WG III contribution to the Sixth Assessment Report

List of corrigenda to be implemented

The corrigenda listed below will be implemented in the SM during copy-editing.

CHAPTER 9 – Supplementary Material

Document (Chapter, Annex, Supp. Material)	Page (Based on the final pdf FGD version)	Line	Detailed information on correction to make
Chapter 9 Supplementary Material	13	5-6	Table SM9.5 header row, replace "Country" with "Country/region"

Chapter 9: Buildings – Supplementary material

SM9.1 Supplementary information to Section 9.4

Figure 9.11 shows a summary of the available technologies with climate change mitigation potential in buildings. Here, an extended list of such technologies is presented (Table SM9.1 to Table SM9.3).

Table SM9.1 Technology strategies contributing to sufficiency aspects. Adapted from

Typology – technology	Advantages	Disadvantages	Energy savings	
			Value [%]	Conditions/comments
Passive strategies for walls				
Insulation materials	- These materials can be used in the different building envelope parts (floor, wall, ceiling and roof) - They have a clear impact on improving the u-value of historic buildings (retrofitting) - Proper installation of insulation using energy-efficient materials reduces the heat loss or heat gain, which leads to the reduction of energy cost as the result	- Conventional insulation materials are derived from petrochemical substances - New organic/sustainable materials are more expensive than conventional materials - If the insulation barrier is broken or without a correct design, thermal bridges may appear (Jedidi and Benjeddou 2018; Capozzoli et al. 2013; Asdrubali et al. 2012)	28-37% in winter 45 – 64% in summer (Cabeza et al. 2010)	Conventional insulation materials (PUR; MW, XPS) Mediterranean continental climate Experimentally tested
			Up to 30% of cooling energy reduction (Kameni Nematchoua et al. 2020)	Conventional insulation materials + PCM Tropical climate Simulation
			Up to 38.83% reduction in the heating season (Annibaldi et al. 2020)	Calcium silicate in heritage buildings Mediterranean climate Simulation
			Reduced energy losses by 57% and energy gains by 39% (Varela Luján et al. 2019)	External Thermal Insulation Composite Systems (ETICS) in existing buildings Mediterranean continental climate Experimentally tested
Trombe wall	- Capability to be integrated with new technologies such as PV systems. - Reduction of building's energy consumption and decrease of moisture and humidity of interior spaces in humid regions. - The indoor temperatures are more stable than in most other passive systems. Prevention of excessive sunshine penetration into the inhabited space. - Installation is relatively inexpensive, where construction would normally be masonry, or for retrofitting existing buildings with uninsulated massive exterior walls. - The time delay between absorption of the solar energy, and delivery of the thermal	- In regions with mild winters and hot summers, over heating problems may outweigh the winter benefits. - In a climate with extended cloudy periods, without employing the adequate operable insulation, the wall may become heat sink. - Trombe walls have low thermal resistance causing to transfer the heat flux from the inside to the outside of a building during the night or prolonged cloudy periods. - The amount of gained heat is unpredictable due to changes occur in solar intensity. - Trombe walls are aesthetically appealing	20% (Bojić et al. 2014)	Annual heating – Mediterranean climate Simulation
			18.2% and 42.2% (Bevilacqua et al. 2019b)	Heating cold climate and cooling cold climate Simulation

	energy to the living space can be used for night-time heating. - Trombe wall not only provides thermal comfort in the spaces connected to itself, but also contributes to the enhanced thermal comfort condition of adjacent spaces			
Vertical Greenery Systems (Green walls / Green facades)	- Enhancing building aesthetics. - Improving the acoustic properties. - Reduction of heat gains and losses. - Ability to be integrated with existing buildings.	- Providing a living environment for mosquitoes, moths, etc. - Requiring significant, and consistent maintenance measures. - Water drainage can be involved in complexities, and difficulties.	58.9 % Green wall 33.8 % Green facade (Coma et al. 2017)	Cooling season warm climate Experimental study
			37.7% and 50% (Djedjig et al. 2015b)	Hot climate Cold climate Cooling Savings Simulation
			12% (Chen et al. 2013b)	Cooling savings Tropical climate Experimental
			20.5 % (Haggag et al. 2014b)	Cooling savings Hot climate Experimental
PCM Wall systems	- Availability at different temperatures - High volumetric energy storage	- Low thermal conductivity - Flammability - Low thermal and chemical stability	19 – 26% (Khoshbakht et al. 2016)	Heating savings Mediterranean climate Experimental
			0 up to 29% (Saffari et al. 2017b)	Heating savings in different climates Simulation
			9.28% (Seong and Lim 2013b)	Annual cooling savings Temperate climate Simulation
AAC Walls (Autoclaved aerated concrete)	- High volumetric energy storage - AAC walls are light weight concrete, and fire resistance.	- Production cost per unit is higher than other ordinary concretes - It is not as strong as conventional concrete - The process of autoclaving concrete requires significant energy consumption	7% (Radhi 2011)	Annual Dry desert climate Experimental and simulation
Double Skin Walls	- Provision of sufficient visual connection with the surroundings - Facilitation of entering a large amount of daylight without glare - Offering attractive aesthetic values	- Higher cost for designing, construction, and maintenance compared to traditional single facades - Increase weight of building structure - Risk of overheating during sunny days	28-33% (Pomponi et al. 2016b)	Heating savings Cooling -- Average of reviews

	- Promotion of natural ventilation and thermal comfort without any electricity demand - Acoustic insulation	- Additional maintenance and operational costs - Increased airflow velocity inside the cavity - Potential issues associated to fire propagation	8 – 9% (Andjelković et al. 2016)	Heating Cooling -- Moderate climate -- Simulation
			51 % and 16% (Khoshbakht et al. 2016)	Annual savings of temperate and subtropical climate Simulation
Passive strategies for roofs				
Cool Roofs	- Reduction of the solar heat gain in the building increasing the solar reflectance of the roof surface - improvement of indoor and outdoor thermal conditions in summer and the decrease of the building energy demand	- May also cause significant heating penalties during cold seasons - Not appropriate in cold climates	0.3 – 27 % (Rosado and Levinson 2019b)	Cooling season Warm climate Simulation
			17 – 25% (Costanzo et al. 2016b)	Cooling season Mediterranean climate Simulation
Roof ponds	- Processes indirect evaporative cooing and/or radiant cooling are combined to provide passive cooling - They can also be used for passive heating in winter - Knowledge available on design and operation of the systems - Useful in arid and temperate climates; can be used in humid climates - Performance is not affected by building orientation - They do not increase indoor humidity	- Increase weight of building - Only to be used in flat roofs - Affection of accessibility of roof for other uses - Potential leakage and contamination of water - Only useful for one- or two-story buildings	30% (Spanaki et al. 2014b)	Annual savings Mediterranean climate Simulation
	- Enhancing building aesthetics. - Improving the acoustic properties. - Reduction of heat gains and losses.	- Increase weight of building - Maintenance	7-16% (Coma et al. 2016b)	Cooling season Mediterranean climate Experimental

Green roofs	- Ability to be integrated with existing buildings. - Reducing greenhouse gas emissions, air pollution and urban heat island effects in highly populated areas		15.2% (Yang et al. 2015)	Cooling season Sub-tropical climate Experimental

Cabeza and Chàfer 2020; Bojić et al. 2014; Bevilacqua et al. 2019a; Coma et al. 2017; Djedjig et al. 2015a; Chen et al. 2013a; Haggag et al. 2014a; Khoshbakht et al. 2017; Saffari et al. 2017a; Seong and Lim 2013a; Radhi 2011; Pomponi et al. 2016a; Andjelković et al. 2016; Rosado and Levinson 2019a; Costanzo et al. 2016a; Spanaki et al. 2014a; Coma et al. 2016a; Yang et al. 2015; Cabeza et al. 2010; Kameni Nematchoua et al. 2020; Annibaldi et al. 2020; Varela Luján et al. 2019; Jedidi and Benjeddou 2018; Capozzoli et al. 2013; Asdrubali et al. 2012

Table SM9.2 Technology strategies contributing to efficiency aspects.

Typology – technology	Advantages	Disadvantages	Energy savings	
			Value [%]	Conditions/comments
Thermally activated building systems (TABS)	- Reduce energy and cost operation	- TABS with high thermal mass, as hollow core slabs or active concrete core, have significant slow response time. - The performance evaluations of real building systems using active slabs for ventilation are still rough limited	17- 24% (Prívara et al. 2011)	- Ceiling radiant heating panels - Monitoring
			15% (Sourbron et al. 2013)	- Ceiling radiant heating panels - Simulation
Heat Pumps	- Low maintenance system - Low cost (ASHP) - Three technologies available (Air-source heat pump (ASHP), ground source heat pumps (GSHP), water source heat pumps (WSHP))	- High space requirements. - Complex control optimization algorithm to achieve maximum energy savings. - outdoor air-source evaporators demand defrosting	17 – 25 % (ASHP) (Ling et al. 2020)	- Case study
			10 % cooling (Peng et al. 2020)	---
			-18.43% to 14.78% (Zhang et al. 2020b)	---
			60 % (Mi et al. 2020)	- Last case coupled with PVT
Organic Rankine Cycles	- Significant energy recovery - Reduction of peak demand - Efficient as heat recovery system	- High space requirements. - High capital cost	41% in the cooling season, 63% in the heating season, 9% in the intermediate season (Dong et al. 2020)	- High-rise apartment building
Adiabatic/Evaporative condensers	- Used in hot climates to enhance the heat rejection process by using the cooling effect of evaporation - Pre-coolers that draw ambient air through spray mist or porous humidification pads. Adiabatic evaporation of water in the entering airstream boosts the cooling capacity of direct expansion vapour-compression refrigeration, or reduces work load of the compressor	- Frost formation is the most detrimental and significant problem that happens on the finned-tube evaporator in air conditioning and refrigerating systems	15-58% (Harby et al. 2016)	- Hot dry climate - Simulation

	- Spray Mist Adiabatic Cooling Nominally Air-Cooled Condensers can work as retrofit of existing plant and equipment			
Smart ventilation	- Reduces energy consumption and costs - Improve internal air quality	- Sometimes energy overconsumption appear	Up to 60% (Liu et al. 2019)	---
Heat recovery system	- No cross contamination depending of the type of heat recovery system - High efficiency, especially in temperate climates	- Difficult to integrate depending of the type of heat recovery system - Larger than conventional air-handling units - Expensive both in capital and operation costs	8% (Vakiloroaya et al. 2014a)	- Annual - Humid climate - Experimental
			60.6% (Mahmoud et al. 2020)	- 4.8 COP of the proposed district heating
Fuel cells	- Can use hydrogen as energy fuel - Allows micro-CHP - Can be used in all climates - Reduced CO_2 emissions - No noise during operation	- High capital cost - High space requirements	35% (Romdhane and Louahlia-Gualous 2018)	- Single-family house in France - PEMFC
			15% (Gong et al. 2019)	- PEMFC and SOFC
Thermal energy storage	- Significant reduction of electricity costs - Required smaller ducts - Increase in flexibility - Three technologies available (sensible, latent and thermochemical energy storage)	- COP lower than conventional vapour compression systems - Expensive both in capital and operation costs - More complex systems	12-37% (Alam et al. 2019) (Omara and Abuelnour 2019)	- Latent heat storage system
			19-26% (de Gracia et al. 2013) 30-50% (Navarro et al. 2016a)	- Active façade with PCM - Cooling and heating - Arid climates - Activated concrete slab with PCM - Cooling and heating - Arid climates
			21% to 26% in summer and from 41% to 59% during winter (Fallahi et al. 2010)	- Sensible TES with concrete thermal mass with mechanical or natural ventilation

			40-70% (Fallahi et al. 2010)	- Aquifer TES (ATES) - Large scale TES
Strategies for cooling				
Direct evaporative cooling	- Reduction of pollution emissions - Life cycle cost effectiveness - Reduction of peak demand - Cheap	- Not good when ambient humidity >40% - Humidity Increase	70% (Mujahid Rafique et al. 2015)	- Hot and dry climate
Indirect evaporative cooling	- Higher air quality than direct evaporative cooling - No humidity increase - More efficient than vapour compression systems	- Installation and operation more complex than direct evaporative systems	50% (Mujahid Rafique et al. 2015)	- Hot climate
Liquid pressure amplification	- Significant energy savings	- Energy savings potential limited to low ambient temperatures - More expensive than conventional vapour compression systems	25.3% (Vakiloroaya et al. 2014b)	-Simulation
Ground-coupled	- Less noise and GHG emissions than conventional vapour compression systems	- Requirements of earth surface - Very high upfront costs - Expensive both in capital and operation costs	50 % (Soltani et al. 2019)	- Ground-coupled heat pump system
Chilled-ceiling	- Less refrigeration use due to use of cooled water instead of chilled water	- Unable to moderate indoor humidity - Risk of condensation at cold surface	10% (Imanari et al. 1999)	- 70% of the ceiling surface covered by radiant ceiling panels
Desiccant cooling	- Humidity control is improved when coupled with conventional systems	- Corrosive materials - Large response time - Crystallization of materials maybe a problem - Expensive both in capital and operation costs	77% (Mujahid Rafique et al. 2015)	-Dunkle cycle
Ejector cooling	- More simple installation, maintenance and construction than conventional compression systems	- Need of a heat source >80ºC - Lower COP than conventional compression systems	14.52% (Yu et al. 2020)	-Simulation -R236ea Refrigerant
Variable refrigerant flow	- Efficient in part load conditions	- Requirement of extra control systems - Cannot provide full control of humidity	17% (Lee et al. 2018)	-Simulation -Building temp set-point 24ºC

Adapted from Prívara et al. 2011; Sourbron et al. 2013; Ling et al. 2020; Peng et al. 2020; Zhang et al. 2020b; Dong et al. 2020; Harby et al. 2016; Liu et al. 2019; Vakiloroaya et al. 2014a; Mahmoud et al. 2020; Romdhane and Louahlia-Gualous 2018; Gong et al. 2019; de Gracia et al. 2013; Navarro et al. 2016b; Fallahi et al. 2010; Mujahid Rafique et al. 2015; Soltani et al. 2019; Imanari et al. 1999; Yu et al. 2020; Lee et al. 2018; Sarbu and Sebarchievici 2014; Irshad et al. 2019; Luo et al. 2017; Hohne et al. 2019; Zhang et al. 2019; Omara and Abuelnour 2019; Alam et al. 2019; Zhu et al. 2015; Cansevdi et al. 2010; Yu and Chan 2009; Jassim 2017; Cabeza and Chàfer 2020

Table SM9.3 Technology strategies contributing to renewables.

Typology – technology	Advantages	Disadvantages	Energy savings	
			Value [%]	Conditions/comments
Geothermal energy or ground source heat pumps	- Abundant and clean - Provides year around low cost heating and cooling using district energy technology - Not affected by climate	- Expensive start-up and maintenance due to corrosion - Risk of toxic emissions - Subsidence, landscape change, and polluting waterways - Long construction time - Hard to assess resource - High cost	cooling 30–50% heating 20–40% (Sarbu and Sebarchievici 2014)	Warm-climate region, Atlanta (cooling-dominated climate) -- Simulation
Solar energy PV	- Abundant supply - Less environmental damage compared to other renewable options - Passive and active systems with the option to also provide cooling during warmer seasons using absorption chillers - Medium – high cost depending of the system used	- Storage and backup issues - Not constant supply	22 % (Irshad et al. 2019)	Energy saving potential -- PV integrated with the TE (thermoelectric technologies)
			12 – 25 % (Luo et al. 2017)	Double skin façade using photovoltaic blinds (PV-DSF) -- Changsha, Hunanprovince, China -- Summer conditions
Solar thermal	- Abundant and clean supply - Less environmental damage compared to other renewable options - Significant energy savings	- Storage and backup issues - Not constant supply	30% (Ahmadi et al. 2021)	Simulation HEAT4COOL

			Winter 75.8%, summer 51.5%. (Hohne et al. 2019)	Hybrid solar Electric water heater
Biomass energy	- Abundant with a wide variety of feedstock and conversion technologies - Indigenous fuel production and conversion technology in developing countries - Low cost	- May release GHGs during biofuel production - Landscape change and deterioration of soil productivity	94.98% (Zhang et al. 2019)	Hybrid solar-biomass
			16 – 94 % (Pardo et al. 2020)	

Adapted from Irshad et al. 2019; Luo et al. 2017; Cabeza and Chàfer 2020

SM9.2 Supplementary information to Section 9.5

Table SM9.4 presents the details to develop Figure 9.14.

Table SM9.4 GHG mitigation potentials for categories of NT interventions for Residential (R) and Non-Residential (NR) buildings. N.f., not found.

Region	Non-technological climate mitigation solution	Residential buildings	Commercial buildings	References
AF Africa	Active management and operation	n.f.	10%	(McGibbon et al. 2014)
DEV Developed Countries	Active management and operation	53%	n.f.	(Ivanova and Büchs 2020b; Cantzler et al. 2020; Harris et al. 2021a; Mata et al. 2020d; Dugast and Soyeux 2019; Ellsworth-Krebs 2020b; Volochovic et al. 2012b; Sköld et al. 2018b; Niamir et al. 2020; Faber et al. 2012; climate foundation 2018; Thomas et al. 2017)
	Circular and sharing economy	n.f.	15-75%	
	Flexible comfort	2-20%	n.f.	
	Limited/sufficient comfort levels	1-50%	n.f.	
	Multiple or unspecified behavioural changes	2-27%	8%	
	Passive management and operation	5-6%	n.f.	
	Social and organizational innovations	3%	3%	
Worldwide	Active management and operation	5%	n.f.	(van Sluisveld et al. 2016; Ivanova and Büchs 2020; Cantzler et al. 2020; Harris et al. 2021)
	Circular and sharing economy	40-81%	n.f.	
	Limited/sufficient comfort levels	3-25%	n.f.	
	Multiple or unspecified behavioural changes	1-30%	n.f.	
	Passive management and operation	20%	n.f.	

SM9.3 Supplementary information to Section 9.8

Table SM9.5 summarizes the results of 17 studies from 12 different countries showing the price premium of energy efficient dwellings.

Table SM9.5 Premium price for rent and sale in residential buildings with high energy performance and/or green features

Ref	Study	Country	From energy rating X to Y (Y/X)	Impact of energy performance		Comments
				Sale	*Rent*	
1	Tajani et al., 2018	Italy (Bari)	A / [B,C,D,E,F]	27.9%		Evaluation based on energy performance certificates
			G / [B,C,D,E,F]	-26.4%		
2	Ayala et al., 2016	Spain	[A,B,C] / [D,E,F,G]	9.8%		Evaluation based on energy performance certificates
3	Marmolejo-Duarte and Chen, 2019	Spain (Barcelona)	A / G	7.8%		Evaluation based on energy performance certificates
			D / G	3.3%		
4	Kahn and Kok, 2014	US (California)	[Green label] / [non-labelled homes]	5.0%		Green labels considered comprise LEED, GreenPoint or Energy Star
5	Fuerst et al., 2015	UK (England)	[A,B] / D	5.0%		Evaluation based on energy performance certificates
			C / D	1.8%		
			E / D	-0.7%		
			F / D	-0.9%		
6	Cajias et al., 2019	Germany	A+ / D		0.9%	Evaluation based on energy performance certificates
			A / D		1.4%	
			B / D		0.1%	
			C / D		0.2%	
			F / D		-0.1%	
			G / D		-0.3%	
			H / D		-0.5%	
7	Hyland et al., 2013	Ireland	A / D	9.3%	1.8%	Evaluation based on energy performance certificates
			B / D	5.2%	3.9%	
			[F,G] / D	-10.6%	-3.2%	
8	Högberg, 2013	Sweden	10% improvement in energy performance	4.0%		
9	Davis et al., 2015	UK (Belfast)	B / D	28.0%		Evaluation based on energy performance certificates
			C / D	4.9%		
			G / D	-2.0%		
10	Jensen et al. 2016	Denmark	[A,B] / D	6.2%		Evaluation based on energy performance certificates after the advertising requirement implemented by 1 July 2010
			C / D	5.1%		
			E / D	-5.4%		

			F / D	-12.9%		
			G / D	-24.3%		
11	Fuerst et al. 2016	Finland (Helsinki)	[A,B,C] / D	1.5-3.3%		Evaluation based on energy performance certificates. The lower value in estimated when a set of detailed neighbourhood characteristics are included. Results of models 2 and 3 are presented here.
12	Cadena and Thomson, 2015	US (Texas)	Green designation / No	0.7%		The models B, D, and F presented here incorporating as independent variable at least one green designation or green/energy efficient feature
			Green features / No	1.7%		
			Energy efficient features / No	5.8%		
13	Jayantha and Man, 2013	Hong Kong	Green certification / No certification	3.4-6.4%		BEAM certification and GBC Award are used as the measurement of green residential buildings.
14	Brounen and Kok, 2011	Netherlands	A / D	10.2%		Evaluation based on energy performance certificates
			B / D	5.6%		
			C / D	2.2%		
			F / D	-2.5%		
			G / D	-5.1%		
15	Deng et al., 2012	Singapore	Platinum / No certification	21.0%		Evaluation of dwellings awarded with a Green Mark.
			[Gold plus, Gold] / No certification	15.0%		
			Green mark / No certification	10.0%		
16	Zheng et al., 2012	China (Beijing)	Green features / No	17.7%	-8.5%	Dwellings with green characteristics in relation to conventional ones.
17	Koirala et al. 2014	US	Existence of energy efficiency building energy codes / No		23.3%	The existence of the codes IECC2003 through IECC2006 for American households is evaluated in this study

SM9.4 Supplementary information to Section 9.9

Box SM9.1 presents an example of a policy package, to complement, Section 9.9.

START BOX SM9.1 HERE

Box SM9.1 EU policy package for energy efficiency of buildings

Buildings consume 40% of final energy in the EU and are responsible for 36% of the EU CO_2 emissions (Renovation Wave, 2020). In the EU the majority of buildings are already built, with several buildings between 50 and 20 years old, i.e., built before energy performance requirements were part of building energy codes, therefore having poor energy performances. The current energy renovation rate is 1% per year, with many renovations only marginally improving the energy performances. At the current renovation rate, the target to decarbonise the building stock in the EU by 2050 will be largely missed.

The EU has developed over the years a comprehensive policy package of several policy instruments, aiming at reducing energy consumption, integrating renewable energies and thus mitigating GHG emissions from buildings (Economidou et al. 2020).

In 1992, a first EU law (Save Directive) encouraged EU Member States (MSs) to adopt energy performance standards in building energy codes, this resulted in mix action by MSs, with only a few adopting stringent energy performances requirements. To reinforce the action by MSs and align it, in 2002 the EU adopted the Energy Performance Buildings Directive (EPBD, 2002), requiring MSs to adopt minimum efficiency performance standards for buildings according to a common methodology both for new and existing buildings, when undergoing major renovation (Bertoldi P. 2019). The EPBD is a regulatory measure, with its implementation left to individual MSs. This has resulted in very different levels of stringency among MSs. In addition, the enforcement of control on the application of the energy performance requirements is left to national authorities and finally delegated to local authorities, who may lack the technical knowledge or manpower to check compliance with legal requirements. This has resulted in low compliance with normative requirements in many MSs. The 2002 EPBD has also introduce the obligation to show an energy performance certificate when a building is sold or rented (information policy) (Li et al. 2019a). In 2010, the EPBD was amended by introducing the requirements for MSs to set the national energy requirement for new and existing buildings at the cost-optimal level and providing a common methodology for calculating it (Zangheri et al. 2018; Corgnati et al. 2013). The 2010 EPBD introduced the requirement for all new buildings to be nearly zero energy (nZEBs) by 2021, however definitions of nZEB are again left to EU Member States, which have different requirements for energy consumption limits and contribution of renewables (D'Agostino and Mazzarella 2019; Attia et al. 2017; Grove-Smith et al. 2018; Economidou et al. 2020). In 20018 the latest amendment of the EPBD introduced the requirements for MSs to prepare a Long Term Renovation Strategies (LTRSs) with an overarching decarbonisation target of the national building stock by 2050. In late 2021 the Commission will propose a new amendment to align it with the new -55% GHG target for 2030 and the decarbonisation goal of 2050.

The 2012 Energy Efficiency Directive (EED) requested MSs: to adopt smart meters and smart billing and to charge consumers on their real heating energy consumption; to remove the split-incentive barriers; to foster energy efficient procurement by public authorities; to renovate each year at least 3% of the building stock of central governments. Article 7 of the EED established the obligation for MSs to set up mandatory obligation for energy companies to save at least 1.5% of their energy sales by implementing energy efficiency actions in end-users, including measure on buildings (Fawcett et al, 2019 or alternative policy measures delivering the same amount of energy savings (Rosenow and Bayer 2017). The EED encourages the setting up of financing programmes for the renovation of buildings.

MSs have implemented a number of financial mechanisms such as low interest loans, grants, guarantees funds, revolving funds etc. (Bertoldi 2020). Moreover, the EU Regional and Cohesion Funds are also used by MSs for the renovation of existing buildings. Some of the instruments used at national level to finance the renovation of dwellings occupied by low-income families result from the auctioning of allowances under the EU Emissions Trading Scheme, which is used in some MSs.

The EU has an overall binding economy-wide domestic emission reductions target of at least 55% by 2030 compared to 1990 and, for sectors of the economy not covered by the EU Emission Trading System, the Effort Sharing Regulation (2018) set a target to reduce emissions by 30% by 2030 compared to 2005 (this target will include only buildings direct emissions), with specific mandatory targets for individual MSs.

In addition, there is an overall mandatory EU energy saving target set at reducing primary energy by 32.5% against a BaU scenario, each MSs must contribute to reaching this target (but no mandatory individual targets for MSs). As results, in order to contribute to the EU target, individual MSs have adopt a range of national policies and measures for the building sector in addition to the EU EPBD LTRSs requirements as described in the National Energy and Climate Plans of 2020.

To complement measures for the overall performance of buildings, regulatory measures focuses on the building equipment and technical services such as air conditioners, boilers, lightings, domestic appliances. In the EU minimum energy performance requirements for appliances and equipment are adopted at EU level under the EcoDesign Directive (2005). The energy efficiency requirements are the same for all the MSs and now all the major building technical equipment are covered by dedicated regulation under the Ecodesign. As example the removal from sale of incandescent and halogen lamps has been implemented under the Eco-design Directive.

In the EU over 10000 cities taking part in the Covenant of Mayors initiative (Palermo et al. 2020) have adopted measures to improve the energy efficieny of public and private as part of the city planning or city building permits.

Despite the comprehensiveness of the EU policy package, the monitoring of the progress made in reducing GHG from the EU building stock shows that the EU would miss its buildings' decarbonisation target for 2050. The following issues were identified as major obstacles to Europe's decarbonisation strategy of the building stock. The inconsistencies between the overarching target of a decarbonised building stock by 2050 and the energy requirement in case of major renovation of existing buildings. Both requirements are included in the EPBD. As of today, there is enough evidence about the lock-in effect of the renovation requirements included in the EPBD. The complexity, and sometimes the impossibility, of bundling public finance targeting GHG mitigation of buildings, with private finance. The Smart Finance for Smart Building (SFSB) initiative addresses this issue only partially. The lack of rigorous MV&E for both buildings (including the Energy Performance Gap) and appliances performances, which reduce the level of expected savings. There is no concrete measure to avoid the direct rebound effect and the current energy prices are relatively low. In addition, there are no specific policies and measures at EU level to address energy sufficiency. Regulations and technical standards do not include the life cycle CO_2 emissions in the performance of the buildings. The complexity of the governance structure at different levels (EU, National, Regional and Local), with many options left to individual MSs, for example the definition of Near Zero Energy Buildings. The complexity of managing several instruments, often dealt by different national ministries and departments (industry, environment, construction, urbanisation, etc.) and, finally, the disconnect between high-level EU targets and the lack of ambition of individual policies, which makes the decarbonisation of the EU building stock more challenging. The 2020 Renovation Wave Communication addresses the above issues, in particular on financing renovation of buildings. As indicated the planned revision of the EPBD and EED in 2021 will partly address the above shortcoming, by addressing the new 2030 target and climate neutrality at 2050. Moreover, the EU financing instrument for the post-Covid recovery, the "EU Next Generation", has earmarked funding for the climate transition, including building renovations. EU MSs have to prepare national Resilience and Recovery Plans. In addition, the EU launched the New Bauhaus Initiative, which aims to change and improve EU citizens daily life in buildings by creating a new lifestyle that matches sustainability, low carbon and affordability with good design. Finally the EU Commission has proposed to extend the EU Emission Trading Systems to buildings.

END BOX SM9.1 HERE

SM9.5 Supplementary information to Section 9.9

Table SM9.6 details the feasibility assessment presented in Figure 9.20.

Table SM9.6. Context and line of sight for the feasibility assessment of mitigation options in the buildings sector

	Geophysical Dimension		
Mitigation Options[a]	**Physical potential**	**Geophysical recourses**	**Land Use**
Building design and performance [S]	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Change in construction methods and circular economy [S]	It is expected that in advanced construction methods (e.g. BIM – Building Information Modelling, industrialization and rationalization, design for deconstruction/disassembly, digital fabrication and design for performance) there is a reduction in the consumption of raw materials and natural resources. Design for deconstruction/disassembly allows increasing the reuse potential of building materials and elements. Materials reuse avoid impacts related to the consumption of virgin resources and end-of-life wastes. This decreases pressure for geophysical resources and land use.		
	Agustí-Juan et al. (2017), Agustí-Juan et al. (2017a), Ahmed and Tsavdaridis (2018), Alhumayani et al. (2020), Brambilla et al. (2019), Huang et al. (2021), Diyamandoglu and Fortuna (2015), Eckelman et al. (2018), Habert et al. (2020), Kuzmenko et al. (2020), González Mahecha et al. (2020), Saade et al. (2020), Santos et al. (2020), Soust-Verdaguer et al. (2017) (Cabeza et al. 2014; Geyer et al. 2016; Ingrao et al. 2014; Ortiz et al. 2009; Vadenbo et al. 2017; Junnila et al. 2018; Mata et al. 2020a; L.K et al. 2020b) Cavalliere et al. (2019), Chau et al. (2017), Hong et al. (2015), Ghayeb, Razak, and Sulong (2020), Kakkos et al. (2020), Li and Zheng (2020), Navarro-rubio, Pineda and García-martínez (2019), Röck et al. (2018), Soust-Verdaguer, Llatas, and Moya (2020), Yu et al. (2021)		
Envelope improvement [E]	Not applicable in historical and heritage buildings where modifications to facade are difficult / Transparent insulation materials (TIM) have the advantage of allowing the use of daylight / Green Roofs enhance building aesthetics and reduce heat gains and losses / Thermal mass is not always beneficial in relation to thermal comfort and energy consumption / Phase change materials (PCM) reduce internal temperature fluctuations in buildings, providing better thermal comfort to occupants / Trombe walls are aesthetically appealing, but in regions with mild winters and hot summers, overheating problems may outweigh the winter benefits.	Conventional insulation materials are derived from petrochemical substances but new sustainable insulation materials have been developed / To consider green roofs as an environmentally friendly technology, the selection of efficient and sustainable components is extremely important. Green walls are still controversial / Improvements in thermal inertia can be achieved with the use of materials with high density, such as concrete or rammed earth or phase change materials (PCM) / The process of autoclaving concrete requires significant energy consumption.	Not Applicable
	(Cabeza et al. 2018; Cabeza and Chàfer 2020), (Sun et al. 2018a; Cabeza et al. 2020) (Lidelöw et al. 2019; Cascone et al. 2018; Pérez et al. 2014; Olsthoorn et al. 2017; Bhamare et al. 2019; Belussi et al. 2019; Omrany et al. 2016; Navarro et al. 2016a); (Aditya et al. 2017; Charoenkit and Yiemwattana 2016; Laborel-Préneron et al. 2016; Tatsidjodoung et al. 2013; Kalnæs Simen Edsjøand Jelle 2015; Shafigh et al. 2018; Irshad et al. 2019; Cascone et al. 2018)		
Heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) [E]	High space requirements in buildings.	NA, with the exception of CO_2 storage, through CO_2 based refrigerants.	Not Applicable
	(Zhang et al. 2020a; Prívara et al. 2011; Ling et al. 2020; Dong et al. 2020; Peng et al. 2020; Gong et al. 2019; Mi et al. 2020) (Abas et al. 2014; Dilshad et al. 2020; Bamisile et al. 2019)		
Efficient Appliances [E]	There are technical limitations to energy efficiency, but there is much room for improvement, especially in developing countries.	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
	(Singh et al. 2019; Saheb et al. 2018; González-Mahecha et al. 2019a; González Mahecha et al. 2020)		
Change in construction materials [E]	Some low carbon construction materials are already used in civil construction. The physical availability of materials (e.g. wood, bamboo, bio-concretes, earth, concrete with limestone and supplementary cementitious materials and limestone calcined clay cement) is abundant, although there may be some regional scarcity depending on the scale of adoption.		For bio-based materials, feedstock can be developed in degraded areas. However, land competition with agriculture, food and other industrial uses (e.g. cellulose) can happen.
	Peñaloza et al. (2016), Pomponi et al. (2020), Churkina et al. (2020), Soust-Verdaguer et al. (2020), Zea Escamilla and Habert (2014), Zea Escamilla et al. (2016), Escamilla et al. (2018), Chang et al. (2018), Ruggieri et al. (2017), Pittau et al. (2018), Rosse Caldas et al. (2020), Arrigoni et al. (2018), Ben-Alon et al. (2019), Alhumayani et al. (2020), Van Den Heede and De Belie (2012), Nakic (2018), Cancio Díaz et al. (2017), Pillai et al. (2019) (L.K et al. 2020a; Teixeira et al. 2016; Cancio Díaz et al. 2017; Pillai et al. 2019) Fouquet et al. (2015), Berriel et al. (2016), Celik et al. (2015)		

	Geophysical Dimension		
Mitigation Options[a]	**Physical potential**	**Geophysical recourses**	**Land Use**
Demand Side Management (active management operation, digitalization and flexible comfort requirements) [E]	Not Applicable	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Renewable energy production [R]	Large untapped potential for most technologies / Rural areas have a great potential for renewable energy sources.	Most technologies not limited by materials.	Not Applicable
	(Capellán-Pérez et al. 2017; Calvert and Mabee 2015; Poggi et al. 2018)		

[a] [S] Sufficiency; [E] Efficiency; [R] Renewable Energy

	Environmental-ecological Dimension			
Mitigation Options[a]	**Air pollution**	**Toxic waste, ecotoxicity eutrophication**	**Water quantity and quality**	**Biodiversity**
Building design and performance [S]	As a result of the reduced consumption of natural resources and reduced air pollution levels.			Green roofs and walls, particularly if connected to other green spaces, enhance urban biodiversity.
	(Joimel et al. 2018; Mayrand and Clergeau 2018a; Sunikka-Blank et al. 2012)(Hui and Chan 2011)			
Change in construction methods and circular economy [S]	The use of Building Information Modelling (BIM) together with the Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) methodology allows a faster, holistic and more assertive assessment of the potential environmental impacts of a building project, reducing impacts throughout the project's life cycle. Advanced construction methods are expected to reduce the consumption of raw materials and natural resources and associated environmental impacts during the production of these materials. In addition, it is expected a decrease in waste generation. However, some trade-offs between environmental impacts can occur, depending on products/processes. Reduced environmental impact depends on solutions and materials. Potential rebound for reduced ownership.			
	(Cabeza et al. 2014; Geyer et al. 2016; Ortiz et al. 2009; Mata et al. 2020a; Ingrao et al. 2014; Vadenbo et al. 2017; L.K et al. 2020b; Junnila et al. 2018) Agustí-Juan et al. (2017), Agustí-Juan et al. (2017a), Ahmed and Tsavdaridis (2018), Alhumayani et al. (2020), Brambilla et al. (2019), Huang et al. (2021), Diyamandoglu and Fortuna (2015), Eckelman et al. (2018), Habert et al. (2020), (Kuzmenko et al. 2020), González Mahecha et al. (2020), Saade et al. (2020), Santos et al. (2020), Soust-Verdaguer et al. (2017) (André and Jorge 2013; Volk et al. 2019; Amal et al. 2017; Mohit et al. 2020) (Ajayi et al. 2015; Schiller et al. 2018; Osmani 2012; Lu and Yuan 2013; Cossu and Williams 2015) (Zink and Geyer 2017)			
Envelope improvement [E]	Eliminate major sources (both direct and indirect) of poor air quality (indoor and outdoor).	As a result of the reduced consumption of natural resources and reduced air pollution levels.	Reduced energy demand can lead to reduced water consumption for thermal cooling at energy production facilities.	Reduced air pollution levels achieved by mitigation actions improves biodiversity.
	(MacNaughton et al. 2018; Levy et al. 2016; Balaban and Puppim de Oliveira 2017; Thema et al. 2017); (Mzavanadze 2018; Thema et al. 2017); (Holland et al. 2015; Fricko et al. 2016; McCollum et al. 2018); (Mayrand and Clergeau 2018b; Joimel et al. 2018; Hui and Chan 2011; Thema et al. 2017; Mzavanadze 2018)			

	Environmental-ecological Dimension			
Mitigation Options[a]	**Air pollution**	**Toxic waste, ecotoxicity eutrophication**	**Water quantity and quality**	**Biodiversity**
Heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) [E]	Eliminate major sources (both direct and indirect) of poor air quality (indoor and outdoor).	As a result of the reduced consumption of natural resources and reduced air pollution levels.	Reduced energy demand can lead to reduced water consumption for thermal cooling at energy production facilities.	Reduced air pollution levels achieved by mitigation actions improves biodiversity.
	(Thema et al. 2017; Levy et al. 2016; Balaban and Puppim de Oliveira 2017; MacNaughton et al. 2018) (Fricko et al. 2016; Holland et al. 2015; McCollum et al. 2018) (Thema et al. 2017; Mzavanadze 2018) (Ferreira et al. 2017)			
Efficient Appliances [E]	Eliminate major sources (both direct and indirect) of poor air quality (indoor and outdoor).The promotion of improved cook-stoves and other modern energy-efficient cooking appliances, are of paramount importance to improve indoor air quality in several developing countries.	Positive impacts as a result of the reduced consumption of natural resources and reduced air pollution levels. On the other hand, a switch to more efficient appliances could result in negative impacts from increased resource use, which can be mitigated by avoiding premature replacement and maximizing the recycling of old appliances	Reduced energy demand can lead to reduced water consumption for thermal cooling at energy production facilities.	Reduced air pollution levels due to mitigation actions improves biodiversity.
	(Rosenthal et al. 2018; Steenland et al. 2018; Goldemberg et al. 2018; Thema et al. 2017; Levy et al. 2016; Balaban and Puppim de Oliveira 2017; MacNaughton et al. 2018) (Thema et al. 2017; Mzavanadze 2018) (Fricko et al. 2016; Holland et al. 2015; McCollum et al. 2018) (Thema et al. 2017; Mzavanadze 2018) (Smith et al. 2016)			
Change in construction materials [E]	Engineered wood/bamboo products normally use petroleum-based adhesives, which can release toxic gases (e.g. formaldehyde and Volatile Organic Compounds - VOCs). Life cycle assessment studies show that the production of raw earth materials is less polluting than conventionally used materials such as concrete, ceramics and steel, and production of concrete with supplementary cementitious materials (SCM) replacing cement or clinker is less polluting.	Some biomass treatment processes uses toxic materials and substances. The use of fertilizers in forestry activities can increase eutrophication. Life cycle assessment studies show that the production of raw earth materials is less polluting than conventionally used materials such as concrete, ceramics and steel, and production of concrete with supplementary cementitious materials (SCM) replacing cement or clinker is less polluting.	An increase in water demand can be observed during the forest activities.	Normally monoculture production is encouraged and can put pressure on native forest areas.
	Peñaloza et al. (2016), Pomponi et al. (2020), Churkina et al. (2020), Soust-Verdaguer et al. (2020), Zea Escamilla and Habert (2014), Zea Escamilla et al. (2016), Escamilla et al. (2018), Chang et al. (2018), Ruggieri et al. (2017), Pittau et al. (2018), Rosse Caldas et al. (2020), Arrigoni et al. (2018), Ben-Alon et al. (2019), Alhumayani et al. (2020), Van Den Heede and De Belie (2012), Nakic (2018), Cancio Díaz et al. (2017), Pillai et al. (2019), Widder (2017), Teixeira et al. (2016) (Heeren et al. 2015; Pauliuk et al. 2021a) (Harb et al. 2018; Xiong et al. 2019; Sotayo et al. 2020), Celik et al. (2015)			
Demand Side Management (active management operation, digitalization and flexible comfort requirements) [E]	Support interventions can eliminate major sources (both direct and indirect) of poor air quality (indoor and outdoor). However, it should be taken into account that smart controls and connected devices result in increased electricity consumption.	As a result of reduced consumption of natural resources and air pollution levels.	Reduced energy demand can lead to reduced water consumption for thermal cooling at energy production facilities. Smart meters give the opportunity to monitor and reduce water consumption in households.	Reduced air pollution levels achieved by mitigation actions improves biodiversity.
	(Thema et al. 2017; Levy et al. 2016; Balaban and Puppim de Oliveira 2017; MacNaughton et al. 2018) (Sovacool et al. 2020; B. Yang et al. 2019; International Energy Agency 2017) (Thema et al. 2017; Mzavanadze 2018); (Inetrnational Energy Agency 2017) (Holland et al. 2015; McCollum et al. 2018); (Fricko et al. 2016) (Creutzig et al. 2016; Jabir et al. 2018) (Beucker et al. 2016; Miara et al. 2014)			
Renewable energy production [R]	Eliminate major sources (both direct and indirect) of poor air quality (indoor and outdoor).	Not Applicable	An upscaling of renewable energy systems can reduce water demand for thermal cooling at energy production facilities. Improved access to electricity is necessary to treat water at homes. In some situations switching to bioenergy could increase water use compared to existing conditions.	Reduced air pollution levels achieved by mitigation actions improves biodiversity. Bioenergy production may have both positive and negative impacts on biodiversity.
	(Thema et al. 2017; Balaban and Puppim de Oliveira 2017; Rosenthal et al. 2018; Steenland et al. 2018; Goldemberg et al. 2018) (Rao and Pachauri 2017; Hejazi et al. 2015; Song et al. 2016; Fricko et al. 2016; Holland et al. 2015; McCollum et al. 2018) (Wu et al. 2018; Immerzeel et al. 2014; Correa et al. 2017; Mzavanadze 2018c) (Ürge-Vorsatz et al. 2016)			

[a] [S] Sufficiency; [E] Efficiency; [R] Renewable Energy

Technological Dimension

Mitigation Options[a]	Simplicity	Technological scalability	Maturity and technology readiness
Building design and performance [S]	Wide range of measures with different levels of simplicity. A straightforward approach to reducing emissions from materials and energy demand in new buildings is by building smaller, especially in developed regions.	Limited by buildings' stock lock in, in which case retrofitting may be necessary.	Wide range of measures with different levels of maturity.
	(Grubler et al. 2018; Berrill and Hertwich 2021; Pauliuk et al. 2021b; Roca-Puigròs et al. 2020) Danny and Soo (2021), Kunwar, Cetin, and Passe (2021), Li et al. (2019), Rice (2020), Si et al. (2019), Singaravel, Suykens, and Geyer (2018), Gholami, Røstvik and Steemers (2021), Getuli and Bruttini (2021), Feng et al. (2021), Du (2021), Deng et al. (2020), Ge et al. (2020), Bomberg, Furtak, and Yarbrough (2017) (Hosseini et al. 2021)(Aimar and Foti 2021; Čurpek and Čekon 2022; Dalla Valle 2021; Vilar et al. 2020)		
Change in construction methods and circular economy [S]	Many advanced construction methods are common and widespread, mainly in developed countries. There is a need for a change of thinking during the project design, especially for complex building design and shapes. Prescriptive standards need to be modified so that products and processes achieve the final performance required for a given situation/need. Circular solutions (reduced waste, materials reuse and recycling) have varying technological complexity.	Construction methods can be applied for a building component, façade or to a whole building. However, it tends to be more difficult to apply to larger scale projects. Circular solutions are not yet implemented at scale. Requires improved design for flexibility and deconstruction, improved procurement and prefabrication and off-site construction, improved standardization and dimensional coordination, with differences among solutions.	Some technologies are well known, but their market applicability varies from country to county. There are few projects using highly advanced construction methods (e.g. Building Information Modelling, design for deconstruction/disassembly, digital fabrication and design for performance). Technological improvements in circular economy are expected (waste reduction and management, recycling and materials and products upgrade), together with improved compatibility with existing design, tools and technologies.
	Agustí-Juan et al. (2017), Agustí-Juan et al. (2017a), Ahmed and Tsavdaridis (2018), Alhumayani et al. (2020), Brambilla et al. (2019), Huang et al. (2021), Diyamandoglu and Fortuna (2015), Eckelman et al. (2018), Habert et al. (2020), (Kuzmenko et al. 2020), González Mahecha et al. (2020), Saade et al. (2020), Santos et al. (2020), Soust-Verdaguer et al. (2017) (André and Jorge 2013; Amal et al. 2017; Volk et al. 2019; Mohit et al. 2020) (Ajayi et al. 2015; Osmani 2012; Schiller et al. 2018; Lu and Yuan 2013; Cossu and Williams 2015) (Osmani 2012; Amal et al. 2017; Mohit et al. 2020; André and Jorge 2013)(Ajayi et al. 2015; Niamir et al. 2017)(Volk et al. 2019) Cavalliere et al. (2019), Chau et al. (2017), Hong et al. (2015), Ghayeb, Razak, and Sulong (2020), Kakkos et al. (2020), Li and Zheng (2020), Navarro-rubio, Pineda and García-martínez (2019), Röck et al. (2018), Schmidt, Alexander, and John (2018), Soust-Verdaguer, Llatas, and Moya (2020), Yu et al. (2021) (Schiller et al. 2018)		
Envelope improvement [E]	There are different envelope measures with different levels of simplicity. Building integrated concepts (such as insulation or phase change materials) are very simple. Reducing infiltration is achieved by replacing windows and doors, and sealing cracks, the simplicity of this varies by building. Other concepts such as greenery systems can be more complicated.	From a facade to a building to a multifamily house.	Insulation is very well known technology, however sustainable materials need future research / A step forward is the use of transparent insulation materials (TIM) for building energy savings and daylight comfort / Vertical greenery systems are still controversial depending on the climate and materials / Phase change materials can be organic or inorganic, each type with their advantages and disadvantages.
	(Wang et al. 2018; Sun et al. 2018b; Riley 2017; Raji et al. 2015; Drissi et al. 2019; Aditya et al. 2017; Pérez et al. 2014; Omrany et al. 2016; Tatsidjodoung et al. 2013; Belussi et al. 2019; Laborel-Préneron et al. 2016; Irshad et al. 2019; Shafigh et al. 2018); (Mavrigiannaki and Ampatzi 2016; Soares et al. 2013; Noro et al. 2014; Khadiran et al. 2016; Silva et al. 2016; Reddy et al. 2018; Wang et al. 2018; Sun et al. 2018b; Riley 2017)		
Heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) [E]	Different levels of simplicity depending on the technology. Evaporative cooling systems have higher simplicity than heat pumps and ground-coupled systems.	It is widely implemented at all scales. For example vehicles, houses, buildings, warehouses, etc.	It is a widely implemented technology. Efforts continue to be allocated to research and development to improve energy efficiency.
	(Harby et al. 2016; Mujahid Rafique et al. 2015; Soltani et al. 2019; Peng et al. 2020; Zhang et al. 2020a; Ling et al. 2020) (Chen et al. 2021; Cvok et al. 2020; Teja S and Yemula 2020; Sha and Qi 2020; Talkar et al. 2020) (Choe 1973; Lo Basso et al. 2021; Pahinkar et al. 2020; Husin et al. 2020; Hadjadj et al. 2020; Chen et al. 2021)		
Efficient Appliances [E]	Simple efficiency improvements are available in many regions. However, increasing appliance efficiency can be complex in countries with already high efficient standards.	Can be easily scaled up.	Many efficient appliances are technologically mature. Moreover, efforts continue to be allocated to research and development to improve energy efficiency.
	(Himeur et al. 2020; Singh et al. 2019) (Wang et al. 2021; Mariano-Hernández et al. 2021; Kaur and Bala 2019; Rajagopal et al. 2019) (Ma et al. 2016; Singh et al. 2019) (Zhang et al. 2016; Mariano-Hernández et al. 2021) (Himeur et al. 2020; Singh et al. 2019; Cabeza et al. 2018) (Hopkins et al. 2020; Joshi et al. 2020)		

	Technological Dimension		
Mitigation Options[a]	**Simplicity**	**Technological scalability**	**Maturity and technology readiness**
Change in construction materials [E]	Bio-concretes use available materials and similar infrastructure of conventional concrete production. However, more research is needed. Biomaterials are widely used and have a variety of applications in residential, commercial and industrial buildings. However, attention is needed for fire protection and biological durability. Other materials such as earth, concrete with limestone and supplementary cementitious materials and limestone calcined clay cement use available materials with adequate performance and similar infrastructure of Portland cement production.	Biomaterials can be applied to furniture, façade and to the whole building in general. Bio-concrete can be used to produce construction elements that do not require high mechanical performance. Emissions from cement can be reduced by using alternative binders, electrifying kilns, using substitute cementitious materials, and reducing over specification of building elements.	Some bio-based materials (e.g. wood and bamboo) are well known and widespread used. However, their applicability in varies from country to county. Some bio-concretes (e.g. hempcrete) are already available in the market. However, they are still not widespread in the construction industry. Other bio-concretes are still at the research phase. The use of limestone in large quantities still needs to be further researched. Earth materials and some supplementary cementitious materials are already used commercially, such as soil-cement bricks and fly ash, respectively. However, others are still at the research stage.
	Peñaloza et al. (2016), Pomponi et al. (2020), Churkina et al. (2020), Soust-Verdaguer et al. (2020), Zea Escamilla and Habert (2014), Zea Escamilla et al. (2016), Escamilla et al. (2018), Chang et al. (2018), Ruggieri et al. (2017), Pittau et al. (2018), Rosse Caldas et al. (2020), Arrigoni et al. (2018), Ben-Alon et al. (2019), Alhumayani et al. (2020), Van Den Heede and De Belie (2012), Nakic (2018), Cancio Díaz et al. (2017), Pillai et al. (2019), Widder (2017), Teixeira et al. (2016) (Pamenter and Myers 2021) Berriel et al. (2016), Gursel, Maryman, and Ostertag (2016)		
Demand Side Management (active management operation, digitalization and flexible comfort requirements) [E]	Ranges from very simple monitoring sensors, or simple concepts to smart cities.	High potential for scalability. Simple measures can be easily upscaled via information campaigns and a high willingness to adopt in some regions. Nevertheless, cultural values and local physical conditions can affect the scalability of measures that affect comfort and well-being directly. Information and communication technologies, peer effects and rewards could help foster scalability; keeping in mind potential barriers such as perception of control, concerns over information sharing and privacy and expectations in terms of effort and benefits.	The simple measures require no technology development, while more complex measures are already widely available, still with potential for improvement.
	(Osunmuyiwa et al. 2020; Dane G Kim DJ 2020; Sadeghi et al. 2016; TL 2020; Christidou et al. 2014); (Serrano 2021; Al-Shareefi et al. 2021; Khan 2019; Wan and Bai 2021; Pigliautile et al. 2021); (Miezis et al. 2016b) (Del Río Castro et al. 2021; Sabarish et al. 2021; Strenger and Frerich 2021; Ardito et al. 2021) (Gavrila Gavrila and de Lucas Ancillo 2021; Dornberger and Schwaferts 2021; Del Río Castro et al. 2021) (Spandagos et al. 2020) (Jensen et al. 2015)		
Renewable energy production [R]	Most technologies are simple. However, supply of technical support at the local scale can be a barrier / Hybridization between several technologies can achieve better results both for energy production and power generation.	Most technologies can be scaled up to most regions.	Most technologies are mature. Moreover, efforts continue to be allocated to research and develpment to improve.
	(Usman et al. 2020; Cabeza and Chàfer 2020) (Gonçalves et al. 2021; Montoya and Perea-moreno 2020; Singh et al. 2020; Shahid 2018; Reindl and Palm 2020) (Guo et al. 2020; Ürge-Vorsatz et al. 2020)		

[a] [S] Sufficiency; [E] Efficiency; [R] Renewable Energy

	Economic Dimension	
Mitigation Options[a]	**Costs in 2030 and long term**	**Employment effects and economic growth**
Building design and performance [S]	There is evidence of new buildings with very high performance relying on advanced design, such as net-zero energy buildings (NZEB), with lower investment costs than standard practices. These buildings are not yet universally cost-effective and often 0-10% more expensive than buildings built according to minimum energy performance standards. The incremental costs of these buildings are however expected to decline further.	Limited Evidence.
	(Zinzi and Mattoni 2019; Onyenokporo and Ochedi 2019; Nocera et al. 2019; Morck et al. 2019; Köhler et al. 2018; Erhorn-Kluttig et al. 2019; Energetics 2016; D'Agostino and Parker 2018; Canes 2018; Ürge-Vorsatz et al. 2020)	

	Economic Dimension	
Mitigation Options[a]	**Costs in 2030 and long term**	**Employment effects and economic growth**
Change in construction methods and circular economy [S]	Potential cost-competitiveness (lower life cycle costs, green/quality premium) for circular economy, but still uncertain to large-scale investors due to perceived higher investment costs.	Construction is a labour intensive activity, which means there are potential positive effect along the value chain (job creation, business value, networking), including synergies with digitalization.
	(Ferreira et al. 2015; Ghisellini et al. 2018; Hart et al. 2019b; Schenkel et al. 2015; Vatalis et al. 2013; Witjes and Lozano 2016) (Patwa et al. 2021; L.K et al. 2020b) (Zinzi and Mattoni 2019; Onyenokporo and Ochedi 2019; Köhler et al. 2018; Erhorn-Kluttig et al. 2019; Energetics 2016; D'Agostino and Parker 2018; Ürge-Vorsatz et al. 2020; Nocera et al. 2019; Morck et al. 2019; Canes 2018) (L.K et al. 2020a) (Azcárate-Aguerre et al. 2018; Mokhlesian and Holmén 2012) (Debacker and Manshoven 2016; Witjes and Lozano 2016)	
Envelope improvement [E]	There are many individual examples of cost-effective deep retrofits involving envelope improvement. However, few studies calculate the costs of deep retrofits at a large scale. Literature tends to agree that cost-effective deep retrofits are not universally applicable for all cases and at a large scale, being one of the most expensive measures. Due to high upfront costs, the key factor determining feasibility is coupling the retrofit with business-as-usual improvement and applying an industrialized one-stop-shop approach. Given the long payback time, energy price dynamics and a discount rate play an especially large role.	Positive and negative direct and indirect effects associated with lower energy demand and possible reductions in energy prices, energy efficiency investments, lower energy expenditures and fostering innovation. Improvements in labour productivity.
	(Ürge-Vorsatz et al. 2016; Mirasgedis et al. 2014; Alawneh et al. 2019; Bleyl et al. 2019; European Commission 2016; Niemelä et al. 2017; Mofidi and Akbari 2017; Saheb et al. 2018; Thema et al. 2017; McCollum et al. 2018) (Zuhaib and Goggins 2019; Zhang et al. 2021; Subramanyam et al. 2017b,a; Streicher et al. 2020; Stancioff et al. 2021; Semprini et al. 2017; Reiter et al. 2019; Paduos and Corrado 2017; Österbring et al. 2019; Novikova et al. 2018; Streicher et al. 2017; Mata et al. 2019, 2015; Markewitz et al. 2015; Ismailos and Touchie 2017; Holopainen et al. 2016; Grande-acosta and Islas-samperio 2020; D'Oca et al. 2018; Cabrera Serrenho et al. 2019; BAL KOÇYİĞİT et al. 2019; Akander et al. 2017; Nocera et al. 2019)	
Heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) [E]	Cost-effectiveness depends on the HVAC technology and its maturity. It could range from very cost-effective to not cost-effective. Incremental costs of advanced HVAC such as heat pumps and those based on integrated renewables are expected to decline due to learning and market development. HVAC-related measures come with high upfront capital costs, which act as a barrier for stakeholders even if the investment is cost-effective in the long term. Given the long payback time, energy price dynamics and a discount rate play an especially large role.	Positive and negative direct and indirect effects associated with lower energy demand and possible reductions in energy prices, energy efficiency investments, lower energy expenditures and fostering innovation. Improvements in labour productivity.
	(Alawneh et al. 2019; European Commission 2016; Niemelä et al. 2017; Saheb et al. 2018; Thema et al. 2017; McCollum et al. 2018; Ürge-Vorsatz et al. 2016; Mirasgedis et al. 2014; Bleyl et al. 2019; Mofidi and Akbari 2017) (William et al. 2020; Vijay and Hawkes 2017; Seeley and Dhakal 2021; Rafique and Williams 2021; González-Mahecha et al. 2019b; Deetjen et al. 2021; Cruz et al. 2020; Calise et al. 2021; Alajmi et al. 2020; Afshari et al. 2014; Subramanyam et al. 2017b,a; Köhler et al. 2018; Energetics 2016; Akander et al. 2017; Ismailos and Touchie 2017; Grande-acosta and Islas-samperio 2020)	
Efficient Appliances [E]	Efficient appliances are typically among the most cost-effective technologies. This is a key mitigation option. The risk is however that more efficient appliances may have large size and other advanced features that to some extent offsets the positive economic effects.	Positive and negative direct and indirect effects associated with lower energy demand and possible reductions in energy prices, energy efficiency investments, lower energy expenditures and fostering innovation. Improvements in labour productivity. Expanding clean cooking in developing countries would increase the productive time for women and children that can be used for income generation or rest.
	(Alawneh et al. 2019; European Commission 2016; Niemelä et al. 2017; Saheb et al. 2018; Thema et al. 2017; McCollum et al. 2018; Ürge-Vorsatz et al. 2016; Mirasgedis et al. 2014; Bleyl et al. 2019; Mofidi and Akbari 2017) (Pedzi Makumbe, Manuela Mot, Marwa Moustafa Khalil 2017; Ren et al. 2021; Department of Environmental Affairs 2014; Prada-hernández et al. 2015; Subramanyam et al. 2017a,b; D'Agostino and Parker 2018; Energetics 2016; Churkina et al. 2020; Grande-acosta and Islas-samperio 2020; González-Mahecha et al. 2019b; Alajmi et al. 2020) (Mills 2016; Galán-Marín et al. 2015; Mehetre et al. 2017; Bonan et al. 2017)	
Change in construction materials [E]	There are only a few fragmented studies on the cost implications of the change in construction materials.	Potential positive effect along the value chain (job creation and value added).
	(Winchester and Reilly 2020); (Churkina et al. 2020; Pomponi et al. 2020; (Nambiar 2019; Zea Escamilla et al. 2016) (Cabrera Serrenho et al. 2019; Zhang et al. 2021)	

	Economic Dimension	
Mitigation Options[a]	Costs in 2030 and long term	Employment effects and economic growth
Demand Side Management (active management operation, digitalization and flexible comfort requirements) [E]	Demand side management measures have proved to be among the most cost-effective measures. Many of them (e.g. various sensors, controls, energy consumption feedback measures) are already mature and are typically very cost-effective. Many more are appearing such as advanced smart management systems or thermal and electric storages linked to fluctuating renewables. These are not yet always cost-effective, but literature tends to expect these solutions to become cost-effective due to learning and scale.	Implementing digitalization to enhance energy efficiency of buildings creates new jobs, which are mainly upfront by nature. At the same time, the increased use of data, sensors, smart devices, and HighD printing could provide new businesses job opportunities in advanced manufacturing. Furthermore, the implementation of digitalization interventions to consumers and enterprises could create long-term jobs due to innovations and new technologies and increase the competitiveness and productivity of local enterprises. Flexible comfort requirements enhance economic dispatching of electric systems, resulting in lower energy prices and contributing to economic development. All interventions, create positive and negative direct and indirect effects associated with lower energy demand, possible reductions in energy prices and lower energy expenditures.
	(Saheb et al. 2018; Thema et al. 2017; McCollum et al. 2018); (Sovacool et al. 2020; Inetrnational Energy Agency 2017) (Huang et al. 2019; Sharda et al. 2021; Rashid et al. 2021; Nguyen et al. 2015; Duman et al. 2021; Costa and Soares 2020; Uchman 2021; Köhler et al. 2018; Seeley and Dhakal 2021; Alajmi et al. 2020; Afshari et al. 2014) (Deepak and Hussain 2015; Janhunen, Leskinen, and Junnila 2020; Stancioff et al. 2021; Schäuble, Marian, and Cremonese 2020; Energetics 2016) (Subramanyam et al. 2017a; Prada-hernández et al. 2015) (Balaban and Puppim de Oliveira 2017a; Aryandoust and Lilliestam 2017; Mata, Korpal, et al. 2020; Stötzer et al. 2015) (Jabir et al. 2018)	
Renewable energy production [R]	The cost-effectiveness of buildings-integrated renewable energy technologies varies. Such measures as roof-top PVs have become cost-effective in several regions worldwide. Still in many locations, they remain expensive technologies. Learning curves are expected to bring them further down by 2030 and beyond.	Positive and negative direct and indirect effects associated with lower demand for fuels and possible reductions in energy prices, renewable energy systems (RES) investments, improved energy access and fostering innovation. Improvements in labour productivity. In addition, electrification of remote rural areas and other regions that do not have access to electricity, through RES and microgrids, enables people living in poor developing countries to read, socialize, and be more productive during the evening, and it is also associated with greater school attendance by children.
	(Alawneh et al. 2019; European Commission 2016; Niemelä et al. 2017; Saheb et al. 2018; Thema et al. 2017; McCollum et al. 2018; Bleyl et al. 2019; Mofidi and Akbari 2017) (Fina et al. 2020; Lindholm et al. 2021; Parupudi et al. 2020; Vimpari and Junnila 2019a; Akander et al. 2017; Köhler et al. 2018; Sharda et al. 2021; Calise et al. 2021; Pedzi Makumbe, Manuela Mot, Marwa Moustafa Khalil 2017; Grande-acosta and Islas-samperio 2020; Alajmi et al. 2020) (Ürge-Vorsatz et al. 2016; Barnes and Samad 2018; Rao et al. 2016; Torero 2015)	

[a] [S] Sufficiency; [E] Efficiency; [R] Renewable Energy

	Socio-cultural Dimension		
Mitigation Options[a]	Public acceptance	Effects on health & wellbeing	Distributional effects
Building design and performance [S]	May require retrofits of existing buildings. May require change in users preferences. Enhanced asset values of energy efficient buildings. Split incentives between tenants and landlords.	As a result of the reduced consumption of natural resources and reduced air pollution levels. May improve buildings' users' quality of life.	Limited Evidence
	(Lorek and Spangenberg 2019; Thomas et al. 2019; Fournier et al. 2019; Cohen 2021; Ellsworth-Krebs 2020b)		
Change in construction methods and circular economy [S]	Although many stakeholders see advantages in new construction methods, especially in terms of sustainable construction, there are social barriers, such as information interaction between software, insufficient technical training for employees, cultural resistance, etc.	Biomass based materials, such as wood and bamboo, has aesthetic advantages and brings the concept of biophilia. However, the preservatives and glues used in the production can bring health problems related to the presence of volatile organic compounds.	Biomass based materials, such as wood and bamboo, can be developed in degraded areas and by socially vulnerable communities.
	(Olawumi et al. 2018; Oesterreich and Teuteberg 2019; Huang et al. 2021); (Mata et al. 2020a; Patwa et al. 2021) (Harb et al. 2018; Xiong et al. 2019; Sotayo et al. 2020; Zea Escamilla and Habert 2014; Escamilla et al. 2018; Chang et al. 2018b); (Ferreira et al. 2015; Hart et al. 2019; Schenkel et al. 2015; Vatalis et al. 2013; Witjes and Lozano 2016; L.K et al. 2020b; Ghisellini et al. 2018) (Winchester and Reilly 2020; Pomponi et al. 2020) (L.K et al. 2020a) (Moreno et al. 2016; Park et al. 2010; Celik and Attaran 2011; Bueren and Broekhans 2014; Zaeri et al. 2016)		

	Socio-cultural Dimension		
Mitigation Options[a]	**Public acceptance**	**Effects on health & wellbeing**	**Distributional effects**
Envelope improvement [E]	Perceived as increased comfort and status, with limited concerns for heritage or aesthetic values in regions with higher living standards. Split incentives between tenants and landlords.	Health benefits through better indoor air quality, energy/fuel poverty alleviation, better ambient air quality and alleviation of the heat island effect. Envelope improvement with inadequate ventilation may lead to sick building syndrome symptoms.	Result in lower energy bills, avoiding the "heat or eat" dilemma, alleviating energy/fuel poverty and improving energy security. Furthermore, these interventions have positive impacts to the energy systems, by improving the primary energy intensity of the economy and reducing dependence on fossil fuels, which for many countries are imported.
	(Abreu et al. 2019; K 2018; Bright et al. 2019; Curtis et al. 2017; Friege 2016; Kim et al. 2019; Lilley et al. 2017; Mortensen et al. 2016; Tam et al. 2016a; Tsoka et al. 2018; Zuhaib et al. 2017; Allcott and Greenstone 2012; Azizi S Nair T 2019; García-López and Heard 2015; Howarth and Roberts 2018; Ketchman et al. 2018; Ozarisoy and Altan 2017; Reindl and Palm 2020; Miezis et al. 2016) (Payne et al. 2015; Tonn et al. 2018; Liddell and Guiney 2015; Thomson et al. 2017; Boermans et al. 2015; Mastrucci et al. 2019; Alawneh et al. 2019; Saheb et al. 2018; Thema et al. 2017; Ürge-Vorsatz et al. 2016) (García-López and Heard 2015; Balaban and Puppim de Oliveira 2017; Curl et al. 2015; Karlsson et al. 2020; Lacroix and Chaton 2015; Levy et al. 2016; P. et al. 2018; Ortiz et al. 2019; Poortinga et al. 2018; Smith et al. 2016; Thomson and Thomas 2015; Willand et al. 2015a; Cedeño-Laurent et al. 2018; Wierzbicka et al. 2018; Ferreira et al. 2017; Markovska et al. 2016)(Si and Marjanovic-Halburd 2018; Tam et al. 2016b; Swan et al. 2017)		
Heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) [E]	Perceived as increased comfort and status, with limited concerns for lack of space for installation in regions with higher living standards. Split incentives between tenants and landlords.	Health benefits through better indoor air quality, energy/fuel poverty alleviation, better ambient air quality and mitigation of the heat island effect. Many studies have highlighted the crucial role of ventilation in creating healthy indoor environmental conditions, which result in (mainly respiratory) health benefits.	Result in lower energy bills, avoiding the "heat or eat" dilemma, alleviating energy/fuel poverty and improving energy security. Electrification of thermal energy uses is expected to increase the demand for electricity in buildings, which in most cases can be reversed (at national or regional level) by promoting nearly zero energy new buildings and a deep renovation of the existing building stock
	(Bevan et al. 2020; Cunha et al. 2020; Tumbaz and Moğulkoç 2018a; Clancy et al. 2017; Curtis et al. 2018; Heiskanen and Matschoss 2017; Qiu et al. 2014; Mata et al. 2021; Bright et al. 2019; Christidou et al. 2014; Si and Marjanovic-Halburd 2018; Azizi S Nair T 2019; TL 2020; Mortensen et al. 2016; Ketchman et al. 2018) (Willand et al. 2015b; Thema et al. 2017; Balaban and Puppim de Oliveira 2017; Tonn et al. 2018; Ürge-Vorsatz et al. 2016; Mzavanadze 2018; Liddell and Guiney 2015; Mastrucci et al. 2019).(Månberger 2018; Alawneh et al. 2019; Thema et al. 2017; Tonn et al. 2018; Liddell and Guiney 2015; Ürge-Vorsatz et al. 2016; Mastrucci et al. 2019)(Spandagos et al. 2020; Trencher and van der Heijden 2019; Tumbaz and Moğulkoç 2018b; Silva et al. 2017; Cedeño-Laurent et al. 2018; Fisk 2018; Hamilton et al. 2015; Militello-Hourigan and Miller 2018; Underhill et al. 2018; Liddell and Guiney 2015; Mastrucci et al. 2019; Thema et al. 2017; Morris et al. 2018; Ürge-Vorsatz et al. 2016; Boermans et al. 2015; Markovska et al. 2016) (Couder and Verbruggen 2017)		
Efficient Appliances [E]	Perceived as increased comfort and status, with limited concerns for technical issues and durability in regions with lower living standards. Split incentives between tenants and landlords.	The promotion of efficient appliances and particularly clean cook stoves results in significant health benefits through better indoor air quality, energy/fuel poverty alleviation, better ambient air quality and mitigation of the heat island effect.	Result in lower energy bills, avoiding the "heat or eat" dilemma, alleviating energy/fuel poverty and improving energy security. Improved cook stoves provide better food security and reduce the danger of fuel shortages in developing countries (under real world conditions these impacts may be limited).
	(Bonan et al. 2017; Figueroa 2016; Johansson et al. 2015; Rey-Moreno and Medina-Molina 2020; Hernandez-Roman et al. 2017; Wang et al. 2019; Zografakis et al. 2012; Reindl and Palm 2020; Christidou et al. 2014; Mata et al. 2021; Ketchman et al. 2018) (Thema et al. 2017; Balaban and Puppim de Oliveira 2017; Tonn et al. 2018; Ürge-Vorsatz et al. 2016; Mzavanadze 2018; Willand et al. 2015b; Rosenthal et al. 2018).(Berrueta et al. 2017b; Hanna et al. 2016; McCollum et al. 2018; Alawneh et al. 2019b; Thema et al. 2017) (Aunan et al. 2013; García-Frapolli et al. 2010; Malla et al. 2011)(Jeuland et al. 2018) (Heffner and Campbell 2011)		
Change in construction materials [E]	Bio-based materials, such as wood, can be well accepted for being a natural and aesthetically pleasing material. However, in some cases (mainly in developing countries) it is associated with low quality buildings. There is limited information about other materials.	Biomass based materials, such as wood and bamboo, has aesthetic advantages and brings the concept of biophilia. However, the preservatives and glues used in the production can bring health problems related to the presence of volatile organic compounds.	Bio-based materials, such as wood and bamboo, can be developed in degraded areas and by socially vulnerable communities.
	(Wang et al. 2014; Zea Escamilla and Habert 2014; Escamilla et al. 2018; Chang et al. 2018b; Obiri et al. 2020; INBAR 2019) (Harb et al. 2018; Xiong et al. 2019; Sotayo et al. 2020; Zea Escamilla and Habert 2014; Escamilla et al. 2018; Chang et al. 2018b; Nfornkah et al. 2020) (Winchester and Reilly 2020; Pomponi et al. 2020; Zea Escamilla and Habert 2014; Escamilla et al. 2018; Chang et al. 2018; Obiri et al. 2020)		

1

	Socio-cultural Dimension		
Mitigation Options[a]	**Public acceptance**	**Effects on health & wellbeing**	**Distributional effects**
Demand Side Management (active management operation, digitalization and flexible comfort requirements) [E]	Willingness to accept due to the potential to reduce energy and water bills. Nevertheless, cultural values and local physical conditions can affect the scalability of measures that affect comfort and well-being directly. Perceived as environmental and technological friendly, with concerns for costs and lack of control in regions with higher living standards. Limited literature in regions with lower living standards.	Health benefits through better indoor air quality, energy/fuel poverty alleviation, better ambient air quality and mitigation of the heat island effect. Furthermore, smart controllers and wireless communications capabilities that are used for controlling lighting, windows, HVAC equipment, water heaters and other building equipment provide many other non-energy benefits such as improved security, access control, fire and other emergency detection and management, and early identification of maintenance issues.	Smart meters support the introduction of new and dynamic tariff schemes that allow price benefits for the end-users. Active management and digitalization practices can effectively enhance energy access and security by reducing peak demand, improving the primary energy intensity of the economy, mitigating the dependence on fossil fuels, postponing the installation of new facilities, reducing electricity prices volatility, etc.
	(Christidou et al. 2014; Sadeghi et al. 2016; Rey-Moreno and Medina-Molina 2020; TL 2020; Mata et al. 2021); (Balta-Ozkan et al. 2014; Batalla-Bejerano J Trujillo-Baute M 2020; Jaramillo et al. 2014; Kendel and Lazaric 2015; Moser 2017; Nikou 2019; Pal et al. 2019; Poortinga et al. 2012; Safdar et al. 2019; Shih 2013; K 2019; Sundt et al. 2020; Tan et al. 2017; Vassileva and Campillo 2016; Vimpari and Junnila 2019b; Zhuang and Wu 2019; Mata et al. 2020c; Park et al. 2018; Reindl and Palm 2020; Si and Marjanovic-Halburd 2018; Mata et al. 2021); (Allcott and Greenstone 2012; Cunha et al. 2020) (Liang et al. 2012; Mir-Artigues et al. 2018; Ruokamo et al. 2019; Xu et al. 2018; Yoo et al. 2020; Ferreira et al. 2018; Seidl et al. 2019; Soland et al. 2018) (Thema et al. 2017; Saheb et al. 2018; Balaban and Puppim de Oliveira 2017; Tonn et al. 2018; Ürge-Vorsatz et al. 2016; Mzavanadze 2018; MacNaughton et al. 2018; Mastrucci et al. 2019); (Tonn et al. 2018; Ürge-Vorsatz et al. 2016; Mastrucci et al. 2019b; Alawneh et al. 2019b; European Commission 2016b); (Vallés et al. 2016; Ponce de Leon Barido et al. 2018; Sovacool et al. 2020; Yang et al. 2019; Inetrnational Energy Agency 2017) (Spandagos et al. 2020; Christensen et al. 2018; Hwang et al. 2017; Lee and Tanverakul 2015; Balaban and Puppim de Oliveira 2017; Creutzig et al. 2016; McCollum et al. 2018; Dixon et al. 2015; Ala-Mantila et al. 2016; Aryandoust and Lilliestam 2017; Jabir et al. 2018)(SARASTI 2015; Wohlfarth et al. 2020; Taniguchi et al. 2016)		
Renewable energy production [R]	Perceived as environmental and technological friendly. Split incentives between tenants and landlords.	Health benefits through better indoor air quality, energy/fuel poverty alleviation, better ambient air quality and elimination of the heat island effect.	Improving energy access enhances agricultural productivity and improves food security. Result in energy/fuel poverty alleviation and in improving energy security. On the other hand, increased bioenergy production may restrict the available land for food production.
	(Roth et al. 2018; Radmehr et al. 2014; Overholm 2015; Lay et al. 2013; Qureshi et al. 2017; Hai et al. 2017; Kosorić et al. 2019; Jung et al. 2016; Stauch and Vuichard 2019; Jimenez et al. 2016; Sagebiel and Rommel 2014; De Groote and Verboven 2019; Frey and Mojtahedi 2018; Wolske et al. 2018; Dong and Sigrin 2019; Torani et al. 2016; Vimpari and Junnila 2019b; Abreu et al. 2019; Heiskanen and Matschoss 2017) (Burney et al. 2017; Van de Ven et al. 2019; SunHorizon 2020; Grubler et al. 2018; Thema et al. 2017; Saheb et al. 2018; Levy et al. 2016; Balaban and Puppim de Oliveira 2017; Tonn et al. 2018; Mzavanadze 2018; Liddell and Guiney 2015; Willand et al. 2015b; Rosenthal et al. 2018; MacNaughton et al. 2018; Payne et al. 2015) (Torero De Boeck Supérieur 2015; Leibrand et al. 2019; Ahmad and Byrd 2013; Sola et al. 2016; Hasegawa et al. 2015; McCollum et al. 2018; Ürge-Vorsatz et al. 2016; Alawneh et al. 2019b) (Shukla et al. 2017; Peñaloza et al. 2021; Kirchhoff and Strunz 2019)		

[a] [S] Sufficiency; [E] Efficiency; [R] Renewable Energy

	Institutional Dimension		
Mitigation Options[a]	**Political acceptance**	**Institutional capacity & governance, cross-sectoral coordination**	**Legal and administrative feasibility**
Building design and performance [S]	There is not yet much evidence in literature on the political acceptance of policies for the support for options in building design and performance. If the concept is linked to wellbeing of energy poor households the political acceptance can increase.	Institutional capacity can enable building design and performance to support sufficiency, in particular in managing building space in order to contribute to energy justice, reduction of energy poverty.	Administrative and legal process have to be introduced in such a way to increase the feasibility of building design and performances in order to promote energy sufficiency. Renewed interest in passive strategies has led to passive design being introduced into the latest versions of many green building rating tools owing to its proved effectiveness in saving energy
	(Fournier et al. 2020; Vadovics and Živčič 2019; Pellegrini-Masini 2019; Thomas et al. 2019) (Fournier et al. 2019) (Chen et al. 2015)		

	Institutional Dimension		
Mitigation Options[a]	**Political acceptance**	**Institutional capacity & governance, cross-sectoral coordination**	**Legal and administrative feasibility**
Change in construction methods and circular economy [S]	Politicians support circular economy since it has a positive impact on the environment and the economy and may create local jobs. At the same time politicians are neutral on new construction methods as this could have a negative impact on employment, substituting low skilled workers with robots (e.g. High D printing) or robotized manufacturing in plants. In some (a few developed) countries there are public policies that encourage industrialization and rationalization of construction.	There should be a change in institutional capacity to follow up technology development in new construction methods, as for example testing could be done in factories and sample buildings rather than in each building. The same is valid for circular economy, where controls have to be done at the production stage, institutional capacity can be an enabler for circular economy.	The legal and administrative practices have to change to follow the new technology and methods for construction and circular economy, which could be a barrier.
	(González Mahecha et al. 2020; Succar and Kassem 2015; Kassem and Succar 2017; Yang and Chou 2018; Li et al. 2018; Li et al. 2020); (L.K et al. 2020b) (Hamam et al. 2021; Abreu and Ceglia 2018; Whalen and Whalen 2018) Edirisinghe (2015)		
Envelope improvement [E]	Not perceived as a priority policy for energy efficiency in buildings by many policy makers in particular in warm climate and in developing countries. Policy makers are neutral to the technology implemented to improve the building energy performances. Incentives are often used to promote insulation in residential buildings	Very often building performance and envelopment improvements require very specific technical capabilities. In some countries building codes are established at local level, with gaps in governance and coordination between different levels of government.	Building codes are difficult to enforce, often compliance is based on design and verification is not carried out when in use. Actual energy used may be much higher than projected. Envelop improvement in particular for existing building are difficult to verify also in the case on public subsidies.
	(Enker and Morrison 2020; Kwag et al. 2020; Liu et al. 2020) (Yan et al. 2017; Schwarz et al. 2020) (Chandel et al. 2016; Sun et al. 2016; Pérez-Bella et al. 2017) (Khosla et al. 2017) (Khosla 2016)		
Heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) [E]	HVAC energy system retrofits reduce buildings' carbon footprint substantially but are often hindered by financial, regulatory or design constraints. Local market constraints and building ownership type might also affect the retrofit decision for HVAC systems. For e.g., newly constructed buildings must typically fulfil specific energy codes and further retrofitting can become cost-ineffective from an investment point of view. Technical HVAC retrofits often require modifications to existing buildings' design, which can be challenging especially in old and historic buildings.	In particular in developing countries there is lack of institutional capacity to adopt and enforce efficiency requirement for air conditioners.	HVAC sections of non-residential building codes need strengthening, as evidenced in 30 countries which show a variety in regulatory approaches. Regulatory agencies should adopt more stringent and homogenous requirements and develop new documentation and software specifications to improve code knowledge, compliance, and enforcement. Further, there is scarcity of studies quantifying energy savings from optimal HVAC temperature set points comprehensively, either as part of individual building retrofit planning or as part of energy policy regulations.
	(Kontokosta et al. 2020; Pisello and Asdrubali 2014; Kelpsaite et al. 2019) (Pérez-Lombard et al. 2011; Papadopoulos et al. 2019)		
Efficient Appliances [E]	There is strong support for appliances labelling and standards by policy makers both in developing and developed countries.	In particular in developing countries there is lack of institutional capacity to adopt and enforce efficiency requirement for appliances and lighting.	
	(Gerke et al. 2017; McNeil et al. 2013; Singh et al. 2019) (Rahman et al. 2015; Russo et al. 2018; Mahlia and Saidur 2010)		
Change in construction materials [E]	Bio-based materials, such as wood and bamboo, have been pointed as important alternatives for the construction sector in low-carbon policies in some countries. But a host of factors limit contemporary use of solid wood: such as the changes to the material based on humidity and water absorption; in spite of being fire-resistive, the charring properties of large structural timbers are recognized in most international building codes; the popular association of timber construction with catastrophic urban conflagration.	The economic, technical, practical and cultural barriers to the uptake of alternatives materials include perceptions of high cost, ineffective allocation of responsibility, industry culture, lack of skills of technicians and companies, and the poor availability of product and building-level carbon data and benchmarks. Opportunities to overcome barriers include earlier engagement of professionals along the supply chain, effective use of whole-life costing, and changes to contract and tender documents. A mounting business case exists for addressing embodied carbon but has yet to be effectively disseminated. There is a need for new regulatory drivers to complement changing attitudes.	Engineered timber products lack capacities and market demand to be more than just a niche market. Instruments are necessary to unlock potential for net carbon storage and increase the market share for engineered wood products, such as the gradual introduction of stricter rules for carbon emissions trading or more incentives for the voluntary use of innovative wood construction materials. In addition to the availability of forest resources, transition to timber based building structures will require changes in building codes, training construction workforce, expansion of manufacturing capacities for bio-based products, and downscaling production of mineral-based materials. Increased demand for timber in construction would have to be supported by a strong legal and political commitment to sustainable forest management, robust forest certification schemes, empowerment of people living in forests, efforts to curb illegal logging and exploring bamboo and other plant fibres as a replacement for timber in tropical and subtropical regions.
	(Himes and Busby 2020; Kremer and Symmons 2018; Laguarda Mallo and Espinoza 2015; Nfornkah et al. 2020) (Giesekam et al. 2016; Orsini and Marrone 2019; Churkina et al. 2020; Hildebrandt et al. 2017)		

	Institutional Dimension		
Mitigation Options[a]	**Political acceptance**	**Institutional capacity & governance, cross-sectoral coordination**	**Legal and administrative feasibility**
Demand Side Management (active management operation, digitalization and flexible comfort requirements) [E]	There is still some scepticism by politicians for demand side management (active management operation, digitalization, and flexible comfort requirements).	There is the need to change the governance of the electricity systems to allow demand option to participate in electricity market and get rewarded for their flexibility. Institutional capacity can be a strong enabler of demand side options.	There are still legal and administrative barriers to demand side management (active management operation, digitalization and flexible comfort requirements) which hinder the feasibility of this option.
	(Mengolini et al. 2016; Warren 2017; Forouli et al. 2021; Izsak and Edler 2011)		
Renewable energy production [R]	While in central governments there is a very high political acceptance and promotion of renewable energy systems as a key mitigation strategy, there can be opposition at the local political level, where local politicians defend views of citizens opposing renewable for aesthetic reasons or to attract tourists.	Institutional capacity is a key enabler of renewable energies. In particular the permitting of new installations, clear rules for connection to the grid, costs and incentives are essential elements. Other important institutional factors, e.g., the legal system and property rights, technical and market regulations and freedom to trade internationally, are other important enablers. However, at the moment, the institutional capacity to support the deployment of renewable is not present in all countries, with some developing countries still lacking it.	Renewable energies investment still faces several constrains from a legal and administrative point of view. In particular there are in some countries cumbersome administrative procedure to be grated the authorisation to install renewable both on and off-site, as well as legal issue on the system charges that renewable producers may face.
	(Jung et al. 2016; Cohen et al. 2016; Koecklin et al. 2021)		

[a] [S] Sufficiency; [E] Efficiency; [R] Renewable Energy

SM9.6 Supplementary information to Section 9.9

Table SM9.7 presents several studies examined in the context of Section 9.9.2.

Table SM9.7 Estimates of the direct and indirect rebound effects for households

Rebound effects		Range	Mean	Median	References
Direct	Including thermal uses	-9 - 127%	43%	36%	(Galvin 2015; Galvin and Sunikka-Blank 2016; Teli et al. 2016)(Copiello and Gabrielli 2017; Cayla and Osso 2013; Terés-Zubiaga et al. 2016; Madonna et al. 2017; Sandberg et al. 2017; Holzmann and Schmid 2018; Calì et al. 2016; Aydin et al. 2017)(Bardsley et al. 2019; Hens et al. 2010; Thomas and Azevedo 2013; Wang et al. 2014b; Lin and Liu 2015; Chitnis et al. 2013)(Brøgger et al. 2018)
	Electric uses	3-14%	7%	5%	(Schleich et al. 2014; Chen et al. 2018; Chitnis et al. 2013)
Indirect		-1.8 - 23.5%	10%	11%	(Cellura et al. 2013; Santos et al. 2018; Walzberg et al. 2020; Thomas and Azevedo 2013; Chitnis et al. 2013)
Direct and indirect		4.5-80%	32%	27%	(Scheer et al. 2013; Qiu et al. 2019; Murray 2013; Orea et al. 2015)

References

Abas, N., N. Khan, and I. Hussain, 2014: A solar water heater for subzero temperature areas. *Progress in Sustainable Energy Technologies: Generating Renewable Energy*, Vol. 1 of, Springer International Publishing, 369–378.

Abreu, J., N. Wingartz, and N. Hardy, 2019: New trends in solar: A comparative study assessing the attitudes towards the adoption of rooftop PV. *Energy Policy*, **128**, 347–363, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2018.12.038.

Abreu, M. C. S. de, and D. Ceglia, 2018: On the implementation of a circular economy: The role of institutional capacity-building through industrial symbiosis. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, **138**, 99–109, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2018.07.001.

Aditya, L., T. M. I. Mahlia, B. Rismanchi, H. M. Ng, M. H. Hasan, H. S. C. Metselaar, O. Muraza, and H. B. Aditiya, 2017: A review on insulation materials for energy conservation in buildings. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **73**, 1352–1365, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.02.034.

Afshari, A., C. Nikolopoulou, and M. Martin, 2014: Life-cycle analysis of building retrofits at the urban scale-a case study in United Arab Emirates. *Sustain.*, **6**, 453–473, https://doi.org/10.3390/su6010453.

Agustí-Juan, I., A. Hollberg, and G. Habert, 2017a: Integration of environmental criteria in early stages of digital fabrication. *eCAADe – Educational and research in Computer Aided Architectural Design in Europe*.

——, F. Müller, N. Hack, T. Wangler, and G. Habert, 2017b: Potential benefits of digital fabrication for complex structures: Environmental assessment of a robotically fabricated concrete wall. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **154**, 330–340, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.04.002.

Ahmad, N. A., and H. Byrd, 2013: *International Journal of Renewable Energy Development*. 59–68 pp. www.ijred.com.

Ahmadi, A., and Coauthors, 2021: Recent residential applications of low-temperature solar collector. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **279**, 123549, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.123549.

Ahmed, I. M., and K. D. Tsavdaridis, 2018: Life cycle assessment (LCA) and cost (LCC) studies of lightweight composite flooring systems. *J. Build. Eng.*, **20**, 624–633, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2018.09.013.

Aimar, M., and S. Foti, 2021: Simplified Criteria to Select Ground Response Analysis Methods for Seismic Building Design: Equivalent Linear versus Nonlinear Approaches. *Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am.*, **111**, 1940–1953, https://doi.org/10.1785/0120200319.

Ajayi, S. O., L. O. Oyedele, M. Bilal, O. O. Akinade, H. A. Alaka, H. A. Owolabi, and K. O. Kadiri, 2015: Waste effectiveness of the construction industry: Understanding the impediments and requisites for improvements. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, **102**, 101–112, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2015.06.001.

Akander, J., M. Cehlin, and B. Moshfegh, 2017: Assessing the Myths on Energy Efficiency When Retrofitting Multifamily Buildings in a Northern Region. *Sustainable High Rise Buildings in Urban Zones: Advantages, Challenges, and Global Case Studies*, A. Sayigh, Ed., Springer International Publishing, 139–161.

Al-Shareefi, N. A., S. A. Abbas, M. S. Alkhazraji, and A. A. Sakran, 2021: Towards secure smart cities: design and implementation of smart home digital communication system. *Indones. J. Electr. Eng. Comput. Sci.*, **21**, 271–277, https://doi.org/10.11591/ijeecs.v21.i1.pp271-277.

Ala-Mantila, S., J. Ottelin, J. Heinonen, and S. Junnila, 2016: To each their own? The greenhouse gas impacts of intra-household sharing in different urban zones. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **135**, 356–367, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.05.156.

Alajmi, A., A. Short, J. Ferguson, K. Vander Poel, and C. Griffin, 2020: Detailed energy efficiency strategies for converting an existing office building to NZEB: a case study in the Pacific Northwest. *Energy Effic.*, **13**, 1089–1104, https://doi.org/10.1007/s12053-020-09861-9.

Alam, M., P. X. W. Zou, J. Sanjayan, and S. Ramakrishnan, 2019: Energy saving performance assessment and lessons learned from the operation of an active phase change materials system in a multi-storey building in Melbourne. *Appl. Energy*, **238**, 1582–1595, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.01.116.

Alawneh, R., F. Ghazali, H. Ali, and M. Asif, 2019: A new index for assessing the contribution of energy efficiency in LEED 2009 certified green buildings to achieving UN sustainable development goals in Jordan. *Int. J. Green Energy*, **16**, 490–499, https://doi.org/10.1080/15435075.2019.1584104.

Alhumayani, H., M. Gomaa, V. Soebarto, and W. Jabi, 2020: Environmental assessment of large-scale 3D printing in construction: A comparative study between cob and concrete. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **270**, 122463, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.122463.

Allcott, H., and M. Greenstone, 2012: Is There an Energy Efficiency Gap? *J. Econ. Perspect.*, **26**, 3–28, https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.26.1.3.

Amal, B., S. Issam, C. Ghassan, E.-F. Mutasem, and K. Jalal, 2017: Behavioral determinants towards enhancing construction waste management: A Bayesian Network analysis. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, **117**, 274–284, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.10.006.

Andjelković, A. S., J. R. Petrović, and M. V. Kljajić, 2016: Double or single skin façade in a moderate climate an energyplus assessment. *Therm. Sci.*, **20**, S1501–S1510, https://doi.org/10.2298/TSCI16S5501A.

André, C., and D. B. Jorge, 2013: Economic viability analysis of a construction and demolition waste recycling plant in Portugal - Part I: Location, materials, technology and economic analysis. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **39**, 338–352, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2012.08.024.

Annibaldi, V., F. Cucchiella, P. De Berardinis, M. Gastaldi, and M. Rotilio, 2020: An integrated sustainable and profitable approach of energy efficiency in heritage buildings. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **251**, 119516, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119516.

Ardito, L., S. Raby, V. Albino, and B. Bertoldi, 2021: The duality of digital and environmental orientations in the context of SMEs: Implications for innovation performance. *J. Bus. Res.*, **123**, 44–56, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.09.022.

Arrigoni, A., R. Pelosato, P. Melià, G. Ruggieri, S. Sabbadini, and G. Dotelli, 2017: Life cycle assessment of natural building materials: the role of carbonation, mixture components and transport in the environmental impacts of hempcrete blocks. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **149**, 1051–1061, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.02.161.

——, C. T. S. Beckett, D. Ciancio, R. Pelosato, G. Dotelli, and A. C. Grillet, 2018: Rammed Earth incorporating Recycled Concrete Aggregate: a sustainable, resistant and breathable construction solution. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, **137**, 11–20, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2018.05.025.

Aryandoust, A., and J. Lilliestam, 2017: The potential and usefulness of demand response to provide electricity system services. *Appl. Energy*, **204**, 749–766, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.07.034.

Asdrubali, F., G. Baldinelli, and F. Bianchi, 2012: A quantitative methodology to evaluate thermal bridges in buildings. *Appl. Energy*, **97**, 365–373, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2011.12.054.

Attia, S., and Coauthors, 2017: Overview and future challenges of nearly zero energy buildings (nZEB) design in Southern Europe. *Energy Build.*, **155**, 439–458, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2017.09.043.

Aunan, K., and Coauthors, 2013: Upgrading to cleaner household stoves and reducing chronic obstructive pulmonary disease among women in rural china - a cost-benefit analysis. *Energy Sustain. Dev.*, **17**, 489–496, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esd.2013.06.002.

Aydin, E., N. Kok, and D. Brounen, 2017: Energy efficiency and household behavior: the rebound effect in the residential sector. *RAND J. Econ.*, **48**, 749–782, https://doi.org/10.1111/1756-2171.12190.

Azcárate-Aguerre, J. F., A. Den Heijer, and T. Klein, 2018: Integrated faades as a Product-Service System -Business process innovation to accelerate integral product implementation. *J. Facade Des. Eng.*, **6**, 41–56, https://doi.org/10.7480/jfde.2018.1.1840.

Azizi S Nair T, G. O., 2019: Analysing the house-owners' perceptions on benefits and barriers of energy renovation in Swedish single-family houses. *ENERGY Build.*, **198**, 187–196, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2019.05.034.

BAL KOÇYİĞİT, F., M. A. ZİNKÇİ, M. SAYESTHNOM, and C. TURHAN, 2019: FEASIBILITY OF NEARLY-ZERO ENERGY BUILDING RETROFITS BY USING RENEWABLE ENERGY SOURCES IN AN EDUCATIONAL BUILDING. *J. Sci. Perspect.*, **3**, 311–318, https://doi.org/10.26900/jsp.3.032.

Balaban, O., and J. A. Puppim de Oliveira, 2017: Sustainable buildings for healthier cities: assessing the co-benefits of green buildings in Japan. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **163**, S68–S78, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.01.086.

Balta-Ozkan, N., B. Boteler, and O. Amerighi, 2014: European smart home market development: Public views on technical and economic aspects across the United Kingdom, Germany and Italy. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.*, **3**, 65–77, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2014.07.007.

Bamisile, O., O. Olagoke, M. Dagbasi, F. Dika, and B. Okwesi, 2019: Review of solar assisted HVAC systems; Its performance analysis using CO2 as a refrigerant. *Energy Sources, Part A Recover. Util. Environ. Eff.*, **41**, 2957–2974, https://doi.org/10.1080/15567036.2019.1582736.

Bardsley, N., and Coauthors, 2019: Domestic thermal upgrades, community action and energy saving: A three-year experimental study of prosperous households. *Energy Policy*, **127**, 475–485, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2018.11.036.

Barnes, D. F., and H. Samad, 2018: *Measuring the Benefits of Energy Access: A Handbook for Development Practitioners*. Inter-American Development Bank,.

Lo Basso, G., L. de Santoli, R. Paiolo, and C. Losi, 2021: The potential role of trans-critical CO2 heat pumps within a solar cooling system for building services: The hybridised system energy analysis by a dynamic simulation model. *Renew. Energy*, **164**, 472–490, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2020.09.098.

Batalla-Bejerano J Trujillo-Baute M, E. V.-A., 2020: Smart meters and consumer behaviour: Insights from the empirical literature. *Energy Policy*, **144**, 111610, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2020.111610.

Belussi, L., and Coauthors, 2019: A review of performance of zero energy buildings and energy efficiency solutions. *J. Build. Eng.*, **25**, 100772, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2019.100772.

Ben-Alon, L., V. Loftness, K. A. Harries, G. DiPietro, and E. C. Hameen, 2019: Cradle to site Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) of natural vs conventional building materials: A case study on cob earthen material. *Build. Environ.*, **160**, 106150, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.05.028.

Berriel, S. ., A. Favier, E. R. Domínguez, I. . Machado, U. Heierli, K. L. Scrivener, F. M. Hernadez, and G. Habert, 2016: Assessing the environmental and economic potential of Limestone Calcined Clay Cement in Cuba. **124**, 361–369, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.02.125.

Berrill, P., and E. G. Hertwich, 2021: Material flows and GHG emissions from housing stock evolution in US counties, 2020–60. *Build. Cities*, **2**, 599–617, https://doi.org/10.5334/bc.126.

Berrueta, V. M., M. Serrano-Medrano, C. García-Bustamante, M. Astier, and O. R. Masera, 2017: Promoting sustainable local development of rural communities and mitigating climate change: the case of Mexico's Patsari improved cookstove project. *Clim. Change*, **140**, 63–77, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-015-1523-y.

Bertoldi P., 2019: Policies, Recommendations and Standards (International Technical Standards, Main Laws and Regulations; EU Directives; Energy Labeling). *Handbook of Energy Efficiency in Buildings*, Elsevier, 5–73.

Bertoldi, P., 2020: *Overview of the European Union policies to promote more sustainable behaviours in energy end-users*. Elsevier Inc., 451–477 pp.

Beucker, S., J. D. Bergesen, and T. Gibon, 2016: Building Energy Management Systems: Global Potentials and Environmental Implications of Deployment. *J. Ind. Ecol.*, **20**, 223–233, https://doi.org/10.1111/jiec.12378.

Bevan, W., S. L. Lu, and M. Sexton, 2020: Skills required to deliver energy efficient school retrofit buildings. *Eng. Constr. Archit. Manag.*, https://doi.org/10.1108/ECAM-03-2019-0126.

Bevilacqua, P., F. Benevento, R. Bruno, and N. Arcuri, 2019a: Are Trombe walls suitable passive systems for the reduction of the yearly building energy requirements? *Energy*, **185**, 554–566, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2019.07.003.

Bevilacqua, P., F. Benevento, R. Bruno, and N. Arcuri, 2019b: Are Trombe walls suitable passive systems for the reduction of the yearly building energy requirements? *Energy*, **185**, 554–566, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2019.07.003.

Bhamare, D. K., M. K. Rathod, and J. Banerjee, 2019: Passive cooling techniques for building and their applicability in different climatic zones—The state of art. *Energy Build.*, **198**, 467–490, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2019.06.023.

Bleyl, J. W., and Coauthors, 2019: Office building deep energy retrofit: life cycle cost benefit analyses using cash flow analysis and multiple benefits on project level. *Energy Effic.*, **12**, 261–279, https://doi.org/10.1007/s12053-018-9707-8.

Boermans, T., G. Papaefthymiou, M. Offermann, A. John, and F. Comaty, 2015: *The role of energy efficient buildings in the EUs future power system*. www.ecofys.com.

Bojić, M., K. Johannes, and F. Kuznik, 2014: Optimizing energy and environmental performance of passive Trombe wall. *Energy Build.*, **70**, 279–286, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2013.11.062.

Bomberg, M., M. Furtak, and D. Yarbrough, 2017: Buildings with environmental quality management : Part 1 : Designing multifunctional construction materials. https://doi.org/10.1177/1744259117711196.

Bonan, J., S. Pareglio, and M. Tavoni, 2017: Access to modern energy: A review of barriers, drivers and impacts. *Environ. Dev. Econ.*, **22**, 491–516, https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355770X17000201.

Brambilla, G., M. Lavagna, G. Vasdravellis, and C. A. Castiglioni, 2019: Environmental benefits arising from demountable steel-concrete composite floor systems in buildings. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, **141**, 133–142, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2018.10.014.

Bright, S., D. Weatherall, and R. Willis, 2019: Exploring the complexities of energy retrofit in mixed tenure social housing: a case study from England, UK. *Energy Effic.*, **12**, 157–174, https://doi.org/10.1007/s12053-018-9676-y.

Brøgger, M., P. Bacher, H. Madsen, and K. B. Wittchen, 2018: Estimating the influence of rebound effects on the energy-saving potential in building stocks. *Energy Build.*, **181**, 62–74, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2018.10.006.

Bueren, E. Van, and B. Broekhans, 2014: *Individual Projects as Portals for Mainstreaming Niche Innovations*. 145–168 pp.

Burney, J., H. Alaofè, R. Naylor, and D. Taren, 2017: Impact of a rural solar electrification project on the level and structure of women's empowerment. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **12**, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aa7f38.

Cabeza, L. F., and M. Chàfer, 2020: Technological options and strategies towards zero energy buildings contributing to climate change mitigation: a systematic review. *Energy Build.*, **219**, 110009 (1-46), https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2020.110009.

Cabeza, L. F., A. Castell, M. Medrano, I. Martorell, G. Pérez, and I. Fernández, 2010: Experimental study on the performance of insulation materials in Mediterranean construction. *Energy Build.*, **42**, 630–636, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2009.10.033.

Cabeza, L. F., L. Rincón, V. Vilariño, G. Pérez, and A. Castell, 2014: Life cycle assessment (LCA) and life cycle energy analysis (LCEA) of buildings and the building sector: A review. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **29**, 394–416, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2013.08.037.

Cabeza, L. F., D. Ürge-Vorsatz, A. Palacios, D. Ürge, S. Serrano, and C. Barreneche, 2018: Trends in penetration and ownership of household appliances. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **82**, 4044–4059, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.10.068.

Cabeza, L. F., É. Mata, and M. Chàfer, 2020: No Title. *Nat. Clim. Chang.*,.

Cabrera Serrenho, A., M. Drewniok, C. Dunant, and J. M. Allwood, 2019: Testing the greenhouse gas emissions reduction potential of alternative strategies for the english housing stock. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, **144**, 267–275, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2019.02.001.

Calì, D., T. Osterhage, R. Streblow, and D. Müller, 2016: Energy performance gap in refurbished German dwellings: Lesson learned from a field test. *Energy Build.*, **127**, 1146–1158, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.05.020.

Calise, F., F. L. Cappiello, M. Vicidomini, J. Song, A. M. Pantaleo, S. Abdelhady, A. Shaban, and C. N. Markides, 2021: Energy and economic assessment of energy efficiency options for energy districts: Case studies in Italy and Egypt. *Energies*, **14**, 1–24, https://doi.org/10.3390/en14041012.

Calvert, K., and W. Mabee, 2015: More solar farms or more bioenergy crops? Mapping and assessing potential land-use conflicts among renewable energy technologies in eastern Ontario, Canada. *Appl. Geogr.*, **56**, 209–221, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apgeog.2014.11.028.

Cancio Díaz, Y., S. Sánchez Berriel, U. Heierli, A. R. Favier, I. R. Sánchez Machado, K. L. Scrivener, J. F. Martirena Hernández, and G. Habert, 2017: Limestone calcined clay cement as a low-carbon solution to meet expanding cement demand in emerging economies. *Dev. Eng.*, **2**, 82–91, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.deveng.2017.06.001.

Canes, M. E., 2018: On the Incremental Costs of Greener Buildings. *Int. J. Energy Policy Manag.*, **3**, 41–46.

Cansevdi, B., U. Calli, and A. Hepbasli, 2010: 1 Improving the Energy Performance of Air-Cooled Chillers with Water-Spray Mist Pre-Cooling : An Application.

Cantzler, J., F. Creutzig, E. Ayargarnchanakul, A. Javaid, L. Wong, and W. Haas, 2020: Saving resources and the climate? A systematic review of the circular economy and its mitigation potential. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **15**, 123001, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abbeb7.

Capellán-Pérez, I., C. de Castro, and I. Arto, 2017: Assessing vulnerabilities and limits in the transition to renewable energies: Land requirements under 100% solar energy scenarios. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **77**, 760–782, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.03.137.

Capozzoli, A., A. Gorrino, and V. Corrado, 2013: A building thermal bridges sensitivity analysis. *Appl. Energy*, **107**, 229–243, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2013.02.045.

Cascone, S., F. Catania, A. Gagliano, and G. Sciuto, 2018: A comprehensive study on green roof performance for retrofitting existing buildings. *Build. Environ.*, **136**, 227–239, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2018.03.052.

Cavalliere, C., G. Habert, G. R. Dell'Osso, and A. Hollberg, 2019: Continuous BIM-based assessment of embodied environmental impacts throughout the design process. *J. Clean. Prod.*, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.11.247.

Cayla, J.-M., and D. Osso, 2013: Does energy efficiency reduce inequalities? impact of policies in residential sector on household budgets. *ECEE 2013 Summer Study - Rethink, Renew, Restart*, 1247–1257.

Cedeño-Laurent, J. G., A. Williams, P. MacNaughton, X. Cao, E. Eitland, J. Spengler, and J. Allen, 2018: Building Evidence for Health: Green Buildings, Current Science, and Future Challenges. *Annu. Rev. Public Health*, **39**, 291–308, https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031816-044420.

Celik, B. G., and S. Attaran, 2011: Customer-Centric View of Sustainable Buildings : The Case of LEED ®. *47th ASC Annu. Int. Conf. Proc.*,.

Celik, K., C. Meral, A. P. Gursel, P. K. Mehta, A. Horvath, and P. J. M. Monteiro, 2015a: Cement & Concrete Composites Mechanical properties , durability , and life-cycle assessment of self-consolidating concrete mixtures made with blended portland cements containing fly ash and limestone powder. *Cem. Concr. Compos.*, **56**, 59–72, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2014.11.003.

——, ——, ——, ——, ——, and ——, 2015b: Cement & Concrete Composites Mechanical properties , durability , and life-cycle assessment of self-consolidating concrete mixtures made with blended portland cements containing fly ash and limestone powder. *Cem. Concr. Compos.*, **56**, 59–72, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2014.11.003.

Cellura, M., A. Di Gangi, S. Longo, and A. Orioli, 2013: An Italian input-output model for the assessment of energy and environmental benefits arising from retrofit actions of buildings. *Energy Build.*, **62**, 97–106, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2013.02.056.

Chandel, S. S., A. Sharma, and B. M. Marwaha, 2016: Review of energy efficiency initiatives and regulations for residential buildings in India. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **54**, 1443–1458, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.10.060.

Chang, F. C., K. S. Chen, P. Y. Yang, and C. H. Ko, 2018: Environmental benefit of utilizing bamboo material based on life cycle assessment. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **204**, 60–69, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.08.248.

Charoenkit, S., and S. Yiemwattana, 2016: Living walls and their contribution to improved thermal comfort and carbon emission reduction: A review. *Build. Environ.*, **105**, 82–94, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2016.05.031.

Chau, C. K., J. M. Xu, T. M. Leung, and W. Y. Ng, 2017: Evaluation of the impacts of end-of-life management strategies for deconstruction of a high-rise concrete framed office building. **185**, 1595–1603, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.01.019.

Chen, K., Z. Li, T.-P. Lu, P.-L. P. Rau, and D. Huang, 2018: *Cross-Cultural Design. Applications in Cultural Heritage, Creativity and Social Development*. P.-L.P. Rau, Ed. Springer International Publishing, 266–274 pp.

Chen, Q., B. Li, and X. Liu, 2013a: An experimental evaluation of the living wall system in hot and humid climate. *Energy Build.*, **61**, 298–307, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2013.02.030.

——, ——, and ——, 2013b: An experimental evaluation of the living wall system in hot and humid climate. *Energy Build.*, **61**, 298–307, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2013.02.030.

Chen, X., H. Yang, and L. Lu, 2015: A comprehensive review on passive design approaches in green building rating tools. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **50**, 1425–1436, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.06.003.

Chen, Y., H. Zou, J. Dong, J. Wu, H. Xu, and C. Tian, 2021: Experimental investigation on the heating performance of a CO2 heat pump system with intermediate cooling for electric vehicles. *Appl. Therm. Eng.*, **182**, 116039, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2020.116039.

Chitnis, M., S. Sorrell, A. Druckman, S. K. Firth, and T. Jackson, 2013: Turning lights into flights: Estimating direct and indirect rebound effects for UK households. *Energy Policy*, **55**, 234–250, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2012.12.008.

Choe, W., 1973: Specifiying HVAC for low-rise housing. *Actual Specif Eng*, **29**, 93–94.

Christensen, P. H., S. J. Robinson, and R. A. Simons, 2018: The influence of energy considerations on decision making by institutional real estate owners in the U.S. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **94**, 275–284, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2018.05.061.

Christidou, C., K. P. Tsagarakis, and C. Athanasiou, 2014: Resource management in organized housing settlements, a case study at Kastoria Region, Greece. *Energy Build.*, **74**, 17–29, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2014.01.012.

Churkina, G., and Coauthors, 2020: Buildings as a global carbon sink. *Nat. Sustain. 2020*, 1–8, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0462-4.

Clancy, J. M., J. Curtis, and B. P. O'Gallachóir, 2017: What are the factors that discourage companies in the Irish commercial sector from investigating energy saving options? *Energy Build.*, **146**, 243–256, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2017.04.077.

climate foundation, E., 2018: *Net Zero by 2050: From Whether to How*. 68 p. pp. www.lindsayynobledesign.com.

Cohen, J., K. Moeltner, A. Reichl, and M. Schmidthaler, 2016: An empirical analysis of local opposition to new transmission lines across the EU-27. *Energy J.*, **37**, 59–82, https://doi.org/10.5547/01956574.37.3.jcoh.

Cohen, M. J., 2021: New Conceptions of Sufficient Home Size in High-Income Countries: Are We Approaching a Sustainable Consumption Transition? *Housing, Theory Soc.*, **38**, 173–203, https://doi.org/10.1080/14036096.2020.1722218.

Coma, J., G. Pérez, C. Solé, A. Castell, and L. F. Cabeza, 2016a: Thermal assessment of extensive green roofs as passive tool for energy savings in buildings. *Renew. Energy*, **85**, 1106–1115, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2015.07.074.

——, ——, ——, ——, and L. F. Cabeza, 2016b: Thermal assessment of extensive green roofs as passive tool for energy savings in buildings. *Renew. Energy*, **85**, 1106–1115, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2015.07.074.

——, ——, A. de Gracia, S. Burés, M. Urrestarazu, and L. F. Cabeza, 2017: Vertical greenery systems for energy savings in buildings: A comparative study between green walls and green facades. *Build. Environ.*, **111**, 228–237, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2016.11.014.

Copiello, S., and L. Gabrielli, 2017: Analysis of building energy consumption through panel data: The role played by the economic drivers. *Energy Build.*, **145**, 130–143, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2017.03.053.

Corgnati, S. P., E. Fabrizio, M. Filippi, and V. Monetti, 2013: Reference buildings for cost optimal analysis: Method of definition and application. *Appl. Energy*, **102**, 983–993, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2012.06.001.

Correa, D. F., H. L. Beyer, H. P. Possingham, S. R. Thomas-Hall, and P. M. Schenk, 2017: Biodiversity impacts of bioenergy production: Microalgae vs. first generation biofuels. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **74**, 1131–1146, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.02.068.

Cossu, R., and I. D. Williams, 2015: Urban mining: Concepts, terminology, challenges. *Waste Manag.*, **45**, 1–3, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wasman.2015.09.040.

Costa, D. F., and A. K. Soares, 2020: Costs and Impacts of a Smart Metering Program in a Water Distribution System: Case Study in Brasília, Brazil. *Environ. Sci. Proc.*, **2**, 7, https://doi.org/10.3390/environsciproc2020002007.

Costanzo, V., G. Evola, and L. Marletta, 2016a: Energy savings in buildings or UHI mitigation? Comparison between green roofs and cool roofs. *Energy Build.*, **114**, 247–255, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2015.04.053.

Costanzo, V., G. Evola, and L. Marletta, 2016b: Energy savings in buildings or UHI mitigation? Comparison between green roofs and cool roofs. *Energy Build.*, **114**, 247–255, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2015.04.053.

Couder, J., and A. Verbruggen, 2017: *Quantification and monetization of selected energy system and security impacts*. 47 p. pp. https://combi-project.eu/wp-content/uploads/D7.4_20180406_final.pdf.

Creutzig, F., B. Fernandez, H. Haberl, R. Khosla, Y. Mulugetta, and K. C. Seto, 2016: Beyond technology: demand-side solutions for climate change mitigation. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, **41**, 173–198, https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-110615-085428.

Cruz, T., R. Schaeffer, A. F. P. Lucena, S. Melo, and R. Dutra, 2020: Solar water heating technical-economic potential in the household sector in Brazil. *Renew. Energy*, **146**, 1618–1639, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2019.06.085.

Cunha, P., S. A. Neves, A. C. Marques, and Z. Serrasqueiro, 2020: Adoption of energy efficiency measures in the buildings of micro-, small- and medium-sized Portuguese enterprises. *Energy Policy*, **146**, 111776, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2020.111776.

Curl, A., A. Kearns, P. Mason, M. Egan, C. Tannahill, and A. Ellaway, 2015: Physical and mental health outcomes following housing improvements: Evidence from the GoWell study. *J. Epidemiol. Community Health*, **69**, 12–19, https://doi.org/10.1136/jech-2014-204064.

Čurpek, J., and M. Čekon, 2022: A Simple Trombe Wall Enhanced with a Phase Change Material: Building Performance Study. *Smart Innovation, Systems and Technologies*, 281–291.

Curtis, J., A. Walton, and M. Dodd, 2017: Understanding the potential of facilities managers to be advocates for energy efficiency retrofits in mid-tier commercial office buildings. *Energy Policy*, **103**, 98–104, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2017.01.016.

Curtis, J., D. McCoy, and C. Aravena, 2018: Heating system upgrades: The role of knowledge, socio-demographics, building attributes and energy infrastructure. *Energy Policy*, **120**, 183–196, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2018.05.036.

Cvok, I., I. Ratkovic, and J. Deur, 2020: Optimization of Control Parameters of Vehicle Air-Conditioning System for Maximum Efficiency. Vol. 2020-April of, University of Zagreb, Croatia, SAE International.

D'Agostino, D., and D. Parker, 2018: A framework for the cost-optimal design of nearly zero energy buildings (NZEBs) in representative climates across Europe. *Energy*, **149**, 814–829, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2018.02.020.

——, and L. Mazzarella, 2019: What is a Nearly zero energy building? Overview, implementation and comparison of definitions. *J. Build. Eng.*, **21**, 200–212, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2018.10.019.

D'Oca, S., A. Ferrante, C. Ferrer, R. Pernetti, A. Gralka, R. Sebastian, and P. op t. Veld, 2018: Technical, financial, and social barriers and challenges in deep building renovation: Integration of lessons learned from the H2020 cluster projects. *Buildings*, **8**, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings8120174.

Dalla Valle, A., 2021: Emerging Trends and Developments in BIM, Green BIM and LCA. 11–18.

Dane G Kim DJ, J. Y., 2020: Preferences Regarding a Web-Based, Neighborhood-Level Intervention Program to Promote Household Energy Conservation. *J. Urban Technol.*, 1–17, https://doi.org/10.1080/10630732.2020.1756688.

Danny, D., and H. Soo, 2021: Energy for Sustainable Development Heating and cooling energy consumption prediction model for high-rise apartment buildings considering design parameters. *Energy Sustain. Dev.*, **61**, 1–14, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esd.2021.01.001.

Debacker, W., and S. Manshoven, 2016: D1- Synthesis of the state-of- the-art. *Bamb*,.

Deepak, P., and Z. A. Hussain, 2015: Nearly Zero Energy Building (NZEB) using IoT and Smart Grid. *Int. J. Students' Res. Technol. Manag.*, **3**, https://doi.org/10.18510/ijsrtm.2015.348.

Deetjen, T. A., L. Walsh, and P. Vaishnav, 2021: US residential heat pumps: the private economic potential and its emissions, health, and grid impacts. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **16**, 084024, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ac10dc.

Deng, Y., J. Li, Q. Wu, S. Pei, and N. Xu, 2020: Using Network Theory to Explore BIM Application Barriers for BIM Sustainable Development in China. **2**.

Department of Environmental Affairs, 2014: *South Africa's Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Mitigation Potential Analysis*. 152 p. pp.

Dilshad, S., A. R. Kalair, and N. Khan, 2020: Review of carbon dioxide (CO2) based heating and cooling technologies: Past, present, and future outlook. *Int. J. Energy Res.*, **44**, 1408–1463, https://doi.org/10.1002/er.5024.

Dixon, G. N., M. B. Deline, K. McComas, L. Chambliss, and M. Hoffmann, 2015: Using Comparative Feedback to Influence Workplace Energy Conservation: A Case Study of a University Campaign. *Environ. Behav.*, **47**, 667–693, https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916513520417.

Diyamandoglu, V., and L. M. Fortuna, 2015: Deconstruction of wood-framed houses: Material recovery and environmental impact. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, **100**, 21–30, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2015.04.006.

Djedjig, R., E. Bozonnet, and R. Belarbi, 2015a: Analysis of thermal effects of vegetated envelopes: Integration of a validated model in a building energy simulation program. *Energy Build.*, **86**, 93–103, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2014.09.057.

——, ——, and ——, 2015b: Analysis of thermal effects of vegetated envelopes: Integration of a validated model in a building energy simulation program. *Energy Build.*, **86**, 93–103, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2014.09.057.

Dong, C., and B. Sigrin, 2019: Using willingness to pay to forecast the adoption of solar photovoltaics: A "parameterization + calibration" approach. *Energy Policy*, **129**, 100–110, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2019.02.017.

Dong, H.-W., B.-J. Kim, S.-Y. Yoon, and J.-W. Jeong, 2020: Energy benefit of organic Rankine cycle in high-rise apartment building served by centralized liquid desiccant and evaporative cooling-assisted ventilation system. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **60**, 102280, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2020.102280.

Dornberger, R., and D. Schwaferts, 2021: Digital Innovation and Digital Business Transformation in the Age of Digital Change. *Stud. Syst. Decis. Control*, **294**, 1–13, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-48332-6_1.

Drissi, S., T. C. Ling, K. H. Mo, and A. Eddhahak, 2019: A review of microencapsulated and composite phase change materials: Alteration of strength and thermal properties of cement-based materials. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **110**, 467–484, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2019.04.072.

Du, X., 2021: Research on Engineering Project Management Method Based on. **2021**.

Dugast, C., and A. Soyeux, 2019: *Faire sa part ? Pouvoir et responsabilité des individus, des entreprises et de l'état face à l'urgence climatique*. 21 pp.

Duman, A. C., H. S. Erden, Ö. Gönül, and Ö. Güler, 2021: A home energy management system with an integrated smart thermostat for demand response in smart grids. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **65**, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2020.102639.

Eckelman, M. J., C. Brown, L. N. Troup, L. Wang, M. D. Webster, and J. F. Hajjar, 2018: Life cycle energy and environmental benefits of novel design-for-deconstruction structural systems in steel buildings. *Build. Environ.*, **143**, 421–430, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2018.07.017.

Economidou, M., V. Todeschi, P. Bertoldi, D. D'Agostino, P. Zangheri, and L. Castellazzi, 2020: Review of 50 years of EU energy efficiency policies for buildings. *Energy Build.*, **225**, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2020.110322.

Edirisinghe, R., 2015: Comparative Analysis of International and National Level BIM Standardization Efforts and BIM adoption.

Ellsworth-Krebs, K., 2020a: Implications of declining household sizes and expectations of home comfort for domestic energy demand. *Nat. Energy*, **5**, 20–25, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41560-019-0512-1.

——, 2020b: Implications of declining household sizes and expectations of home comfort for domestic energy demand. *Nat. Energy*, **5**, 20–25, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41560-019-0512-1.

Energetics, 2016: *Modelling and analysis of Australia's abatement opportunities*. 60 p. pp.

Enker, R. A., and G. M. Morrison, 2020: The potential contribution of building codes to climate change response policies for the built environment. *Energy Effic.*, **13**, https://doi.org/10.1007/s12053-020-09871-7.

Erhorn-Kluttig, H., and Coauthors, 2019: Cost-efficient Nearly Zero-Energy Buildings (NZEBs). *IOP Conf. Ser. Mater. Sci. Eng.*, **609**, 062002, https://doi.org/10.1088/1757-899X/609/6/062002.

European Commission, 2016: *The Macroeconomic and Other Benefits of Energy Efficiency Final report*. http://europa.eu.

Faber, J., and Coauthors, 2012: *Behavioural Climate Change Mitigation Options and Their Appropriate Inclusion in Quantitative Longer Term Policy Scenarios*. CE Delft, 87 pp. http://publications.europa.eu/resource/cellar/d9f5683a-b330-47c4-beac-d4d4f5dec681.0001.07/DOC_1.

Fallahi, A., F. Haghighat, and H. Elsadi, 2010: Energy performance assessment of double-skin façade with thermal mass. *Energy Build.*, **42**, 1499–1509, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2010.03.020.

Feng, K., S. Chen, W. Lu, S. Wang, B. Yang, C. Sun, and Y. Wang, 2021: Embedding ensemble learning into simulation-based optimisation : a learning-based optimisation approach for construction planning. https://doi.org/10.1108/ECAM-02-2021-0114.

Ferreira, J., M. Duarte Pinheiro, and J. De Brito, 2015: Economic and environmental savings of structural buildings refurbishment with demolition and reconstruction - A Portuguese benchmarking. *J. Build. Eng.*, **3**, 114–126, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2015.07.001.

Ferreira, M., M. Almeida, and A. Rodrigues, 2017: Impact of co-benefits on the assessment of energy related building renovation with a nearly-zero energy target. *Energy Build.*, **152**, 587–601, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2017.07.066.

Ferreira, P., A. Rocha, and M. Araujo, 2018: Awareness and attitudes towards demand response programs – a pilot study. *2018 International Conference on Smart Energy Systems and Technologies (SEST)*, IEEE, 1–6.

Figueroa, A. R., 2016: Efficient lighting uptake among the urban poor: evidence from a Kenyan informal settlement. *Environ. Urban.*, **28**, 535–552, https://doi.org/10.1177/0956247816647871.

Fina, B., H. Auer, and W. Friedl, 2020: Cost-optimal economic potential of shared rooftop PV in energy communities: Evidence from Austria. *Renew. Energy*, **152**, 217–228, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2020.01.031.

Fisk, W. J., 2018: How home ventilation rates affect health: A literature review. *Indoor Air*, **28**, 473–487, https://doi.org/10.1111/ina.12469.

Forouli, A., E. A. Bakirtzis, G. Papazoglou, K. Oureilidis, V. Gkountis, L. Candido, E. D. Ferrer, and P. Biskas, 2021: Assessment of demand side flexibility in european electricity markets: A country level review. *Energies*, **14**, 1–23, https://doi.org/10.3390/en14082324.

Fouquet, M., A. Levasseur, M. Margni, A. Lebert, S. Lasvaux, B. Souyri, C. Buhé, and M. Woloszyn, 2015: Methodological challenges and developments in LCA of low energy buildings: Application to biogenic carbon and global warming assessment. *Build. Environ.*, **90**, 51–59, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2015.03.022.

Fournier, E. D., F. Federico, E. Porse, and S. Pincetl, 2019: Effects of building size growth on residential energy efficiency and conservation in California. *Appl. Energy*, **240**, 446–452, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.02.072.

Fournier, E. D., R. Cudd, F. Federico, and S. Pincetl, 2020: On energy sufficiency and the need for new policies to combat growing inequities in the residential energy sector. *Elementa*, **8**, https://doi.org/10.1525/elementa.419.

Frey, E. F., and S. Mojtahedi, 2018: The impact of solar subsidies on California's non-residential sector. *Energy Policy*, **122**, 27–35, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2018.07.020.

Fricko, O., S. C. Parkinson, N. Johnson, M. Strubegger, M. T. Van Vliet, and K. Riahi, 2016: Energy sector water use implications of a 2 °C climate policy. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **11**, 034011, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/11/3/034011.

Friege, J., 2016: Increasing homeowners' insulation activity in Germany: An empirically grounded agent-based model analysis. *Energy Build.*, **128**, 756–771, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.07.042.

Galán-Marín, C., C. Rivera-Gómez, and A. García-Martínez, 2015: Embodied energy of conventional load-bearing walls versus natural stabilized earth blocks. *Energy Build.*, **97**, 146–154, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2015.03.054.

Galvin, R., 2015: Integrating the rebound effect: Accurate predictors for upgrading domestic heating. *Build. Res. Inf.*, **43**, 710–722, https://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2014.988439.

——, and M. Sunikka-Blank, 2016: Quantification of (p)rebound effects in retrofit policies - Why does it matter? *Energy*, **95**, 415–424, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2015.12.034.

García-Frapolli, E., and Coauthors, 2010: Beyond fuelwood savings: Valuing the economic benefits of introducing improved biomass cookstoves in the Purépecha region of Mexico. *Ecol. Econ.*, **69**, 2598–2605, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2010.08.004.

García-López, E., and C. Heard, 2015: A study of the social acceptability of a proposal to improve the thermal comfort of a traditional dwelling. *Appl. Therm. Eng.*, **75**, 1287–1295, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2014.09.014.

Gavrila Gavrila, S., and A. de Lucas Ancillo, 2021: Spanish SMEs' digitalization enablers: E-Receipt applications to the offline retail market. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, **162**, 120381, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120381.

Ge, J., Y. Zhao, X. Luo, and M. Lin, 2020: Study on the suitability of green building technology for affordable housing : A case study on Zhejiang Province , China. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **275**, 122685, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.122685.

Gerke, B. F., M. A. McNeil, and T. Tu, 2017: The International Database of Efficient Appliances (IDEA): A new tool to support appliance energy-efficiency deployment. *Appl. Energy*, **205**, 453–464, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.07.093.

Getuli, V., and P. C. and A. Bruttini, 2021: Planning , management and administration of HS contents with BIM and VR in construction : an implementation protocol. **28**, 603–623, https://doi.org/10.1108/ECAM-11-2019-0647.

Geyer, R., B. Kuczenski, T. Zink, and A. Henderson, 2016: Common Misconceptions about Recycling. *J. Ind. Ecol.*, **20**, 1010–1017, https://doi.org/10.1111/jiec.12355.

Ghayeb, H. H., H. A. Razak, and N. H. R. Sulong, 2020a: Evaluation of the CO 2 emissions of an innovative composite precast concrete structure building frame. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **242**, 118567, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.118567.

——, ——, and ——, 2020b: Evaluation of the CO 2 emissions of an innovative composite precast concrete structure building frame. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **242**, 118567, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.118567.

Ghisellini, P., M. Ripa, and S. Ulgiati, 2018: Exploring environmental and economic costs and benefits of a circular economy approach to the construction and demolition sector. A literature review. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **178**, 618–643, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.11.207.

Giesekam, J., J. R. Barrett, and P. Taylor, 2016: Construction sector views on low carbon building materials. *Build. Res. Inf.*, **44**, 423–444, https://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2016.1086872.

Goldemberg, J., J. Martinez-Gomez, A. Sagar, and K. R. Smith, 2018: Household air pollution, health, and climate change: cleaning the air. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **13**, 030201, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aaa49d.

Gonçalves, J. E., T. van Hooff, and D. Saelens, 2021: Simulating building integrated photovoltaic facades: Comparison to experimental data and evaluation of modelling complexity. *Appl. Energy*, **281**, 116032, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2020.116032.

Gong, X., N. Wu, C. Li, M. Liang, and Y. Akashi, 2019: Energy performance and CO 2 emissions of fuel cells for residential application in Chinese hot summer and cold winter areas. *IOP Conf. Ser. Earth Environ. Sci.*, **310**, 022057, https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/310/2/022057.

González-Mahecha, R. E., A. F. P. Lucena, R. Garaffa, R. F. C. Miranda, M. Chávez-Rodriguez, T. Cruz, P. Bezerra, and R. Rathmann, 2019a: Greenhouse gas mitigation potential and abatement costs in the Brazilian residential sector. *Energy Build.*, **184**, 19–33, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2018.11.039.

González-Mahecha, R. E., A. F. P. Lucena, R. Garaffa, R. F. C. Miranda, M. Chávez-Rodriguez, T.

Cruz, P. Bezerra, and R. Rathmann, 2019b: Greenhouse gas mitigation potential and abatement costs in the Brazilian residential sector. *Energy Build.*, **184**, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2018.11.039.

González Mahecha, R. E., L. Rosse Caldas, R. Garaffa, A. F. P. Lucena, A. Szklo, and R. D. Toledo Filho, 2020: Constructive systems for social housing deployment in developing countries: A case study using dynamic life cycle carbon assessment and cost analysis in Brazil. *Energy Build.*, **227**, 110395, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2020.110395.

de Gracia, A., L. Navarro, A. Castell, Á. Ruiz-Pardo, S. Alvárez, and L. F. Cabeza, 2013: Experimental study of a ventilated facade with PCM during winter period. *Energy Build.*, **58**, 324–332, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2012.10.026.

Grande-acosta, G. K., and J. M. Islas-samperio, 2020: Boosting Energy Effciency and Solar Energy inside the Residential, Commercial, and Public Services Sectors in Mexico.

De Groote, O., and F. Verboven, 2019: Subsidies and time discounting in new technology adoption: Evidence from solar photovoltaic systems. *Am. Econ. Rev.*, **109**, 2137–2172, https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20161343.

Grove-Smith, J., V. Aydin, W. Feist, J. Schnieders, and S. Thomas, 2018: Standards and policies for very high energy efficiency in the urban building sector towards reaching the 1.5°C target. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.*, **30**, 103–114, https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COSUST.2018.04.006.

Grubler, A., and Coauthors, 2018: A low energy demand scenario for meeting the 1.5 °c target and sustainable development goals without negative emission technologies. *Nat. Energy*, **3**, 515–527, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41560-018-0172-6.

Guo, W., and Coauthors, 2020: Energy performance of photovoltaic (PV) windows under typical climates of China in terms of transmittance and orientation. *Energy*, **213**, 118794, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2020.118794.

Gursel, A. P., H. Maryman, and C. Ostertag, 2016: A life-cycle approach to environmental , mechanical , and durability properties of " green " concrete mixes with rice husk ash. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **112**, 823–836, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.06.029.

Habert, G., S. A. Miller, V. M. John, J. L. Provis, A. Favier, A. Horvath, and K. L. Scrivener, 2020: Environmental impacts and decarbonization strategies in the cement and concrete industries. *Nat. Rev. Earth Environ.*, **1**, 559–573, https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-020-0093-3.

Hadjadj, A., B. Benhaoua, A. Atia, A. Khechekhouche, N. Lebbihiat, and A. Rouag, 2020: Air velocity effect on the performance of geothermal helicoidally water-air heat exchanger under El Oued climate, Algeria. *Therm. Sci. Eng. Prog.*, **20**, 100548, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsep.2020.100548.

Haggag, M., A. Hassan, and S. Elmasry, 2014a: Experimental study on reduced heat gain through green façades in a high heat load climate. *Energy Build.*, **82**, 668–674, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2014.07.087.

——, ——, and ——, 2014b: Experimental study on reduced heat gain through green façades in a high heat load climate. *Energy Build.*, **82**, 668–674, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2014.07.087.

Hai, M. A., M. M. M.E, and U. Seppälä, 2017: Results of intention-behaviour gap for solar energy in regular residential buildings in Finland. *Int. J. Sustain. Built Environ.*, **6**, 317–329, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsbe.2017.04.002.

Hamam, M., G. Chinnici, G. Di Vita, G. Pappalardo, B. Pecorino, G. Maesano, and M. D'Amico, 2021: Circular economy models in agro-food systems: A review. *Sustain.*, **13**, 1–18, https://doi.org/10.3390/su13063453.

Hamilton, I., J. Milner, Z. Chalabi, P. Das, B. Jones, C. Shrubsole, M. Davies, and P. Wilkinson, 2015:

Health effects of home energy efficiency interventions in England: A modelling study. *BMJ Open*, **5**, 1–11, https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2014-007298.

Hanna, R., E. Duflo, and M. Greenstone, 2016: Up in smoke: The influence of household behavior on the long-run impact of improved cooking stoves. *Am. Econ. J. Econ. Policy*, **8**, 80–114, https://doi.org/10.1257/pol.20140008.

Harb, P., N. Locoge, and F. Thevenet, 2018: Emissions and treatment of VOCs emitted from wood-based construction materials: Impact on indoor air quality. *Chem. Eng. J.*, **354**, 641–652, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2018.08.085.

Harby, K., D. R. Gebaly, N. S. Koura, and M. S. Hassan, 2016: Performance improvement of vapor compression cooling systems using evaporative condenser: An overview. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **58**, 347–360, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.12.313.

Harris, S., É. Mata, A. Plepys, and C. Katzeff, 2021: Sharing is daring, but is it sustainable? An assessment of sharing cars, electric tools and offices in Sweden. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, **170**, 105583, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2021.105583.

Hart, J., K. Adams, J. Giesekam, D. D. Tingley, and F. Pomponi, 2019: Barriers and drivers in a circular economy: The case of the built environment. *Procedia CIRP*, **80**, 619–624, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2018.12.015.

Hasegawa, T., S. Fujimori, Y. Shin, A. Tanaka, K. Takahashi, and T. Masui, 2015: Consequence of Climate Mitigation on the Risk of Hunger. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, **49**, 7245–7253, https://doi.org/10.1021/es5051748.

Hassan Gholami, H., H. N. Nils Røstvik, and K. Steemers, 2021: The Contribution of Building-Integrated Photovoltaics (BIPV) to the Concept of Nearly Zero-Energy Cities in Europe: Potential and Challenges Ahead. *Energies*, 1–22.

Van den Heede, P., and N. De Belie, 2012: Environmental impact and life cycle assessment (LCA) of traditional and 'green' concretes: Literature review and theoretical calculations. *Cem. Concr. Compos.*, **34**, 431–442, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2012.01.004.

Heeren, N., C. L. Mutel, B. Steubing, Y. Ostermeyer, H. Wallbaum, and S. Hellweg, 2015: Environmental Impact of Buildings—What Matters? *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, **49**, 9832–9841, https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b01735.

Heffner, G., and N. Campbell, 2011: Evaluating the co-benefits of. 27–28.

Heiskanen, E., and K. Matschoss, 2017: Understanding the uneven diffusion of building-scale renewable energy systems: A review of household, local and country level factors in diverse European countries. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **75**, 580–591, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2016.11.027.

Hejazi, M. I., and Coauthors, 2015: 21st century United States emissions mitigation could increase water stress more than the climate change it is mitigating. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **112**, 10635–10640, https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1421675112.

Hens, H., W. Parijs, and M. Deurinck, 2010: Energy consumption for heating and rebound effects. *Energy Build.*, **42**, 105–110, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2009.07.017.

Hernandez-Roman, F., C. Sheinbaum-Pardo, and A. Calderon-Irazoque, 2017: "Socially neglected effect" in the implementation of energy technologies to mitigate climate change: Sustainable building program in social housing. *Energy Sustain. Dev.*, **41**, 149–156, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esd.2017.09.005.

Hildebrandt, J., N. Hagemann, and D. Thrän, 2017: The contribution of wood-based construction materials for leveraging a low carbon building sector in europe. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2017.06.013.

Himes, A., and G. Busby, 2020: Wood buildings as a climate solution. *Dev. Built Environ.*, **4**, 100030, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dibe.2020.100030.

Himeur, Y., A. Alsalemi, A. Al-Kababji, F. Bensaali, and A. Amira, 2020: Data fusion strategies for energy efficiency in buildings: Overview, challenges and novel orientations. *Inf. Fusion*, **64**, 99–120, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2020.07.003.

Hohne, P. A., K. Kusakana, and B. P. Numbi, 2019: Optimal energy management and economic analysis of a grid-connected hybrid solar water heating system: A case of Bloemfontein, South Africa. *Sustain. Energy Technol. Assessments*, **31**, 273–291, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seta.2018.12.027.

Holland, R. A., and Coauthors, 2015: Global impacts of energy demand on the freshwater resources of nations. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **112**, E6707–E6716, https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1507701112.

Holopainen, R., A. Milandru, H. Ahvenniemi, and T. Häkkinen, 2016: Feasibility Studies of Energy Retrofits - Case Studies of Nearly Zero-energy Building Renovation. *Energy Procedia*, Vol. 96 of, Elsevier Ltd, 146–157.

Holzmann, A., and E. Schmid, 2018: Consumer behaviour in the residential heating sector in Austria: Findings from a bottom-up modelling approach. *Energy Build.*, **158**, 486–493, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2017.10.036.

Hong, Y., L. Jaillon, P. Chu, and C. S. Poon, 2015a: Comparing carbon emissions of precast and cast-in-situ construction methods – A case study of high-rise private building. *Constr. Build. Mater.*, **99**, 39–53, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2015.08.145.

——, ——, ——, and ——, 2015b: Comparing carbon emissions of precast and cast-in-situ construction methods – A case study of high-rise private building. *Constr. Build. Mater.*, **99**, 39–53, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2015.08.145.

Hopkins, E. A., A. T. Carswell, and K. R. Love, 2020: Impacts of ENERGY STAR Appliances on U.S. Multifamily Rents. *Fam. Consum. Sci. Res. J.*, **49**, 37–51, https://doi.org/10.1111/fcsr.12372.

Hosseini, S. M., R. Shirmohammadi, A. Kasaeian, and F. Pourfayaz, 2021: Dynamic thermal simulation based on building information modeling: A review. *Int. J. Energy Res.*, **45**, 14221–14244, https://doi.org/10.1002/er.6740.

Howarth, C., and B. M. Roberts, 2018: The Role of the UK Green Deal in Shaping Pro-Environmental Behaviours: Insights from Two Case Studies. *Sustainability*, **10**, 2107, https://doi.org/10.3390/su10062107.

Huang, B., J. Lei, F. Ren, Y. Chen, Q. Zhao, S. Li, and Y. Lin, 2021: Contribution and obstacle analysis of applying BIM in promoting green buildings. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **278**, 123946, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.123946.

Huang, P., and Coauthors, 2019: Transforming a residential building cluster into electricity prosumers in Sweden: Optimal design of a coupled PV-heat pump-thermal storage-electric vehicle system. *Appl. Energy*, **255**, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.113864.

Hui, S. C. M., and K. L. Chan, 2011: Biodiversity assessment of green roofs for green building design. www.cbd.int.

Husin, M. H., M. F. Rahmat, and N. A. Wahab, 2020: Decentralized proportional-integral control with carbon addition for wastewater treatment plant. *Bull. Electr. Eng. Informatics*, **9**, 2278–2285, https://doi.org/10.11591/eei.v9i6.2170.

Hwang, B.-G., L. Zhu, Y. Wang, and X. Cheong, 2017: Green Building Construction Projects in Singapore. *Proj. Manag. J.*, **48**, 67–79.

Imanari, T., T. Omori, and K. Bogaki, 1999: Thermal comfort and energy consumption of the radiant ceiling panel system. *Energy Build.*, **30**, 167–175, https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-7788(98)00084-X.

Immerzeel, D. J., P. A. Verweij, F. Van der Hilst, and A. P. C. Faaij, 2014: Biodiversity impacts of bioenergy crop production: a state-of-the-art review. *GCB Bioenergy*, **6**, 183–209, https://doi.org/10.1111/gcbb.12067.

INBAR, 2019: *Ethiopian Bamboo Devlopment Strategy and Action Plan*.

Inetrnational Energy Agency, 2017: *Digitalization & Energy*. www.iea.org/t&c/.

Ingrao, C., A. Lo Giudice, C. Tricase, R. Rana, C. Mbohwa, and V. Siracusa, 2014: Recycled-PET fibre based panels for building thermal insulation: Environmental impact and improvement potential assessment for a greener production. *Sci. Total Environ.*, **493**, 914–929, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.06.022.

Irshad, K., K. Habib, R. Saidur, M. W. Kareem, and B. B. Saha, 2019: Study of thermoelectric and photovoltaic facade system for energy efficient building development: A review. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **209**, 1376–1395, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2018.09.245.

Ismailos, C., and M. F. Touchie, 2017: Achieving a low carbon housing stock: An analysis of low-rise residential carbon reduction measures for new construction in Ontario. *Build. Environ.*, **126**, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2017.09.034.

Ivanova, D., and M. Büchs, 2020: Household Sharing for Carbon and Energy Reductions: The Case of EU Countries. *Energies*, **13**, 1909, https://doi.org/10.3390/en13081909.

Izsak, K., and J. Edler, 2011: Trends and Challenges in Demand-Side Innovation Policies in Europe. Thematic Report 2011 under Specific Contract for the Integration of INNO Policy TrendChart with ERAWATCH (2011-2012).

Jabir, H. J., J. Teh, D. Ishak, and H. Abunima, 2018: Impacts of demand-side management on electrical power systems: A review. *Energies*, **11**, 1–19, https://doi.org/10.3390/en11051050.

Janhunen, E., N. Leskinen, and S. Junnila, 2020: The economic viability of a progressive smart building system with power storage. *Sustain.*, **12**, https://doi.org/10.3390/su12155998.

Jaramillo, N. C., C. C. J.F, and H. J. D.V, 2014: Smart meters adoption: Recent advances and future trends. *DYNA*, **81**, 221–230.

Jassim, N. A., 2017: Performance Enhancement of an Air Cooled Air Conditioner with Evaporative Water Mist Pre-cooling. **23**.

Jedidi, M., and O. Benjeddou, 2018: Effect of Thermal Bridges on the Heat Balance of Buildings. *Int. J. Sci. Res. Civ. Eng.*, **2**, 2456–6667.

Jensen, T., G. Holtz, and É. J. L. Chappin, 2015: Agent-based assessment framework for behavior-changing feedback devices: Spreading of devices and heating behavior. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, **98**, 105–119, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2015.06.006.

Jeuland, M., J. S. Tan Soo, and D. Shindell, 2018: The need for policies to reduce the costs of cleaner cooking in low income settings: Implications from systematic analysis of costs and benefits. *Energy Policy*, **121**, 275–285, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2018.06.031.

Jimenez, M., C. J. Franco, and I. Dyner, 2016: Diffusion of renewable energy technologies: The need for policy in Colombia. *Energy*, **111**, 818–829, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2016.06.051.

Johansson, M., M. Küller, and E. Pedersen, 2015: Understanding a housing cooperatives' reasons for rejecting energy-efficient outdoor lighting. *Light. Res. Technol.*, **47**, 876–892, https://doi.org/10.1177/1477153514555535.

Joimel, S., B. Grard, A. Auclerc, M. Hedde, N. Le Doaré, S. Salmon, and C. Chenu, 2018: Are Collembola “flying” onto green roofs? *Ecol. Eng.*, **111**, 117–124, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2017.12.002.

Joshi, G., V. Sen, and M. Kunte, 2020: Do star ratings matter? A qualitative study on consumer awareness and inclination to purchase energy-efficient home appliances. *Int. J. Soc. Ecol. Sustain. Dev.*, **11**, 40–41, https://doi.org/10.4018/IJSESD.2020100104.

Jung, N., M. E. Moula, T. Fang, M. Hamdy, and R. Lahdelma, 2016: Social acceptance of renewable energy technologies for buildings in the Helsinki Metropolitan Area of Finland. *Renew. Energy*, **99**, 813–824, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2016.07.006.

Junnila, S., J. Ottelin, and L. Leinikka, 2018: Influence of reduced ownership on the environmental benefits of the circular economy. *Sustain.*, **10**, https://doi.org/10.3390/su10114077.

K, P. H. S. B. K. S. J., 2019: Further reflections on vulnerability and resistance in the United Kingdom’s smart meter transition. *Energy Policy*, **124**, 411–417, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2018.08.038.

K, T. R. B. R. D. H. M., 2018: Which factors determine the extent of house owners’ energy-related refurbishment projects? A Motivation-Opportunity-Ability Approach. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **36**, 33–41, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2017.09.025.

Kakkos, E., F. Heisel, D. E. Hebel, and R. Hischier, 2020: Towards Urban Mining — Estimating the Potential Environmental Benefits by Applying an Alternative Construction Practice . A Case Study from Switzerland.

Kalnæs Simen Edsjøand Jelle, B. P., 2015: Phase change materials and products for building applications: A state-of-the-art review and future research opportunities. *Energy Build.*, **94**, 150–176, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2015.02.023.

Kameni Nematchoua, M., J. C. Vanona, and J. A. Orosa, 2020: Energy Efficiency and Thermal Performance of Office Buildings Integrated with Passive Strategies in Coastal Regions of Humid and Hot Tropical Climates in Madagascar. *Appl. Sci.*, **10**, 2438, https://doi.org/10.3390/app10072438.

Karlsson, M., E. Alfredsson, and N. Westling, 2020: Climate policy co-benefits: a review. *Clim. Policy*, **20**, 292–316, https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2020.1724070.

Kassem, M., and B. Succar, 2017: Macro BIM adoption: Comparative market analysis. *Autom. Constr.*, **81**, 286–299, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2017.04.005.

Kaur, J., and A. Bala, 2019: A hybrid energy management approach for home appliances using climatic forecasting. *Build. Simul.*, **12**, 1033–1045, https://doi.org/10.1007/s12273-019-0552-2.

Kelpsaite, L., R. Schloemann, and N. Kearney, 2019: Assessing testing capacity in ECOWAS and ASEAN regions to support S&L programs for cooling appliances. *Eceee Summer Study Proc.*, **2019-June**, 1713–1722.

Kendel, A., and N. Lazaric, 2015: The diffusion of smart meters in France. *J. Strateg. Manag.*, **8**, 231–244, https://doi.org/10.1108/JSMA-04-2015-0034.

Ketchman, K. J., D. R. Riley, V. Khanna, and M. M. Bilec, 2018: Survey of Homeowners’ Motivations for the Adoption of Energy Efficiency Measures: Evaluating a Holistic Energy Assessment Program. *J. Archit. Eng.*, **24**, 04018024, https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)AE.1943-5568.0000310.

Khadiran, T., M. Z. Hussein, Z. Zainal, and R. Rusli, 2016: Advanced energy storage materials for building applications and their thermal performance characterization: A review. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **57**, 916–928, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.12.081.

Khan, I., 2019: Energy-saving behaviour as a demand-side management strategy in the developing world: the case of Bangladesh. *Int. J. Energy Environ. Eng.*, **10**, 493–510, https://doi.org/10.1007/s40095-019-0302-3.

Khoshbakht, M., Z. Gou, K. Dupre, and H. Altan, 2016: Thermal Environments of an Office building with double skin facade. *J. Green Build.*, **20**, 1501–1510.

——, ——, ——, and ——, 2017: Thermal Environments of an Office building with double skin facade. *J. Green Build.*, **12**, https://doi.org/10.3992/1943-4618.12.3.3.

Khosla, R., 2016: Closing the policy gap: Building energy code lessons from Andhra Pradesh. *Econ. Polit. Wkly.*, **51**, 66–73.

——, A. Sagar, and A. Mathur, 2017: Deploying Low-carbon Technologies in Developing Countries: A view from India's buildings sector. *Environ. Policy Gov.*, **27**, 149–162, https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.1750.

Kim, A. A., Y. Sunitiyoso, and L. A. Medal, 2019: Understanding facility management decision making for energy efficiency efforts for buildings at a higher education institution. *Energy Build.*, **199**, 197–215, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2019.06.044.

Kirchhoff, H., and K. Strunz, 2019: Key drivers for successful development of peer-to-peer microgrids for swarm electrification. *Appl. Energy*, **244**, 46–62, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.03.016.

Koecklin, M. T., G. Longoria, D. Z. Fitiwi, J. F. DeCarolis, and J. Curtis, 2021: Public acceptance of renewable electricity generation and transmission network developments: Insights from Ireland. *Energy Policy*, **151**, 112185, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2021.112185.

Köhler, B., M. Stobbe, C. Moser, and F. Garzia, 2018: *Guideline II : nZEB Technolo- gies ACCELERATION FOR VIABLE NEARLY ZERO- Guideline II : nZEB Technolo- gies : Report on cost reduction potentials*.

Kontokosta, C. E., D. Spiegel-Feld, and S. Papadopoulos, 2020: The impact of mandatory energy audits on building energy use. *Nat. Energy*, **5**, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41560-020-0589-6.

Kosorić, V., H. Huang, A. Tablada, S. K. Lau, and H. T. W. Tan, 2019: Survey on the social acceptance of the productive façade concept integrating photovoltaic and farming systems in high-rise public housing blocks in Singapore. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **111**, 197–214, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2019.04.056.

Kremer, P., and M. A. Symmons, 2018: Perceived barriers to the widespread adoption of Mass Timber Construction: An Australian construction industry case study. *Mass Timber Constr. J.* , **1**, 8.

Kunwar, N., K. S. Cetin, and U. Passe, 2021: Energy & Buildings Calibration of energy simulation using optimization for buildings with dynamic shading systems. *Energy Build.*, **236**, 110787, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2021.110787.

Kuzmenko, K., C. Roux, A. Feraille, and O. Baverel, 2020: Assessing environmental impact of digital fabrication and reuse of constructive systems. *Structures*, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.istruc.2020.05.035.

Kwag, B. C., S. Han, G. T. Kim, B. Kim, and J. Y. Kim, 2020: Analysis of the Effects of Strengthening Building Energy Policy on Multifamily Residential Buildings in South Korea. *Sustainability*, **12**, 3566, https://doi.org/10.3390/su12093566.

L.K, N. J., F. N. F. N. Rasmussen, K. Whalen, A. Plepys, J. L. K. Nußholz, F. N. F. N. Rasmussen, K. Whalen, and A. Plepys, 2020a: Material reuse in buildings: Implications of a circular business model for sustainable value creation. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **245**, 118546, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.118546.

——, F. N. Rasmussen, K. Whalen, and A. Plepys, 2020b: Material reuse in buildings: Implications of a circular business model for sustainable value creation. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **245**, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.118546.

Laborel-Préneron, A., J. E. Aubert, C. Magniont, C. Tribout, and A. Bertron, 2016: Plant aggregates and fibers in earth construction materials: A review. *Constr. Build. Mater.*, **111**, 719–734, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.02.119.

Lacroix, E., and C. Chaton, 2015: Fuel poverty as a major determinant of perceived health: The case of France. *Public Health*, **129**, 517–524, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2015.02.007.

Laguarda Mallo, M. F., and O. Espinoza, 2015: Awareness, perceptions and willingness to adopt Cross-Laminated Timber by the architecture community in the United States. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **94**, 198–210, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.01.090.

Lay, J., J. Ondraczek, and J. Stoever, 2013: Renewables in the energy transition: Evidence on solar home systems and lighting fuel choice in kenya. *Energy Econ.*, **40**, 350–359, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2013.07.024.

Lee, J., and S. A. Tanverakul, 2015: Price elasticity of residential water demand in California. *J. Water Supply Res. Technol. - AQUA*, **64**, 211–218, https://doi.org/10.2166/aqua.2014.082.

Lee, J. H., P. Im, and Y. Song, 2018: Field test and simulation evaluation of variable refrigerant flow systems performance. *Energy Build.*, **158**, 1161–1169, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2017.10.077.

Leibrand, A., N. Sadoff, T. Maslak, and A. Thomas, 2019: Using Earth Observations to Help Developing Countries Improve Access to Reliable, Sustainable, and Modern Energy. *Front. Environ. Sci.*, **7**, 1–14, https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2019.00123.

Levy, J. I., M. K. Woo, S. L. Penn, M. Omary, Y. Tambouret, C. S. Kim, and S. Arunachalam, 2016: Carbon reductions and health co-benefits from US residential energy efficiency measures. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **11**, 34017, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/11/3/034017.

Li, J., H. Liu, J. Zuo, R. Xia, and G. Zillante, 2018: Are construction enterprises ready for industrialized residential building policy? A case study in Shenzhen. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **41**, 899–906, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2018.06.033.

Li, L., Z. Li, X. Li, S. Zhang, and X. Luo, 2020: A new framework of industrialized construction in China: Towards on-site industrialization. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **244**, 118469, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.118469.

Li, X., and Y. Zheng, 2020a: Using LCA to research carbon footprint for precast concrete piles during the building construction stage : A China study. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **245**, 118754, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.118754.

——, and ——, 2020b: Using LCA to research carbon footprint for precast concrete piles during the building construction stage : A China study. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **245**, 118754, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.118754.

Li, Y., S. Kubicki, A. Guerriero, and Y. Rezgui, 2019a: Review of building energy performance certification schemes towards future improvement. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **113**, 109244, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2019.109244.

Li, Z., J. Dai, H. Chen, and B. Lin, 2019b: An ANN-based fast building energy consumption prediction method for complex architectural form at the early design stage. 665–681.

Liang, C., M. Lu, and Y. Wu, 2012: Research on Indoor Thermal Environment in Winter and Retrofit Requirement in Existing Residential Buildings in China's Northern Heating Region. *Energy Procedia*, **16**, 983–990, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2012.01.157.

Liddell, C., and C. Guiney, 2015: Living in a cold and damp home: Frameworks for understanding impacts on mental well-being. *Public Health*, **129**, 191–199, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2014.11.007.

Lidelöw, S., T. Örn, A. Luciani, and A. Rizzo, 2019: Energy-efficiency measures for heritage buildings: A literature review. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **45**, 231–242, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2018.09.029.

Lilley, S., G. Davidson, and Z. Alwan, 2017: ExternalWall Insulation (EWI): Engaging social tenants in energy efficiency retrofitting in the North East of England. *Buildings*, **7**, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings7040102.

Lin, B., and H. Liu, 2015: A study on the energy rebound effect of China's residential building energy efficiency. *Energy Build.*, **86**, 608–618, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2014.10.049.

Lindholm, O., H. U. Rehman, and F. Reda, 2021: Positioning positive energy districts in European cities. *Buildings*, **11**, 1–31, https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings11010019.

Ling, J., H. Tong, J. Xing, and Y. Zhao, 2020: Simulation and optimization of the operation strategy of ASHP heating system: A case study in Tianjin. *Energy Build.*, **226**, 110349, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2020.110349.

Liu, G., Y. Tan, and X. Li, 2020: China's policies of building green retrofit: A state-of-the-art overview. *Build. Environ.*, **169**, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.106554.

Liu, Z., W. Li, Y. Chen, Y. Luo, and L. Zhang, 2019: Review of energy conservation technologies for fresh air supply in zero energy buildings. *Appl. Therm. Eng.*, **148**, 544–556, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2018.11.085.

Lorek, S., and J. H. Spangenberg, 2019: Energy sufficiency through social innovation in housing. *Energy Policy*, **126**, 287–294, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2018.11.026.

Lu, W., and H. Yuan, 2013: Investigating waste reduction potential in the upstream processes of offshore prefabrication construction. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **28**, 804–811, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2013.08.048.

Luo, Y., L. Zhang, X. Wang, L. Xie, Z. Liu, J. Wu, Y. Zhang, and X. He, 2017: A comparative study on thermal performance evaluation of a new double skin façade system integrated with photovoltaic blinds. *Appl. Energy*, **199**, 281–293, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.05.026.

Ma, S., B. Wang, X. Zhang, and X. Gao, 2016: ApplianceBricks: A scalable network appliance architecture for network functions virtualization. *China Commun.*, **13**, 32–42, https://doi.org/10.1109/CC.0.7560893.

MacNaughton, P., X. Cao, J. Buonocore, J. Cedeno-Laurent, J. Spengler, A. Bernstein, and J. Allen, 2018: Energy savings, emission reductions, and health co-benefits of the green building movement review-article. *J. Expo. Sci. Environ. Epidemiol.*, **28**, 307–318, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41370-017-0014-9.

Madonna, F., P. Quaglia, V. Corrado, and L. Croci, 2017: Influence of Comfort Expectations on Building Energy Need. *Energy Procedia*, **140**, 265–276, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2017.11.141.

Mahlia, T. M. I., and R. Saidur, 2010: A review on test procedure, energy efficiency standards and energy labels for room air conditioners and refrigerator-freezers. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **14**, 1888–1900, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2010.03.037.

Mahmoud, M., M. Ramadan, S. Naher, K. Pullen, A. Baroutaji, and A.-G. Olabi, 2020: Recent advances in district energy systems: A review. *Therm. Sci. Eng. Prog.*, **20**, 100678, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tsep.2020.100678.

Malla, M. B., N. Bruce, E. Bates, and E. Rehfuess, 2011: Applying global cost-benefit analysis methods to indoor air pollution mitigation interventions in Nepal, Kenya and Sudan: Insights and challenges. *Energy Policy*, **39**, 7518–7529, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2011.06.031.

Månberger, A., 2018: *Deep Decarbonization and Energy Security for Low-Carbon Societies*. 55 p. pp. www.iges.or.jp.

Mariano-Hernández, D., L. Hernández-Callejo, A. Zorita-Lamadrid, O. Duque-Pérez, and F. Santos García, 2021: A review of strategies for building energy management system: Model predictive control, demand side management, optimization, and fault detect & diagnosis. *J. Build. Eng.*, **33**, 101692, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2020.101692.

Markewitz, P., P. Hansen, W. Kuckshinrichs, and J. F. Hake, 2015: Strategies for a low carbon building stock in Germany. *8th International Scientific Conference on Energy and Climate Change*.

Markovska, N., N. Duić, B. V. Mathiesen, Z. Guzović, A. Piacentino, H. Schlör, and H. Lund, 2016: Addressing the main challenges of energy security in the twenty-first century – Contributions of the conferences on Sustainable Development of Energy, Water and Environment Systems. *Energy*, **115**, 1504–1512, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2016.10.086.

Mastrucci, A., E. Byers, S. Pachauri, and N. D. Rao, 2019: Improving the SDG energy poverty targets: Residential cooling needs in the Global South. *Energy Build.*, **186**, 405–415, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2019.01.015.

Mata, É., A. Sasic Kalagasidis, and F. Johnsson, 2015: Cost-effective retrofitting of Swedish residential buildings: effects of energy price developments and discount rates. *Energy Effic.*, **8**, https://doi.org/10.1007/s12053-014-9287-1.

——, J. Wanemark, V. M. Nik, and A. Sasic Kalagasidis, 2019: Economic feasibility of building retrofitting mitigation potentials: Climate change uncertainties for Swedish cities. *Appl. Energy*, **242**, 1022–1035, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.03.042.

——, S. Harris, A. Novikova, A. F. P. Lucena, and P. Bertoldi, 2020a: Climate Mitigation from Circular and Sharing Economy in the Buildings Sector. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, **158**, 104817, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2020.104817.

——, A. K. Korpal, S. H. Cheng, J. P. Jiménez Navarro, F. Filippidou, J. Reyna, and R. Wang, 2020b: A map of roadmaps for zero and low energy and carbon buildings worldwide. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **15**, 113003, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abb69f.

——, J. Ottosson, and J. Nilsson, 2020c: A review of flexibility of residential electricity demand as climate solution in four EU countries. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **15**, 073001, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab7950.

——, D. Peñaloza, J. Wanemark, and F. Sandkvist, 2021: A review of reasons for (non) adoption of low carbon building solutions. *Environ. Innov. Soc. Transitions*,.

Mavrigiannaki, A., and E. Ampatzi, 2016: Latent heat storage in building elements: A systematic review on properties and contextual performance factors. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **60**, 852–866, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2016.01.115.

Mayrand, F., and P. Clergeau, 2018a: Green roofs and greenwalls for biodiversity conservation: A contribution to urban connectivity? *Sustain.*, **10**, https://doi.org/10.3390/su10040985.

——, and ——, 2018b: Green Roofs and Green Walls for Biodiversity Conservation: A Contribution to Urban Connectivity? *Sustainability*, **10**, 985, https://doi.org/10.3390/su10040985.

McCollum, D. L., and Coauthors, 2018: Connecting the sustainable development goals by their energy inter-linkages. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **13**, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aaafe3.

McGibbon, C., J. Ophoff, V. Belle, and J. P, 2014: Our building is smarter than your building: The use of competitive rivalry to reduce energy consumption and linked carbon footprint. *Knowl. Manag. E-Learning*, **6**, 464–471.

McNeil, M. A., V. E. Letschert, S. de la Rue du Can, and J. Ke, 2013: Bottom-Up Energy Analysis

System (BUENAS)-an international appliance efficiency policy tool. *Energy Effic.*, **6**, 191–217, https://doi.org/10.1007/s12053-012-9182-6.

Mehetre, S. A., N. L. Panwar, D. Sharma, and H. Kumar, 2017: Improved biomass cookstoves for sustainable development: A review. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **73**, 672–687, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.01.150.

Mengolini, A., F. Gangale, and J. Vasiljevska, 2016: Exploring community-oriented approaches in demand side management projects in Europe. *Sustain.*, **8**, 1–12, https://doi.org/10.3390/su8121266.

Mi, P., L. Ma, and J. Zhang, 2020: Integrated optimization study of hot water supply system with multi-heat-source for the public bath based on PVT heat pump and water source heat pump. *Appl. Therm. Eng.*, **176**, 115146, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2020.115146.

Miara, A., C. Tarr, R. Spellman, C. J. Vörösmarty, and J. E. Macknick, 2014: The power of efficiency: Optimizing environmental and social benefits through demand-side-management. *Energy*, **76**, 502–512, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2014.08.047.

Miezis, M., K. Zvaigznitis, N. Stancioff, and L. Soeftestad, 2016: Climate change and buildings energy efficiency - The key role of residents. *Environ. Clim. Technol.*, **17**, 30–43, https://doi.org/10.1515/rtuect-2016-0004.

Militello-Hourigan, R. E., and S. L. Miller, 2018: The impacts of cooking and an assessment of indoor air quality in Colorado passive and tightly constructed homes. *Build. Environ.*, **144**, 573–582, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2018.08.044.

Mills, E., 2016: Job creation and energy savings through a transition to modern off-grid lighting. *Energy Sustain. Dev.*, **33**, 155–166, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esd.2016.06.001.

Mir-Artigues, P., P. del Río, and E. Cerdá, 2018: The impact of regulation on demand-side generation. The case of Spain. *Energy Policy*, **121**, 286–291, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2018.05.008.

Mirasgedis, S., C. Tourkolias, E. Pavlakis, and D. Diakoulaki, 2014: A methodological framework for assessing the employment effects associated with energy efficiency interventions in buildings. *Energy Build.*, **82**, 275–286, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2014.07.027.

Mofidi, F., and H. Akbari, 2017: Personalized energy costs and productivity optimization in offices. *Energy Build.*, **143**, 173–190, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2017.03.018.

Mohit, A., R. Felix, C. Lynette, and S. Arlindo, 2020: Buildings and the circular economy: Estimating urban mining, recovery and reuse potential of building components. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, **154**, 104581, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2019.104581.

Mokhlesian, S., and M. Holmén, 2012: Business model changes and green construction processes. *Constr. Manag. Econ.*, **30**, 761–775, https://doi.org/10.1080/01446193.2012.694457.

Montoya, F. G., and A. J. Perea-moreno, 2020: Environmental Energy Sustainability at Universities. *Sustainability*, **12**, 9219, https://doi.org/10.3390/su12219219.

Morck, O., M. S. M. Gutierrez, K. E. Thomsen, and K. B. Wittchen, 2019: Life-cycle cost and environmental assessment of nearly zero-energy buildings (NZEBs) in four European countries. *IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering*, Vol. 609 of, Institute of Physics Publishing.

Moreno, M., C. De los Rios, Z. Rowe, and F. Charnley, 2016: A conceptual framework for circular design. *Sustain.*, **8**, https://doi.org/10.3390/su8090937.

Morris, P., D. Vine, and L. Buys, 2018: Critical Success Factors for Peak Electricity Demand Reduction: Insights from a Successful Intervention in a Small Island Community. *J. Consum. Policy*, **41**, 33–54, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10603-017-9366-8.

Mortensen, A., P. Heiselberg, and M. Knudstrup, 2016: Identification of key parameters determining Danish homeowners' willingness and motivation for energy renovations. *Int. J. Sustain. Built Environ.*, **5**, 246–268, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsbe.2016.09.002.

Moser, C., 2017: The role of perceived control over appliances in the acceptance of electricity load-shifting programmes. *Energy Effic.*, **10**, 1115–1127, https://doi.org/10.1007/s12053-017-9508-5.

Mujahid Rafique, M., P. Gandhidasan, S. Rehman, and L. M. Al-Hadhrami, 2015: A review on desiccant based evaporative cooling systems. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **45**, 145–159, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.01.051.

Murray, C. K., 2013: What if consumers decided to all "go green"? Environmental rebound effects from consumption decisions. *Energy Policy*, **54**, 240–256, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2012.11.025.

Mzavanadze, N., 2018: *Quantifying energy poverty relatedhealth impacts of energy efficiency*.

Nakic, D., 2018: Environmental evaluation of concrete with sewage sludge ash based on LCA. *Sustain. Prod. Consum.*, **16**, 193–201, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spc.2018.08.003.

Nambiar, E. K. S., 2019: Tamm Review: Re-imagining forestry and wood business: pathways to rural development, poverty alleviation and climate change mitigation in the tropics. *For. Ecol. Manage.*, **448**, 160–173, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foreco.2019.06.014.

Navarro-rubio, J., P. Pineda, and A. García-martínez, 2019a: Sustainability , prefabrication and building optimization under di ff erent durability and re-using scenarios : Potential of dry precast structural connections. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **44**, 614–628, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2018.10.045.

——, ——, and ——, 2019b: Sustainability , prefabrication and building optimization under di ff erent durability and re-using scenarios : Potential of dry precast structural connections. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **44**, 614–628, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2018.10.045.

Navarro, L., A. de Gracia, A. Castell, and L. F. Cabeza, 2016a: Experimental evaluation of a concrete core slab with phase change materials for cooling purposes. *Energy Build.*, **116**, 411–419, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.01.026.

——, ——, S. Colclough, M. Browne, S. J. McCormack, P. Griffiths, and L. F. Cabeza, 2016b: Thermal energy storage in building integrated thermal systems: A review. Part 1. active storage systems. *Renew. Energy*, **88**, 526–547, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2015.11.040.

Nfornkah, B. N., C. C. Djomo, F. G. Walter, and R. Kaam, 2020: *Bamboo Policy Integration Analysis Cameroon*.

Nguyen, H. T., D. T. Nguyen, and L. B. Le, 2015: Energy management for households with solar assisted thermal load considering renewable energy and price uncertainty. *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid*, **6**, 301–314, https://doi.org/10.1109/TSG.2014.2350831.

Niamir, L., and Coauthors, 2017: Construction waste management policies and their effectiveness in Hong Kong: A longitudinal review. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, **23**, 214–223, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2013.03.007.

——, G. Kiesewetter, F. Wagner, W. Schöpp, T. Filatova, A. Voinov, and H. Bressers, 2020: Assessing the macroeconomic impacts of individual behavioral changes on carbon emissions. *Clim. Change*, **158**, 141–160, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-019-02566-8.

Niemelä, T., K. Levy, R. Kosonen, and J. Jokisalo, 2017: Cost-optimal renovation solutions to maximize environmental performance, indoor thermal conditions and productivity of office buildings in cold climate. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **32**, 417–434, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2017.04.009.

Nikou, S., 2019: Factors driving the adoption of smart home technology: An empirical assessment. *Telemat. Informatics*, **45**, 101283, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2019.101283.

Nocera, F., S. Giuffrida, M. R. Trovato, and A. Gagliano, 2019: Energy and new economic approach for nearly zero energy hotels. *Entropy*, **21**, https://doi.org/10.3390/e21070639.

Noro, M., R. M. Lazzarin, and F. Busato, 2014: Solar cooling and heating plants: An energy and economic analysis of liquid sensible vs phase change material (PCM) heat storage. *Int. J. Refrig.*, **39**, 104–116, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrefrig.2013.07.022.

Novikova, A., T. Csoknyai, M. D. Jovanovi, B. D. Stankovi, and Z. Szalay, 2018: Assessment of Decarbonization Scenarios for the residential buildings of Serbia. **22**, 1231–1247.

Obiri, B. D., K. A. Oduro, E. A. Obeng, S. Pentsil, and E. Appiah-Kubi, 2020: *Bamboo Value Chain Study: Ghana*. 118 pp.

Oesterreich, T. D., and F. Teuteberg, 2019: Behind the scenes: Understanding the socio-technical barriers to BIM adoption through the theoretical lens of information systems research. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, **146**, 413–431, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2019.01.003.

Olawumi, T. O., D. W. M. Chan, J. K. W. Wong, and A. P. C. Chan, 2018: Barriers to the integration of BIM and sustainability practices in construction projects: A Delphi survey of international experts. *J. Build. Eng.*, **20**, 60–71, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2018.06.017.

Olsthoorn, D., F. Haghighat, A. Moreau, and G. Lacroix, 2017: Abilities and limitations of thermal mass activation for thermal comfort, peak shifting and shaving: A review. *Build. Environ.*, **118**, 113–127, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2017.03.029.

Omara, A. A. M., and A. A. A. Abuelnour, 2019: Improving the performance of air conditioning systems by using phase change materials: A review. *Int. J. Energy Res.*, **43**, 5175–5198, https://doi.org/10.1002/er.4507.

Omrany, H., A. GhaffarianHoseini, A. GhaffarianHoseini, K. Raahemifar, and J. Tookey, 2016: Application of passive wall systems for improving the energy effciency in buildings: A comprehensive review. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **62**, 1252–1269, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2016.04.010.

Onyenokporo, N. C., and E. T. Ochedi, 2019: Low-cost retrofit packages for residential buildings in hot-humid Lagos, Nigeria. *Int. J. Build. Pathol. Adapt.*, **37**, 250–272, https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBPA-01-2018-0010.

Orea, L., M. Llorca, and M. Filippini, 2015: A new approach to measuring the rebound effect associated to energy efficiency improvements: An application to the US residential energy demand. *Energy Econ.*, **49**, 599–609, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2015.03.016.

Orsini, F., and P. Marrone, 2019: Approaches for a low-carbon production of building materials: A review. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **241**, 118380, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.118380.

Ortiz, J., N. Casquero-Modrego, and J. Salom, 2019: Health and related economic effects of residential energy retrofitting in Spain. *Energy Policy*, **130**, 375–388, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2019.04.013.

Ortiz, O., F. Castells, and G. Sonnemann, 2009: Sustainability in the construction industry: A review of recent developments based on LCA. *Constr. Build. Mater.*, **23**, 28–39, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2007.11.012.

Osmani, M., 2012: Construction Waste Minimization in the UK: Current Pressures for Change and Approaches. *Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci.*, **40**, 37–40, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.03.158.

Österbring, M., C. Camarasa, C. Nägeli, L. Thuvander, and H. Wallbaum, 2019: Prioritizing deep renovation for housing portfolios. *Energy Build.*, **202**, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2019.109361.

Osunmuyiwa, O. O., S. R. Payne, P. Vigneswara Ilavarasan, A. D. Peacock, and D. P. Jenkins, 2020: I cannot live without air conditioning! The role of identity, values and situational factors on cooling consumption patterns in India. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.*, **69**, 101634, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2020.101634.

Overholm, H., 2015: Spreading the rooftop revolution: What policies enable solar-as-a-service? *Energy Policy*, **84**, 69–79, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2015.04.021.

Ozarisoy, B., and H. Altan, 2017: Adoption of Energy Design Strategies for Retrofitting Mass Housing Estates in Northern Cyprus. *Sustainability*, **9**, 1477, https://doi.org/10.3390/su9081477.

P., M., C. X., B. J., C.-L. J., S. J., B. A., and A. J., 2018: Energy savings, emission reductions, and health co-benefits of the green building movement. *J. Expo. Sci. Environ. Epidemiol.*, **28**, 307–318, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41370-017-0014-9.

Paduos, S., and V. Corrado, 2017: Cost-optimal approach to transform the public buildings into nZEBs: An European cross-country comparison. *Energy Procedia*, Vol. 140 of, Elsevier Ltd, 314–324.

Pahinkar, D. G., D. B. Boman, and S. Garimella, 2020: High performance microchannel adsorption heat pumps . *Int. J. Refrig.*, **119**, 184–194, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrefrig.2020.07.020.

Pal, D., B. Papasratorn, W. Chutimaskul, and S. Funilkul, 2019: Embracing the Smart-Home Revolution in Asia by the Elderly: An End-User Negative Perception Modeling. *IEEE Access*, **7**, 38535–38549, https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2906346.

Palermo, V., P. Bertoldi, M. Apostolou, A. Kona, and S. Rivas, 2020: Assessment of climate change mitigation policies in 315 cities in the Covenant of Mayors initiative. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **60**, 102258, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2020.102258.

Pamenter, S., and R. J. Myers, 2021: Decarbonizing the cementitious materials cycle: A whole-systems review of measures to decarbonize the cement supply chain in the UK and European contexts. *J. Ind. Ecol.*, **25**, 359–376, https://doi.org/10.1111/jiec.13105.

Papadopoulos, S., C. E. Kontokosta, A. Vlachokostas, and E. Azar, 2019: Rethinking HVAC temperature setpoints in commercial buildings: The potential for zero-cost energy savings and comfort improvement in different climates. *Build. Environ.*, **155**, 350–359, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.03.062.

Pardo, J. E., A. Mejías, and A. Sartal, 2020: Assessing the importance of biomass-based heating systems for more sustainable buildings: A case study based in Spain. *Energies*, **13**, 1025, https://doi.org/10.3390/en13051025.

Park, E., S. Kim, Y. S. Kim, and S. J. Kwon, 2018: Smart home services as the next mainstream of the ICT industry: determinants of the adoption of smart home services. *Univers. Access Inf. Soc.*, **17**, 175–190, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10209-017-0533-0.

Park, J., J. Sarkis, and Z. Wu, 2010: Creating integrated business and environmental value within the context of China's circular economy and ecological modernization. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **18**, 1494–1501, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2010.06.001.

Parupudi, R. V., H. Singh, and M. Kolokotroni, 2020: Low Concentrating Photovoltaics (LCPV) for buildings and their performance analyses. *Appl. Energy*, **279**, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2020.115839.

Patwa, N., U. Sivarajah, A. Seetharaman, S. Sarkar, K. Maiti, and K. Hingorani, 2021: Towards a circular economy: An emerging economies context. *J. Bus. Res.*, **122**, 725–735, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.05.015.

Pauliuk, S., N. Heeren, P. Berrill, T. Fishman, A. Nistad, Q. Tu, P. Wolfram, and E. G. Hertwich, 2021a: Global scenarios of resource and emission savings from material efficiency in residential buildings and cars. *Nat. Commun.*, **12**, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-25300-4.

——, ——, ——, ——, ——, ——, ——, and ——, 2021b: Global scenarios of resource and emission savings from material efficiency in residential buildings and cars. *Nat. Commun.*, **12**, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-25300-4.

Payne, J., F. Downy, and D. Weatherall, 2015: Capturing the "multiple benefits" of energy efficiency in practice: the UK example. *ECEEE 2015 Summer Study*, 229–238 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/hmrc-exchange-rates-for-.

Pedzi Makumbe, Manuela Mot, Marwa Moustafa Khalil, and M. H., 2017: *Energy Efficiency and Rooftop Solar PV Opportunities in Cairo and Alexandria*. 38 pp.

Pellegrini-Masini, G., 2019: Energy equality and energy sufficiency: New policy principles to accelerate the energy transition. *Eceee Summer Study Proc.*, **2019-June**, 143–148.

Peñaloza, D., M. Erlandsson, and A. Falk, 2016: Exploring the climate impact effects of increased use of bio-based materials in buildings. *Constr. Build. Mater.*, **125**, 219–226, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2016.08.041.

——, É. Mata, N. Fransson, H. Fridén, Á. Samperio, A. Quijano, and A. Cuneo, 2021: Social and market acceptance of photovoltaic panels and heat pumps in Europe - Review and survey. *Renew. Sustain. ENERGY Rev.*,.

Peng, P., G. Gong, X. Deng, C. Liang, and W. Li, 2020: Field study and numerical investigation on heating performance of air carrying energy radiant air-conditioning system in an office. *Energy Build.*, **209**, 109712, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2019.109712.

Pérez-Bella, J. M., J. Domínguez-Hernández, E. Cano-Suñén, J. J. Del Coz-Díaz, and B. R. Soria, 2017: Adjusting the design thermal conductivity considered by the Spanish building technical code for façade materials. *Dyna*, **92**, 195–201, https://doi.org/10.6036/8005.

Pérez-Lombard, L., J. Ortiz, J. F. Coronel, and I. R. Maestre, 2011: A review of HVAC systems requirements in building energy regulations. *Energy Build.*, **43**, 255–268, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2010.10.025.

Pérez, G., J. Coma, I. Martorell, and L. F. Cabeza, 2014: Vertical Greenery Systems (VGS) for energy saving in buildings: A review. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **39**, 139–165, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2014.07.055.

Pigliautile, I., S. D'Eramo, and A. L. Pisello, 2021: Intra-urban microclimate mapping for citizens' wellbeing: Novel wearable sensing techniques and automatized data-processing. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **279**, 123748, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.123748.

Pillai, R. G., R. Gettu, M. Santhanam, S. Rengaraju, Y. Dhandapani, S. Rathnarajan, and A. S. Basavaraj, 2019: Service life and life cycle assessment of reinforced concrete systems with limestone calcined clay cement (LC3). *Cem. Concr. Res.*, **118**, 111–119, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cemconres.2018.11.019.

Pisello, A. L., and F. Asdrubali, 2014: Human-based energy retrofits in residential buildings: A cost-effective alternative to traditional physical strategies. *Appl. Energy*, **133**, 224–235, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2014.07.049.

Pittau, F., F. Krause, G. Lumia, and G. Habert, 2018: Fast-growing bio-based materials as an opportunity for storing carbon in exterior walls. *Build. Environ.*, **129**, 117–129, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2017.12.006.

Poggi, F., A. Firmino, and M. Amado, 2018: Planning renewable energy in rural areas: Impacts on occupation and land use. *Energy*, **155**, 630–640, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2018.05.009.

Pomponi, F., P. A. E. Piroozfar, R. Southall, P. Ashton, and E. R. P. Farr, 2016a: Energy performance of Double-Skin Façades in temperate climates: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Renew.*

Sustain. Energy Rev., **54**, 1525–1536, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.10.075.

——, ——, ——, ——, and ——, 2016b: Energy performance of Double-Skin Façades in temperate climates: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **54**, 1525–1536, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.10.075.

——, J. Hart, J. H. Arehart, and B. D'Amico, 2020: Buildings as a Global Carbon Sink? A Reality Check on Feasibility Limits. *One Earth*, **3**, 157–161, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2020.07.018.

Ponce de Leon Barido, D., S. Suffian, D. M. Kammen, and D. Callaway, 2018: Opportunities for behavioral energy efficiency and flexible demand in data-limited low-carbon resource constrained environments. *Appl. Energy*, **228**, 512–523, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2018.06.115.

Poortinga, W., A. Spence, C. Demski, and N. F. Pidgeon, 2012: Individual-motivational factors in the acceptability of demand-side and supply-side measures to reduce carbon emissions. *Energy Policy*, **48**, 812–819, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2012.06.029.

——, S. Jiang, C. Grey, and C. Tweed, 2018: Impacts of energy-efficiency investments on internal conditions in low-income households. *Build. Res. Inf.*, **46**, 653–667, https://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2017.1314641.

Prada-hernández, A., H. Vargas, A. Ozuna, and J. L. Ponz-tienda, 2015: Marginal Abatement Costs Curve (MACC) for Carbon Emissions Reduction from Buildings : An Implementation for Office Buildings in Colombia of Carbon Emissions from. *Int. J. Civ. Struct. Eng. IJCSE*, **2**, 175–183.

Prívara, S., J. Široký, L. Ferkl, and J. Cigler, 2011: Model predictive control of a building heating system: The first experience. *Energy Build.*, **43**, 564–572, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2010.10.022.

Qiu, Y., G. Colson, and C. Grebitus, 2014: Risk preferences and purchase of energy-efficient technologies in the residential sector. *Ecol. Econ.*, **107**, 216–229, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2014.09.002.

——, M. E. Kahn, and B. Xing, 2019: Quantifying the rebound effects of residential solar panel adoption. *J. Environ. Econ. Manage.*, **96**, 310–341, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeem.2019.06.003.

Qureshi, T. M., K. Ullah, and M. J. Arentsen, 2017: Factors responsible for solar PV adoption at household level: A case of Lahore, Pakistan. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **78**, 754–763, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.04.020.

Radhi, H., 2011: Viability of autoclaved aerated concrete walls for the residential sector in the United Arab Emirates. *Energy Build.*, **43**, 2086–2092, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2011.04.018.

Radmehr, M., K. Willis, and U. E. Kenechi, 2014: A framework for evaluating WTP for BIPV in residential housing design in developing countries: A case study of North Cyprus. *Energy Policy*, **70**, 207–216, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2014.03.041.

Rafique, A., and A. P. Williams, 2021: Reducing household greenhouse gas emissions from space and water heating through low-carbon technology: Identifying cost-effective approaches. *Energy Build.*, **248**, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2021.111162.

Rahman, K. A., M. Z. M. Yusof, M. N. M. Salleh, and A. M. Leman, 2015: Implementation of energy efficiency standards and labelling for household electrical appliances: A comparison among Asian countries. *Chem. Eng. Trans.*, **45**, 1663–1668, https://doi.org/10.3303/CET1545278.

Rajagopal, K., V. Mahajan, S. Sen, and S. Divkar, 2019: Energy efficient smart home automation adoption-A research. *Int. J. Innov. Technol. Explor. Eng.*, **8**, 536–540, https://doi.org/10.35940/ijitee.K1090.09811S19.

Raji, B., M. J. Tenpierik, and A. Van Den Dobbelsteen, 2015: The impact of greening systems on building energy performance: A literature review. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **45**, 610–623, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.02.011.

Rao, N. D., and S. Pachauri, 2017: Energy access and living standards: Some observations on recent trends. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **12**, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aa5b0d.

Rao, N. D., A. Agarwal, and D. Wood, 2016: *Impact of small-scale electricity system*. 66 p. pp. www.iiasa.ac.at.

Rashid, M. M. U., M. A. Alotaibi, A. H. Chowdhury, M. Rahman, M. S. Alam, M. A. Hossain, and M. A. Abido, 2021: Home energy management for community microgrids using optimal power sharing algorithm. *Energies*, **14**, https://doi.org/10.3390/en14041060.

Reddy, K. S., V. Mudgal, and T. K. Mallick, 2018: Review of latent heat thermal energy storage for improved material stability and effective load management. *J. Energy Storage*, **15**, 205–227, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.est.2017.11.005.

Reindl, K., and J. Palm, 2020: Energy efficiency in the building sector: A combined middle-out and practice theory approach. *Int. J. Sustain. Energy Plan. Manag.*, **28**, 3–16, https://doi.org/10.5278/ijsepm.3426.

Reiter, U., A. Palacios, M. Jakob, P. Manz, and T. Fleiter, 2019: Cost-curves for heating and cooling demand reduction in residential buildings. *Eceee Summer Study Proceedings*, Vol. 2019-June of.

Ren, H., M. Tibbs, C. McLauchlan, Z. Ma, and L. Harrington, 2021: Refrigerator cost trap for low-income households: Developments in measurement and verification of appliance replacements. *Energy Sustain. Dev.*, **60**, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esd.2020.11.001.

Rey-Moreno, M., and C. Medina-Molina, 2020: Dual models and technological platforms for efficient management of water consumption. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, **150**, 119761, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2019.119761.

Rice, L., 2020: Healthy BIM : the feasibility of integrating architecture health indicators using a building information model (BIM) computer system. https://doi.org/10.1108/ARCH-07-2020-0133.

Riley, B., 2017: The state of the art of living walls: Lessons learned. *Build. Environ.*, **114**, 219–232, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2016.12.016.

Del Río Castro, G., M. C. González Fernández, and Á. Uruburu Colsa, 2021: Unleashing the convergence amid digitalization and sustainability towards pursuing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs): A holistic review. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **280**, 122204, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.122204.

Roca-Puigròs, M., R. G. Billy, A. Gerber, P. Wäger, and D. B. Müller, 2020: Pathways toward a carbon-neutral Swiss residential building stock. *Build. Cities*, **1**, 579–593, https://doi.org/10.5334/bc.61.

Röck, M., A. Hollberg, G. Habert, and A. Passer, 2018: LCA and BIM: Visualization of environmental potentials in building construction at early design stages. *Build. Environ.*, **140**, 153–161, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2018.05.006.

Romdhane, J., and H. Louahlia-Gualous, 2018: Energy assessment of PEMFC based MCCHP with absorption chiller for small scale French residential application. *Int. J. Hydrogen Energy*, **43**, 19661–19680, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2018.08.132.

Rosado, P. J., and R. Levinson, 2019a: Potential benefits of cool walls on residential and commercial buildings across California and the United States: Conserving energy, saving money, and reducing emission of greenhouse gases and air pollutants. *Energy Build.*, **199**, 588–607, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2019.02.028.

Rosado, P. J., and R. Levinson, 2019b: Potential benefits of cool walls on residential and commercial buildings across California and the United States: Conserving energy, saving money, and reducing emission of greenhouse gases and air pollutants. *Energy Build.*, **199**, 588–607, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2019.02.028.

Rosenow, J., and E. Bayer, 2017: Costs and benefits of Energy Efficiency Obligations: A review of European programmes. *Energy Policy*, **107**, 53–62, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2017.04.014.

Rosenthal, J., A. Quinn, A. P. Grieshop, A. Pillarisetti, and R. I. Glass, 2018: Clean cooking and the SDGs: Integrated analytical approaches to guide energy interventions for health and environment goals. *Energy Sustain. Dev.*, **42**, 152–159, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esd.2017.11.003.

Rosse Caldas, L., A. Bernstad Saraiva, V. M. Andreola, and R. Dias Toledo Filho, 2020: Bamboo bio-concrete as an alternative for buildings' climate change mitigation and adaptation. *Constr. Build. Mater.*, **263**, 120652, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conbuildmat.2020.120652.

Roth, L., J. Lowitzsch, Ö. Yildiz, and A. Hashani, 2018: Does (Co-)ownership in renewables matter for an electricity consumer's demand flexibility? Empirical evidence from Germany. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.*, **46**, 169–182, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.07.009.

Ruokamo, E., M. Kopsakangas-Savolainen, T. Meriläinen, and R. Svento, 2019: Towards flexible energy demand – Preferences for dynamic contracts, services and emissions reductions. *Energy Econ.*, **84**, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2019.104522.

Russo, A. C., M. Rossi, M. Germani, and C. Favi, 2018: Energy Label Directive: Current Limitations and Guidelines for the Improvement. *Procedia CIRP*, **69**, 674–679, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procir.2017.11.136.

Saade, M. R. M., A. Yahia, and B. Amor, 2020: How has LCA been applied to 3D printing? A systematic literature review and recommendations for future studies. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **244**, 118803, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.118803.

Sabarish, J., S. Sonali, and P. T. R. Vidhyaa, 2021: Application of Big Data in Field of Medicine. P. J.D., F. S.L., A. A.H., and A. A.H., Eds., Vol. 1167 of, Springer, 473–484.

Sadeghi, S. A., P. Karava, I. Konstantzos, and A. Tzempelikos, 2016: Occupant interactions with shading and lighting systems using different control interfaces: A pilot field study. *Build. Environ.*, **97**, 177–195, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2015.12.008.

Safdar, M., G. A. Hussain, and M. Lehtonen, 2019: Costs of demand response from residential customers' perspective. *Energies*, **12**, 1–16, https://doi.org/10.3390/en12091617.

Saffari, M., A. de Gracia, C. Fernández, and L. F. Cabeza, 2017a: Simulation-based optimization of PCM melting temperature to improve the energy performance in buildings. *Appl. Energy*, **202**, 420–434, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.05.107.

——, ——, ——, and ——, 2017b: Simulation-based optimization of PCM melting temperature to improve the energy performance in buildings. *Appl. Energy*, **202**, 420–434, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.05.107.

Sagebiel, J., and K. Rommel, 2014: Preferences for electricity supply attributes in emerging megacities - Policy implications from a discrete choice experiment of private households in Hyderabad, India. *Energy Sustain. Dev.*, **21**, 89–99, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esd.2014.06.002.

Saheb, Y., H. Ossenbrink, S. Szabo, K. Bódis, and S. Panev, 2018: Energy transition of Europe's building stock Implications for EU 2030 Sustainable Development Goals. *Responsab. Environ.*, **90**, 62–67.

Sandberg, N. H., I. Sartori, M. I. Vestrum, and H. Brattebø, 2017: Using a segmented dynamic dwelling stock model for scenario analysis of future energy demand: The dwelling stock of Norway 2016–2050. *Energy Build.*, **146**, 220–232, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2017.04.016.

Santos, R., A. Aguiar Costa, J. D. Silvestre, and L. Pyl, 2020: Development of a BIM-based Environmental and Economic Life Cycle Assessment tool. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **265**, 121705, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121705.

Santos, R. S., J. C. O. C. O. Matias, A. Abreu, and F. Reis, 2018: Evolutionary algorithms on reducing energy consumption in buildings: An approach to provide smart and efficiency choices, considering the rebound effect. *Comput. Ind. Eng.*, **126**, 729–755, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cie.2018.09.050.

SARASTI, C. A., 2015: Modelling factors influencing the adoption of smart-home technologies Introduction. *Ekp*, **13**, 1576–1580.

Sarbu, I., and C. Sebarchievici, 2014: General review of ground-source heat pump systems for heating and cooling of buildings. *Energy Build.*, **70**, 441–454, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2013.11.068.

Schäuble, D., A. Marian, and L. Cremonese, 2020: Conditions for a cost-effective application of smart thermostat systems in residential buildings. *Appl. Energy*, **262**, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2020.114526.

Scheer, J., M. Clancy, and S. N. Hógáin, 2013: Quantification of energy savings from Ireland’s Home Energy Saving scheme: An ex post billing analysis. *Energy Effic.*, **6**, 35–48, https://doi.org/10.1007/s12053-012-9164-8.

Schenkel, M., M. C. J. Caniëls, H. Krikke, and E. Van Der Laan, 2015: Understanding value creation in closed loop supply chains - Past findings and future directions. *J. Manuf. Syst.*, **37**, 729–745, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmsy.2015.04.009.

Schiller, G., K. Gruhler, and R. Ortlepp, 2018: Quantification of anthropogenic metabolism using spatially differentiated continuous MFA. *Chang. Adapt. Socio-Ecological Syst.*, **3**, 119–132, https://doi.org/10.1515/cass-2017-0011.

Schleich, J., B. Mills, and E. Dütschke, 2014: A brighter future? Quantifying the rebound effect in energy efficient lighting. *Energy Policy*, **72**, 35–42, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2014.04.028.

Schmidt, W., M. Alexander, and V. John, 2018: Cement and Concrete Research Education for sustainable use of cement based materials. *Cem. Concr. Res.*, **114**, 103–114, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cemconres.2017.08.009.

Schwarz, M., C. Nakhle, and C. Knoeri, 2020: Innovative designs of building energy codes for building decarbonization and their implementation challenges. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **248**, 119260, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119260.

Seeley, C. C., and S. Dhakal, 2021: Energy efficiency retrofits in commercial buildings: An environmental, financial, and technical analysis of case studies in Thailand. *Energies*, **14**, https://doi.org/10.3390/en14092571.

Seidl, R., T. von Wirth, and P. Krütli, 2019: Social acceptance of distributed energy systems in Swiss, German, and Austrian energy transitions. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.*, **54**, 117–128, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2019.04.006.

Semprini, G., R. Gulli, and A. Ferrante, 2017: Deep regeneration vs shallow renovation to achieve nearly Zero Energy in existing buildings: Energy saving and economic impact of design solutions in the housing stock of Bologna. *Energy Build.*, **156**, 327–342, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2017.09.044.

Seong, Y.-B., and J.-H. Lim, 2013a: Energy Saving Potentials of Phase Change Materials Applied to Lightweight Building Envelopes. *Energies*, **6**, 5219–5230, https://doi.org/10.3390/en6105219.

Seong, Y. B., and J. H. Lim, 2013b: Energy saving potentials of phase change materials applied to lightweight building envelopes. *Energies*, **6**, 5219–5230, https://doi.org/10.3390/en6105219.

Serrano, W., 2021: The Blockchain Random Neural Network for cybersecure IoT and 5G infrastructure in Smart Cities. *J. Netw. Comput. Appl.*, **175**, 102909, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnca.2020.102909.

Sha, H., and D. Qi, 2020: A Review of High-Rise Ventilation for Energy Efficiency and Safety. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **54**, 101971, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2019.101971.

Shafigh, P., I. Asadi, and N. B. Mahyuddin, 2018: Concrete as a thermal mass material for building applications - A review. *J. Build. Eng.*, **19**, 14–25, https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2018.04.021.

Shahid, A., 2018: Smart Grid Integration of Renewable Energy Systems. *2018 7th International Conference on Renewable Energy Research and Applications (ICRERA)*, IEEE, 944–948.

Sharda, S., K. Sharma, and M. Singh, 2021: A real-time automated scheduling algorithm with PV integration for smart home prosumers. *J. Build. Eng.*, **44**, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2021.102828.

Shih, T. Y., 2013: Determinates of Consumer Adoption Attitudes: An Empirical Study of Smart Home Services. *Int. J. E-Adoption*, **5**, 40–56, https://doi.org/10.4018/jea.2013040104.

Shukla, A. K., K. Sudhakar, P. Baredar, and R. Mamat, 2017: BIPV in Southeast Asian countries – opportunities and challenges. *Renew. Energy Focus*, **21**, 25–32, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ref.2017.07.001.

Si, B., J. Wang, X. Yao, X. Shi, X. Jin, and X. Zhou, 2019: Multi-objective optimization design of a complex building based on an artificial neural network and performance evaluation of algorithms. *Adv. Eng. Informatics*, **40**, 93–109, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aei.2019.03.006.

Si, J., and L. Marjanovic-Halburd, 2018: Criteria weighting for green technology selection as part of retrofit decision making process for existing non-domestic buildings. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **41**, 625–638, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2018.05.051.

Silva, M. F., S. Maas, H. A. de Souza, and A. P. Gomes, 2017: Post-occupancy evaluation of residential buildings in Luxembourg with centralized and decentralized ventilation systems, focusing on indoor air quality (IAQ). Assessment by questionnaires and physical measurements. *Energy Build.*, **148**, 119–127, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2017.04.049.

Silva, T., R. Vicente, and F. Rodrigues, 2016: Literature review on the use of phase change materials in glazing and shading solutions. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **53**, 515–535, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.07.201.

Singaravel, S., J. Suykens, and P. Geyer, 2018: Advanced Engineering Informatics Deep-learning neural-network architectures and methods : Using component- based models in building-design energy prediction. *Adv. Eng. Informatics*, **38**, 81–90, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aei.2018.06.004.

Singh, C., J. Ford, D. Ley, A. Bazaz, and A. Revi, 2020: Assessing the feasibility of adaptation options: methodological advancements and directions for climate adaptation research and practice. *Clim. Change*, **162**, 255–277, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-020-02762-x.

Singh, V. K., C. O. Henriques, and A. G. Martins, 2019: Assessment of energy-efficient appliances: A review of the technologies and policies in India's residential sector. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Energy Environ.*, https://doi.org/10.1002/wene.330.

Sköld, B., and Coauthors, 2018: Household preferences to reduce their greenhouse gas footprint: A comparative study from four European cities. *Sustain.*, **10**, https://doi.org/10.3390/su10114044.

van Sluisveld, M. A. E., S. H. Martínez, V. Daioglou, and D. P. van Vuuren, 2016: Exploring the implications of lifestyle change in 2°C mitigation scenarios using the IMAGE integrated assessment model. *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, **102**, 309–319, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2015.08.013.

Smith, A. C., and Coauthors, 2016: Health and environmental co-benefits and conflicts of actions to meet UK carbon targets. *Clim. Policy*, **16**, 253–283, https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2014.980212.

Soares, N., J. J. Costa, A. R. Gaspar, and P. Santos, 2013: Review of passive PCM latent heat thermal energy storage systems towards buildings' energy efficiency. *Energy Build.*, **59**, 82–103, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2012.12.042.

Sola, P., C. Ochieng, J. Yila, and M. Iiyama, 2016: Links between energy access and food security in sub Saharan Africa: an exploratory review. *Food Secur.*, **8**, 635–642, https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-016-0570-1.

Soland, M., S. Loosli, J. Koch, and O. Christ, 2018: Acceptance among residential electricity consumers regarding scenarios of a transformed energy system in Switzerland—a focus group study. *Energy Effic.*, **11**, 1673–1688, https://doi.org/10.1007/s12053-017-9548-x.

Soltani, M., and Coauthors, 2019: A comprehensive study of geothermal heating and cooling systems. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **44**, 793–818, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2018.09.036.

Song, Y., M. Cervarich, A. K. Jain, H. S. Kheshgi, W. Landuyt, and X. Cai, 2016: The interplay between bioenergy grass production and water resources in the United States of America. *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, **50**, 3010–3019, https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b05239.

Sotayo, A., and Coauthors, 2020: Review of state of the art of dowel laminated timber members and densified wood materials as sustainable engineered wood products for construction and building applications. *Dev. Built Environ.*, **1**, 100004, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dibe.2019.100004.

Sourbron, M., C. Verhelst, and L. Helsen, 2013: Building models for model predictive control of office buildings with concrete core activation. *J. Build. Perform. Simul.*, **6**, 175–198, https://doi.org/10.1080/19401493.2012.680497.

Soust-Verdaguer, B., C. Llatas, and A. García-Martínez, 2017: Critical review of bim-based LCA method to buildings. *Energy Build.*, **136**, 110–120, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2016.12.009.

Soust-Verdaguer, B., C. Llatas, and L. Moya, 2020: Comparative BIM-based Life Cycle Assessment of Uruguayan timber and concrete-masonry single-family houses in design stage. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **277**, 121958, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121958.

Sovacool, B. K., M. Martiskainen, A. Hook, and L. Baker, 2020: Beyond cost and carbon: The multidimensional co-benefits of low carbon transitions in Europe. *Ecol. Econ.*, **169**, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106529.

Spanaki, A., D. Kolokotsa, T. Tsoutsos, and I. Zacharopoulos, 2014a: Assessing the passive cooling effect of the ventilated pond protected with a reflecting layer. *Appl. Energy*, **123**, 273–280, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2014.02.040.

——, ——, ——, and ——, 2014b: Assessing the passive cooling effect of the ventilated pond protected with a reflecting layer. *Appl. Energy*, **123**, 273–280, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2014.02.040.

Spandagos, C., M. Yarime, E. Baark, and T. L. Ng, 2020: "Triple Target" policy framework to influence household energy behavior: Satisfy, strengthen, include. *Appl. Energy*, **269**, 115117, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2020.115117.

Stancioff, C. E., L. M. Pesoa, P. Penev, and K. Jegiazarjana, 2021: The SUNShINE platform: efficiency, transparency and standardization in the dEEP renovation process of multi-family buildings. *Open Res. Eur.*, **1**, 86, https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.13271.1.

Stauch, A., and P. Vuichard, 2019: Community solar as an innovative business model for building-integrated photovoltaics: An experimental analysis with Swiss electricity consumers. *Energy Build.*, **204**, 109526, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2019.109526.

Steenland, K., A. Pillarisetti, M. Kirby, J. Peel, M. Clark, W. Checkley, H. H. Chang, and T. Clasen, 2018: Modeling the potential health benefits of lower household air pollution after a hypothetical liquified petroleum gas (LPG) cookstove intervention. *Environ. Int.*, **111**, 71–79, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2017.11.018.

Stötzer, M., I. Hauer, M. Richter, and Z. A. Styczynski, 2015: Potential of demand side integration to maximize use of renewable energy sources in Germany. *Appl. Energy*, **146**, 344–352, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2015.02.015.

Streicher, K. N., D. Parra, M. C. Buerer, and M. K. Patel, 2017: Techno-economic potential of large-scale energy retrofit in the Swiss residential building stock. *Energy Procedia*, **122**, 121–126, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2017.07.314.

——, S. Mennel, J. Chambers, D. Parra, and M. K. Patel, 2020: Cost-effectiveness of large-scale deep energy retrofit packages for residential buildings under different economic assessment approaches. *Energy Build.*, **215**, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2020.109870.

Strenger, N., and S. Frerich, 2021: How to Design Digitalized Laboratories? A. M.E. and M. D., Eds., Vol. 1231 AISC of, Springer, 103–111.

Subramanyam, V., M. Ahiduzzaman, and A. Kumar, 2017a: Greenhouse gas emissions mitigation potential in the commercial and institutional sector. *Energy Build.*, **140**, 295–304, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2017.02.007.

——, A. Kumar, A. Talaei, and M. A. H. Mondal, 2017b: Energy efficiency improvement opportunities and associated greenhouse gas abatement costs for the residential sector. *Energy*, **118**, 795–807, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2016.10.115.

Succar, B., and M. Kassem, 2015: Macro-BIM adoption: Conceptual structures. *Autom. Constr.*, **57**, 64–79, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.autcon.2015.04.018.

Sun, X., M. A. Brown, M. Cox, and R. Jackson, 2016: Mandating better buildings: A global review of building codes and prospects for improvement in the United States. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Energy Environ.*, **5**, 188–215, https://doi.org/10.1002/wene.168.

Sun, Y., E. A. Silva, W. Tian, R. Choudhary, and H. Leng, 2018a: An Integrated Spatial Analysis Computer Environment for Urban-Building Energy in Cities. *Sustainability*, **10**, 4235, https://doi.org/10.3390/su10114235.

Sun, Y., R. Wilson, and Y. Wu, 2018b: A Review of Transparent Insulation Material (TIM) for building energy saving and daylight comfort. *Appl. Energy*, **226**, 713–729, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2018.05.094.

Sundt, S., K. Rehdanz, and J. Meyerhoff, 2020: Consumers' Willingness to Accept Time-of-Use Tariffs for Shifting Electricity Demand. *Energies*, **13**, 1895, https://doi.org/10.3390/en13081895.

SunHorizon, 2020: *Sun coupled innovative Heat pumps in terms of emissions*. 76 pp.

Sunikka-Blank, M., J. Chen, J. Britnell, and D. Dantsiou, 2012: Improving Energy Efficiency of Social Housing Areas: A Case Study of a Retrofit Achieving an "A" Energy Performance Rating in the UK. *Eur. Plan. Stud.*, **20**, 131–145, https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2011.638494.

Swan, W., R. Fitton, L. Smith, C. Abbott, and L. Smith, 2017: Adoption of sustainable retrofit in UK social housing 2010-2015. *Int. J. Build. Pathol. Adapt.*, **35**, 456–469, https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBPA-04-2017-0019.

Talkar, S., A. Choudhari, and P. Rayar, 2020: Building Envelope Optimization and Cost-Effective Approach in HVAC to Support Smart Manufacturing. V. H., K. V.K.N., and R. A.A., Eds., Springer, 299–308.

Tam, V. W. Y., J. Wang, and K. N. Le, 2016a: Thermal insulation and cost effectiveness of green-roof systems: An empirical study in Hong Kong. *Build. Environ.*, **110**, 46–54, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2016.09.032.

——, ——, and ——, 2016b: Thermal insulation and cost effectiveness of green-roof systems: An empirical study in Hong Kong. *Build. Environ.*, **110**, 46–54, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2016.09.032.

Tan, D., Y. Gong, and J. Siri, 2017: The Impact of Subsidies on the Prevalence of Climate-Sensitive Residential Buildings in Malaysia. *Sustainability*, **9**, 2300, https://doi.org/10.3390/su9122300.

Taniguchi, A., T. Inoue, M. Otsuki, Y. Yamaguchi, Y. Shimoda, A. Takami, and K. Hanaoka, 2016: Estimation of the contribution of the residential sector to summer peak demand reduction in Japan using an energy end-use simulation model. *Energy Build.*, **112**, 80–92, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2015.11.064.

Tatsidjodoung, P., N. Le Pierrès, and L. Luo, 2013: A review of potential materials for thermal energy storage in building applications. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **18**, 327–349, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2012.10.025.

Teixeira, E. R., R. Mateus, A. F. Camõesa, L. Bragança, and F. G. Branco, 2016: Comparative environmental life-cycle analysis of concretes using biomass and coal fly ashes as partial cement replacement material. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **112**, 2221–2230, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.09.124.

Teja S, C., and P. K. Yemula, 2020: Architecture for demand responsive HVAC in a commercial building for transformer lifetime improvement. *Electr. Power Syst. Res.*, **189**, 106599, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsr.2020.106599.

Teli, D., T. Dimitriou, P. A. B. James, A. S. Bahaj, L. Ellison, and A. Waggott, 2016: Fuel poverty-induced “prebound effect” in achieving the anticipated carbon savings from social housing retrofit. *Build. Serv. Eng. Res. Technol.*, **37**, 176–193, https://doi.org/10.1177/0143624415621028.

Terés-Zubiaga, J., A. Campos-Celador, I. González-Pino, and G. Diarce, 2016: The role of the design and operation of individual heating systems for the energy retrofits of residential buildings. *Energy Convers. Manag.*, **126**, 736–747, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2016.08.042.

Thema, J., and Coauthors, 2017: More than energy savings: quantifying the multiple impacts of energy efficiency in Europe. *ECEEE 2017 Summer Study*, 1727–1736.

Thomas, B. A., and I. L. Azevedo, 2013: Estimating direct and indirect rebound effects for U.S. households with input-output analysis. Part 2: Simulation. *Ecol. Econ.*, **86**, 188–198, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2012.12.002.

Thomas, S., L.-A. Brischke, J. Thema, L. Leuser, and M. Kopatz, 2017: Energy sufficiency policy: how to limit energy consumption and per capita dwelling size in a decent way. *ECEEE 2017 Summer Study*, 103–112.

——, J. Thema, L. A. Brischke, L. Leuser, M. Kopatz, and M. Spitzner, 2019: Energy sufficiency policy for residential electricity use and per-capita dwelling size. *Energy Effic.*, **12**, 1123–1149, https://doi.org/10.1007/s12053-018-9727-4.

Thomson, H., and S. Thomas, 2015: Developing empirically supported theories of change for housing investment and health. *Soc. Sci. Med.*, **124**, 205–214, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.11.043.

Thomson, H., C. Snell, and S. Bouzarovski, 2017: Health, well-being and energy poverty in Europe: A comparative study of 32 European countries. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, **14**, https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph14060584.

TL, M. B. S. C. Y. E. N., 2020: “Triple Target” policy framework to influence household energy behavior: Satisfy, strengthen, include. *Appl. Energy*, **269**, 115117, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2020.115117.

Tonn, B., E. Rose, and B. Hawkins, 2018: Evaluation of the U.S. department of energy’s weatherization assistance program: Impact results. *Energy Policy*, **118**, 279–290, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2018.03.051.

Torani, K., G. Rausser, and D. Zilberman, 2016: Innovation subsidies versus consumer subsidies: A real options analysis of solar energy. *Energy Policy*, **92**, 255–269, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2015.07.010.

Torero De Boeck Supérieur, M., 2015: THE IMPACT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION: CHALLENGES AND WAYS FORWARD. Vol. 23 of, 49–75.

Torero, M., 2015: The impact of rural electrification: Challenges and ways forward. *Rev. Econ. Dev.*, **23**, 49–75, https://doi.org/10.3917/edd.hs03.0049.

Trencher, G., and J. van der Heijden, 2019: Instrument interactions and relationships in policy mixes: Achieving complementarity in building energy efficiency policies in New York, Sydney and Tokyo. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.*, **54**, 34–45, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2019.02.023.

Tsoka, S., K. Tsikaloudaki, T. Theodosiou, and A. Dugue, 2018: Rethinking user based innovation: Assessing public and professional perceptions of energy efficient building facades in Greece, Italy and Spain. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.*, **38**, 165–177, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.02.009.

Tumbaz, M. N. M., and H. T. Moğulkoç, 2018a: Profiling energy efficiency tendency: A case for Turkish households. *Energy Policy*, **119**, 441–448, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2018.04.064.

——, and ——, 2018b: Profiling energy efficiency tendency: A case for Turkish households. *Energy Policy*, **119**, 441–448, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2018.04.064.

Uchman, W., 2021: The cost of increasing prosumer self-sufficiency. *Appl. Therm. Eng.*, **186**, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2020.116361.

Underhill, L. J., M. P. Fabian, K. Vermeer, M. Sandel, G. Adamkiewicz, J. H. Leibler, and J. I. Levy, 2018: Modeling the resiliency of energy-efficient retrofits in low-income multifamily housing. *Indoor Air*, **28**, 459–468, https://doi.org/10.1111/ina.12446.

Ürge-Vorsatz, D., and Coauthors, 2016: Measuring multiple impacts of low-carbon energy options in a green economy context. *Appl. Energy*, **179**, 1409–1426, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.07.027.

——, R. Khosla, R. Bernhardt, Y. C. Chan, D. Vérez, S. Hu, and L. F. Cabeza, 2020: Advances Toward a Net-Zero Global Building Sector. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.*, **45**, 227–269, https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-012420-045843.

Usman, Z., J. Tah, H. Abanda, and C. Nche, 2020: A Critical Appraisal of PV-Systems ’ Performance. *Buildings*, **10**, 1–22.

Vadenbo, C., S. Hellweg, and T. F. Astrup, 2017: Let’s Be Clear(er) about Substitution: A Reporting Framework to Account for Product Displacement in Life Cycle Assessment. *J. Ind. Ecol.*, **21**, 1078–1089, https://doi.org/10.1111/jiec.12519.

Vadovics, E., and L. Živčič, 2019: Energy sufficiency: Are we ready for it? An analysis of sustainable energy initiatives and citizen visions. *Eceee Summer Study Proc.*, **2019-June**, 159–168.

Vakiloroaya, V., B. Samali, A. Fakhar, and K. Pishghadam, 2014a: A review of different strategies for HVAC energy saving. *Energy Convers. Manag.*, **77**, 738–754, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2013.10.023.

——, ——, and K. Pishghadam, 2014b: A comparative study on the effect of different strategies for energy saving of air-cooled vapor compression air conditioning systems. *Energy Build.*, **74**, 163–172, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2014.01.042.

Vallés, M., J. Reneses, P. Frías, and C. Mateo, 2016: Economic benefits of integrating Active Demand in distribution network planning: A Spanish case study. *Electr. Power Syst. Res.*, **136**, 331–340, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.epsr.2016.03.017.

Varela Luján, S., C. Viñas Arrebola, A. Rodríguez Sánchez, P. Aguilera Benito, and M. González Cortina, 2019: Experimental comparative study of the thermal performance of the façade of a building refurbished using ETICS, and quantification of improvements. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **51**, 101713, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2019.101713.

Vassileva, I., and J. Campillo, 2016: Consumers' Perspective on Full-Scale Adoption of Smart Meters: A Case Study in Västerås, Sweden. *Resources*, **5**, 3, https://doi.org/10.3390/resources5010003.

Vatalis, K. I., O. Manoliadis, G. Charalampides, S. Platias, and S. Savvidis, 2013: Sustainability Components Affecting Decisions for Green Building Projects. *Procedia Econ. Financ.*, **5**, 747–756, https://doi.org/10.1016/s2212-5671(13)00087-7.

Van de Ven, D.-J., and Coauthors, 2019: Integrated policy assessment and optimisation over multiple sustainable development goals in Eastern Africa. *Environ. Res. Lett.*, **14**, 094001, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab375d.

Vijay, A., and A. Hawkes, 2017: The Techno-Economics of Small-Scale Residential Heating in Low Carbon Futures. *Energies*, **10**, 1915, https://doi.org/10.3390/en10111915.

Vilar, A. Á., G. Xydis, and E. A. Nanaki, 2020: Small Wind: A Review of Challenges and Opportunities. *Sustaining Resources for Tomorrow*, 185–204.

Vimpari, J., and S. Junnila, 2019a: Estimating the diffusion of rooftop PVs: A real estate economics perspective. *Energy*, **172**, 1087–1097, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2019.02.049.

Vimpari, J., and S. Junnila, 2019b: Estimating the diffusion of rooftop PVs: A real estate economics perspective. *Energy*, **172**, 1087–1097, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2019.02.049.

Volk, R., R. Müller, J. Reinhardt, and F. Schultmann, 2019: An Integrated Material Flows, Stakeholders and Policies Approach to Identify and Exploit Regional Resource Potentials. *Ecol. Econ.*, **161**, 292–320, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.03.020.

Volochovic, A., Z. Simanaviciene, and D. Streimikiene, 2012: GHG Emission Reduction by Behavioral Changes in Lithuanian Households. *Eng. Econ.*, **23**, 242–249, https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.ee.23.3.1936.

Walzberg, J., T. Dandres, N. Merveille, M. Cheriet, and R. Samson, 2020: Should we fear the rebound effect in smart homes? *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **125**, 109798, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.109798.

Wan, L., and Y. Bai, 2021: Application Research on the BIM and Internet of Things Technology in Construction Logistics Management in the Period of Big Data. X. J., D. G., A. S.E., G.M. F.P., and H. A., Eds., Vol. 1191 AISC of, Springer, 704–716.

Wang, H., W. Chen, and J. Shi, 2018: Low carbon transition of global building sector under 2- and 1.5-degree targets. *Appl. Energy*, **222**, 148–157, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2018.03.090.

Wang, L., A. Toppinen, and H. Juslin, 2014a: Use of wood in green building: a study of expert perspectives from the UK. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **65**, 350–361, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.08.023.

Wang, X., X. Mao, and H. Khodaei, 2021: A multi-objective home energy management system based on internet of things and optimization algorithms. *J. Build. Eng.*, **33**, 101603, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2020.101603.

Wang, Z., M. Lu, and J.-C. Wang, 2014b: Direct rebound effect on urban residential electricity use: An empirical study in China. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **30**, 124–132, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2013.09.002.

——, Q. Sun, B. Wang, and B. Zhang, 2019: Purchasing intentions of Chinese consumers on energy-efficient appliances: Is the energy efficiency label effective? *J. Clean. Prod.*, **238**, 117896, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.117896.

Warren, P., 2017: Transferability of demand-side policies between countries. *Energy Policy*, **109**, 757–766, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2017.07.032.

Whalen, K. A., and C. J. Whalen, 2018: The Circular Economy and Institutional Economics: Compatibility and Complementarity. *J. Econ. Issues*, **52**, 605–614, https://doi.org/10.1080/00213624.2018.1495985.

Widder, L., 2017: Earth eco-building: textile-reinforced earth block construction. *Energy Procedia*, **122**, 757–762, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2017.07.392.

Wierzbicka, A., and Coauthors, 2018: Healthy Indoor Environments: The Need for a Holistic Approach. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, **15**, 1874, https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph15091874.

Willand, N., I. Ridley, and C. Maller, 2015a: Towards explaining the health impacts of residential energy efficiency interventions – A realist review. Part 1: Pathways. *Soc. Sci. Med.*, **133**, 191–201, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.02.005.

——, ——, and ——, 2015b: Towards explaining the health impacts of residential energy efficiency interventions - A realist review. Part 1: Pathways. *Soc. Sci. Med.*, **133**, 191–201, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2015.02.005.

William, M. A., A. M. Elharidi, A. A. Hanafy, A. Attia, and M. Elhelw, 2020: Energy-efficient retrofitting strategies for healthcare facilities in hot-humid climate: Parametric and economical analysis. *Alexandria Eng. J.*, **59**, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aej.2020.08.011.

Winchester, N., and J. M. Reilly, 2020: The economic and emissions benefits of engineered wood products in a low-carbon future. *Energy Econ.*, **85**, 104596, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2019.104596.

Witjes, S., and R. Lozano, 2016: Towards a more Circular Economy: Proposing a framework linking sustainable public procurement and sustainable business models. *Resour. Conserv. Recycl.*, **112**, 37–44, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2016.04.015.

Wohlfarth, K., M. Klobasa, and R. Gutknecht, 2020: Demand response in the service sector – Theoretical, technical and practical potentials. *Appl. Energy*, **258**, 114089, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.114089.

Wolske, K. S., A. Todd, M. Rossol, J. McCall, and B. Sigrin, 2018: Accelerating demand for residential solar photovoltaics: Can simple framing strategies increase consumer interest? *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, **53**, 68–77, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2018.08.005.

Wu, Y., F. Zhao, S. Liu, L. Wang, L. Qiu, G. Alexandrov, and V. Jothiprakash, 2018: Bioenergy production and environmental impacts. *Geosci. Lett.*, **5**, 14, https://doi.org/10.1186/s40562-018-0114-y.

Xiong, J., F. Chen, L. Sun, X. Yu, J. Zhao, Y. Hu, and Y. Wang, 2019: Characterization of VOC emissions from composite wood furniture: Parameter determination and simplified model. *Build. Environ.*, **161**, 106237, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.106237.

Xu, X., C. Chen, X. Zhu, and Q. Hu, 2018: Promoting acceptance of direct load control programs in the United States: Financial incentive versus control option. *Energy*, **147**, 1278–1287, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2018.01.028.

Yan, D., T. Hong, C. Li, Q. Zhang, J. An, and S. Hu, 2017: A thorough assessment of China's standard for energy consumption of buildings. *Energy Build.*, **143**, 114–128, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2017.03.019.

Yang, B., S. Liu, M. Gaterell, and Y. Wang, 2019: Smart metering and systems for low-energy households: challenges, issues and benefits. *Adv. Build. Energy Res.*, **13**, 80–100, https://doi.org/10.1080/17512549.2017.1354782.

Yang, J. Bin, and H. Y. Chou, 2018: Mixed approach to government BIM implementation policy: An empirical study of Taiwan. *J. Build. Eng.*, **20**, 337–343, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jobe.2018.08.007.

Yang, W., Z. Wang, J. Cui, Z. Zhu, and X. Zhao, 2015: Comparative study of the thermal performance of the novel green(planting) roofs against other existing roofs. *Sustain. Cities Soc.*, **16**, 1–12, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2015.01.002.

Yoo, S., J. Eom, and I. Han, 2020: Factors driving consumer involvement in energy consumption and energy-efficient purchasing behavior: Evidence from Korean residential buildings. *Sustain.*, **12**, 1–20, https://doi.org/10.3390/su12145573.

Yu, F. W., and K. T. Chan, 2009: Modelling of improved energy performance of air-cooled chillers with mist pre-cooling. *Int. J. Therm. Sci.*, **48**, 825–836, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijthermalsci.2008.06.016.

Yu, S., Y. Liu, D. Wang, A. S. Bahaj, Y. Wu, and J. Liu, 2021a: Review of thermal and environmental performance of prefabricated buildings : Implications to emission reductions in China. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **137**, 110472, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.110472.

——, ——, ——, ——, ——, and ——, 2021b: Review of thermal and environmental performance of prefabricated buildings : Implications to emission reductions in China. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **137**, 110472, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2020.110472.

Yu, W., Y. Xu, H. Wang, Z. Ge, J. Wang, D. Zhu, and Y. Xia, 2020: Thermodynamic and thermoeconomic performance analyses and optimization of a novel power and cooling cogeneration system fueled by low-grade waste heat. *Appl. Therm. Eng.*, **179**, 115667, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2020.115667.

Zaeri, F., F. E. Rotimi, and J. D. Owolabi, 2016: The effectiveness of the Last Planner System in New Zealand construction industry: Towards an empirical justification. *Creat. built Environ. new Oppor.*, **1**, 528.

Zangheri, P., R. Armani, M. Pietrobon, and L. Pagliano, 2018: Identification of cost-optimal and NZEB refurbishment levels for representative climates and building typologies across Europe. *Energy Effic.*, **11**, 337–369, https://doi.org/10.1007/s12053-017-9566-8.

Zea Escamilla, E., and G. Habert, 2014: Environmental impacts of bamboo-based construction materials representing global production diversity. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **69**, 117–127, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.01.067.

Zea Escamilla, E., G. Habert, and E. Wohlmuth, 2016: When CO2 counts: Sustainability assessment of industrialized bamboo as an alternative for social housing programs in the Philippines. *Build. Environ.*, **103**, 44–53, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2016.04.003.

Zea Escamilla, E., G. Habert, J. Correal Daza, H. Archilla, J. Echeverry Fernández, and D. Trujillo, 2018: Industrial or Traditional Bamboo Construction? Comparative Life Cycle Assessment (LCA) of Bamboo-Based Buildings. *Sustainability*, **10**, 3096, https://doi.org/10.3390/su10093096.

Zhang, C., J. Sun, M. Lubell, L. Qiu, and K. Kang, 2019: Design and simulation of a novel hybrid solar-biomass energy supply system in northwest China. *J. Clean. Prod.*, **233**, 1221–1239, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.06.128.

Zhang, C., M. Hu, B. Laclau, T. Garnesson, X. Yang, and A. Tukker, 2021: Energy-carbon-investment payback analysis of prefabricated envelope-cladding system for building energy renovation: Cases in Spain, the Netherlands, and Sweden. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **145**, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2021.111077.

Zhang, M., Y. Song, P. Li, and H. Li, 2016: Study on affecting factors of residential energy consumption in urban and rural Jiangsu. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **53**, 330–337, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.08.043.

Zhang, X., J. Yang, Y. Fan, X. Zhao, R. Yan, J. Zhao, and S. Myers, 2020a: Experimental and analytic study of a hybrid solar/biomass rural heating system. *Energy*, **190**, 116392, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2019.116392.

Zhang, Y., N. Akkurt, J. Yuan, Z. Xiao, Q. Wang, and W. Gang, 2020b: Study on model uncertainty of water source heat pump and impact on decision making. *Energy Build.*, **216**, 109950, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2020.109950.

Zhu, J. H., Y. Y. Sun, W. Wang, S. M. Deng, Y. J. Ge, and L. T. Li, 2015: Developing a new frosting map to guide defrosting control for air-source heat pump units. *Appl. Therm. Eng.*, **90**, 782–791, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2015.06.076.

Zhuang, X., and C. Wu, 2019: The effect of interactive feedback on attitude and behavior change in setting air conditioners in the workplace. *Energy Build.*, **183**, 739–748, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2018.11.040.

Zink, T., and R. Geyer, 2017: Circular Economy Rebound. *J. Ind. Ecol.*, **21**, 593–602, https://doi.org/10.1111/jiec.12545.

Zinzi, M., and B. Mattoni, 2019: Assessment of construction cost reduction of nearly zero energy dwellings in a life cycle perspective. *Appl. Energy*, **251**, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.113326.

Zografakis, N., K. Karyotakis, and K. P. Tsagarakis, 2012: Implementation conditions for energy saving technologies and practices in office buildings: Part 1. Lighting. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.*, **16**, 4165–4174, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2012.03.005.

Zuhaib, S., and J. Goggins, 2019: *Assessing evidence-based single-step and staged deep retrofit towards nearly zero-energy buildings (nZEB) using multi-objective optimisation*. 1891–1920 pp.

Zuhaib, S., R. Manton, M. Hajdukiewicz, M. M. Keane, and J. Goggins, 2017: Attitudes and approaches of Irish retrofit industry professionals towards achieving nearly zero-energy buildings. *Int. J. Build. Pathol. Adapt.*, **35**, 16–40, https://doi.org/10.1108/IJBPA-07-2016-0015.