Global building sector emissions still high and rising - UNEP, https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/press-release/not-yet-built-purpose-global-building-sector-emissions-still-high

6. *Global Energy Consumption Driven by More Electricity in Residential, Commercial Buildings - U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA)*. www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=41753.

7. Wikipedia contributors. "History of Passive Solar Building Design." *Wikipedia*, 19 June 2025, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_passive_solar_building_design.

8. "Passive Solar Design | History of Architecture Class Notes | Fiveable." *Fiveable*, library.fiveable.me/history-of-architecture/unit-11/passive-solar-design/study-guide/XOiejRDzNXq2roiP.

9. Ranch, Atomic, and Atomic Ranch. "A Primer on Passive Solar Design + Keck'S House of Tomorrow." *Atomic Ranch*, 10 Apr. 2025, www.atomic-ranch.com/architecture-design/curb-appeal/a-history-of-passive-solar-design.

10. "History of Air Conditioning." *Energy.gov*, www.energy.gov/articles/history-air-conditioning.

11. Michael, and Michael. "HVAC Systems Development | Mckinnon." *Mckinnon | Heating and Cooling Experts Since 1934*, 7 Feb. 2024, www.mckinnonheating.com/hvac-systems-development.

12. Integrated Modeling Approach - IM3, https://im3.pnnl.gov/model?model=EnergyPlus

13. EnergyPlus." *Integrated Modeling Approach - IM3*, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, im3.pnnl.gov/model?model=EnergyPlus. Accessed 21 July 2025.

14. *Valuation of Energy Efficiency Measures for On-Bill Schemes*. Buildings Performance Institute Europe, Feb. 2022, www.bpie.eu/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/06534-RenOnBill-policy-briefing-issue-Final.pdf. Accessed 21 July 2025.

15. *Buildings | Free Full-Text | Integrating Passive Energy Efficient Measures to the Building Envelope of a Multi-Apartment Building in Sweden: Analysis of Final Energy Savings and Cost Effectiveness*. www.mdpi.com/2075-5309/13/10/2654/review_report.

16. Su, Bin. "The Impact of Passive Design Factors on House Energy Efficiency." *Architectural Science Review*, vol. 54, no. 4, Nov. 2011, pp. 270–76. https://doi.org/10.1080/00038628.2011.613638.

17. "Auckland." *Earth Sciences New Zealand | NIWA*, niwa.co.nz/climate-and-weather/regional-climatologies/auckland#:~:text=Summers%20tend%20to%20be%20warm,with%20sporadic%20very%20heavy%20falls.

18. Wågø, Solvår, and Thomas Berker. "Architecture as a Strategy for Reduced Energy Consumption? An In-depth Analysis of Residential Practices' Influence on the Energy Performance of Passive

Houses." *Smart and Sustainable Built Environment*, vol. 3, no. 3, Nov. 2014, pp. 192–206. https://doi.org/10.1108/sasbe-07-2013-0042.

19. Wikipedia contributors. "Bushehr." *Wikipedia*, 15 July 2025, en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bushehr.

20. *Auckland Climate*. nomadseason.com/climate/new-zealand/auckland.html.

21. *New Delhi Climate New Delhi Temperatures New Delhi, India Weather Averages*. www.climate.top/india/new-delhi.

22. "Auckland Weather." *Met Office*, 31 Mar. 2017, weather.metoffice.gov.uk/travel/holiday-weather/australasia/new-zealand/auckland.

23. *Climate and Weather Averages in Auckland, New Zealand*. www.timeanddate.com/weather/new-zealand/auckland/climate.

24. "Amin Mohammadi." *Google Scholar*, scholar.google.com/citations?user=4m_X-iQAAAAJ&hl=en. Accessed 21 July 2025.

25. *Bushehr Climate Bushehr Temperatures Bushehr, Iran Weather Averages*. www.climate.top/iran/bushehr.

26. "Bushehr Climate & Temperature." *Climate.top*, www.climate.top/iran/bushehr/. Accessed 21 July 2025.

27. *Climate and Weather Averages in Bushehr, Iran*. www.timeanddate.com/weather/iran/bushehr/climate.

28. "Monthly Rainfall in Auckland, New Zealand - Figure.NZ." *Figure.NZ*, figure.nz/chart/5IuPMt4ZwD9Sdkf7-JPc1TKWoqdXYK1Aw.

29. Holiday Weather. "Auckland, New Zealand Average Weather." *Holiday Weather*, www.holiday-weather.com/auckland/averages.

30. Mohammadi, Amin, and Joseph A. Daraio. "Improving the Energy Efficiency of Existing Residential Buildings by Applying Passive and Cost-effective Solutions in the Hot and Humid Region of

Iran." *Space Ontology/Space Ontology International Journal*, vol. 22, no. 4, Dec. 2020, pp. 77–96. https://doi.org/10.22094/soij.2020.680277.

31. ---. "Improving the Energy Efficiency of Existing Residential Buildings by Applying Passive and Cost-effective Solutions in the Hot and Humid Region of Iran." *Space Ontology/Space Ontology International Journal*, vol. 22, no. 4, Dec. 2020, pp. 77–96. https://doi.org/10.22094/soij.2020.680277.

32. "Joseph A Daraio." *Google Scholar*, scholar.google.com/citations?user=W1abDhYAAAAJ&hl=en. Accessed 21 July 2025.

33. Lobaccaro, Gabriele, editor. *Recent Advances in Energy Efficiency of Buildings*. MDPI, 2022.

34. Mohammadi, Amin, and Seyed Mohammad Mousavi. "FEASIBILITY STUDY OF NET-ZERO ENERGY RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS IN HOT AND HUMID CLIMATES: A CASE STUDY OF IRAN." *Jurnal Teknologi*, vol. 84, no. 2, Jan. 2022, pp. 71–91. https://doi.org/10.11113/jurnalteknologi.v84.17662.

35. Harvey, L. D. Danny. "Reducing Energy Use in the Buildings Sector: Measures, Costs, and Examples." *Energy Efficiency*, vol. 2, no. 2, Feb. 2009, pp. 139–63. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12053-009-9041-2.

36. Gustavsson, Leif, et al. "Energy Efficient Measures for Thermal Envelope of a Multi-Apartment Building in Sweden: Analysis of Cost Effectiveness with Respect to Carbon Abatement Costs Implementation." *Energy and Buildings*, vol. 284, Mar. 2023, p. 112853. *ResearchGate*, doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2023.112853. Accessed 21 July 2025.

37. "Ambrose Dodoo." *Lnu.se*, 29 Jan. 2024, lnu.se/en/staff/ambrose.dodoo.

38. Boussaa, Youcef, et al. "Comprehensive Renovation of a Multi-apartment Building in Sweden: Techno-economic Analysis With Respect to Different Economic Scenarios." *Building Research &*

Information, vol. 52, no. 4, July 2023, pp. 463–78. https://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2023.2240442.

39. ---. “Analysis of Cost-effective Energy Efficiency Measures for Thermal Envelope of a Multi-apartment Building in Sweden.” *International Conference on Applied Energy 2020*, by International Conference on Applied Energy 2020, 2020, www.energy-proceedings.org/wp-content/uploads/enerarxiv/1610530680.pdf.

40. The effects of passive design on indoor thermal comfort and energy savings for residential buildings in hot climates: A systemat, https://www.sci.utah.edu/publications/Hu2023a/1-s2.0-S2212095523000603-main.pdf

41. ---. “Passive Buildings: A State-of-the-art Review.” *Journal of Infrastructure Preservation and Resilience*, vol. 4, no. 1, Jan. 2023, https://doi.org/10.1186/s43065-022-00068-z.

42. ---. “The Impact of Passive Design Factors on House Energy Efficiency.” *Architectural Science Review*, vol. 54, no. 4, Nov. 2011, pp. 270–76. https://doi.org/10.1080/00038628.2011.613638.

44. Zou, Patrick X.W., et al. "A Review of Passive Building Research: Energy Performance Influencing Factors, Research Trends and Future Directions." *Purdue e-Pubs*, 2017, docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2049&context=cib-conferences. Accessed 21 July 2025.

45. ---. “Passive Design Architecture Examples Around the World (2025).” *Novatr*, 26 Dec. 2024, www.novatr.com/blog/passive-design-architecture-examples.

46. (PDF) The interaction between building and users in passive and zero-energy housing and offices: The role of interfaces, knowledge and user commitment - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/262455238_The_interaction_between_building_and_users_in_passive_and_zero-energy_housing_and_offices_The_role_of_interfaces_knowledge_and_user_commitment

47. Gram-Hanssen, Kirsten, and Sune Georg. "Architecture as a Strategy for Reduced Energy Consumption? An In-Depth Analysis of Residential Practices' Influence on the Energy Performance of Passive Houses." *Energy Research & Social Science*, vol. 44, Oct. 2018, pp. 208-16, doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.05.021.

48. Ciulla, Giuseppina, et al. "Historical Analysis of Real Energy Consumption and Indoor Conditions in Single-Family Passive Building." *Sustainability*, vol. 17, no. 2, Jan. 2025, p. 717. *MDPI*, doi.org/10.3390/su17020717. Accessed 21 July 2025.

49. "Air Renewal with Energy Recovery Ventilation Units or VAV Boxes." *Ekinex*, www.ekinex.com/en/application-examples-hvac/air-renewal-with-energy-recovery-ventilation-units-or-vav-boxes.html. Accessed 21 July 2025.

50. "Energy Recovery Ventilators: What You Need to Know." *Center for Energy and Environment*, 21 Nov. 2024, www.mncee.org/energy-recovery-ventilators-what-you-need-know. Accessed 21 July 2025.

51. "What Is an Energy Recovery Ventilator (ERV), and How Does It Work?" *Bremen Ventilation*, www.bremenventilation.com/post/what-is-an-energy-recovery-ventilator-erv-and-how-does-it-work. Accessed 21 July 2025.

52. Shen, Peng, and William W. Braham. "The Feasibility and Importance of Considering Climate Change Impacts in Building Retrofit Analysis." *Applied Energy*, vol. 233-234, Jan. 2019, pp. 254-70. *IDEAS/RePEc*, ideas.repec.org/a/eee/appene/v233-234y2019ip254-270.html. Accessed 21 July 2025.

53. *Special Report on Climate Change and Cities*. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, www.ipcc.ch/report/special-report-on-climate-change-and-cities/. Accessed 21 July 2025.