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Survey on the current use of daylight simulations during building design

• online survey (January 2004)

• 185 individuals from 27 countries – 20% from Canada, 20% from the United States

• “out of 40 selected tools, over 50% of votes went to Radiance”

• sign up for a copy of survey results if you are interested
Simulation Output

Which output are you producing, using computer simulation tools?

- Designers (35)
- Engineers (53)
- Researchers (39)

Percentage of participants that choose this option %:

- Interior illuminances
- Daylight factor
- Photo-realistic images
- Interior luminances
- Electric lighting use
- Glare indices
- Daylight autonomy

NRC-CNRC
Increased use of simulations during design development... less use of scale models... digitalization is a general trend in building design.
Effectected Design Parameters

Which aspects of your design are affected by your daylight analysis?

- **Designers (53)**
- **Engineers (65)**
- **Researchers (42)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Designers</th>
<th>Engineers</th>
<th>Researchers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shading Type/Control</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window size</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glazing type</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting controls</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building orientation</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior surface properties</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room dimensions</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Previous Radiance Validation Studies

Light. Res. & Technology
Mardaljevic, 1995

Validation Radiance/sky scanner data for a clear glazing with/without a lightshelf (Radiance materials: “plastic”, “metal”, “glass”)
Previous Radiance Validation Studies

Light Res. & Technology
Mardaljevic, 2000

Daylight Coefficients: “same accuracy as standard Radiance”
(Radiance materials: “plastic”, “metal”, “glass”)
Daylight Coefficients

(1) Division of the Celestial Hemisphere

(2) Calculate Daylight Coefficients

\[
E_\alpha(x) \text{ illuminance at } x \text{ due to } S_\alpha
\]
Previous Radiance Validation Studies

Energy & Buildings
Reinhart & Herkel 2000

Daylight Coefficients were the fastest & most accurate dynamic method.
Previous Radiance Validation Studies

Radiance & Perez & Daylight Coefficients – venetian blinds

(Radiance materials: “plastic”, “metal”, “glass”)

Energy & Buildings
Reinhart, Walkenhorst 2001
Conclusion from Previous Studies

• The combination Perez/Radiance/Daylight Coefficients is capable of accurately modeling the short time step development of indoor illuminances due to daylight for complex geometries and “plastic”, “metal”, and “glass” type materials.

• Good accuracy corresponds to a MBE ~10% and a RMSE of ~25%. The simulation errors for the sky model and the raytracing algorithm are of the same order of magnitude.

• Simulations of ceiling sensors tend to be less accurate (MBE ~20%, RMSE 30%) as they require detailed modeling of surrounding buildings and ground.
Validation Study: Objectives

- to increase the number of validated Radiance material modifiers to include translucent glazings,

- present a general methodology of how to derive a Radiance material model of a translucent panel based on goniophotometer and integrating sphere measurements, and

- to validate the resulting Radiance model in a full scale test room.
Kalwall Validation: Methodology

- Goniophotometer & Integrating Sphere Measurements
- Development of a Radiance model
- Test-room measurements
- Radiance/Perez validation
Goniophotometer measurements

Light redirecting systems assessment

- BRDF or BTDF = light distribution after reflection or transmission, for each incident direction

\[
\text{BT(R)DF} (\theta_1, \phi_1, \theta_2, \phi_2) = \frac{L_{\text{out from sample}}}{E_{\text{inc on sample}}} \left[ \frac{\text{Cd} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}}{\text{lx}} \right]
\]
EPFL bidirectional goniophotometer

- Functioning principle: Transmission

courtesy of M. Andersen
The Sample

exterior

Interior
Goniophotometer Measurements I

- two diaphragm sizes used: 150mm and 280mm (tradeoff between edge effects and signal to noise ratio)
Approximation: The system is rotationally invariant (no variation with either the incident or the emerging azimuth angles).

The spatial heterogeneity in diffusion being due to the framing and size of the analyzed sample as well as to the limitations of the experimental equipment, the system can reasonably be considered as a good diffuser.

BRDF: mean diffuse refl. 21%
specular refl. 8%

BRDF along 20°, 0°, Ø = 150 mm
Direct hemispherical Transmittance

- An ideal diffuser would have a constant function.
- Direct normal hemispherical transmittance 24%
“trans” and “transdata”

- “trans” describes an ideal diffuser.
- “transdata” allows to specify an angle dependant transmittance.

Caveat: The function file onlies apply to direct sunlight and not to diffuse daylight.
# RADIANCE "trans" model of a translucent panel assuming
# only direct normal hemispherical transmittance is available
# \( R_d = C_r = C_g = C_b = 0.21 \) = diffuse reflectance
# \( R_s = A_4 = 0.08 \) = specular reflectance
# \( S_r = 0.0 \) = surface roughness
# \( T_d = 0.24 \) = direct normal diffuse hemispherical transmittance
# \( T_s = 0 \) = transmitted specularity (ideal diffuser)
# \( A_7 = T_s/(T_d+T_s) = 0 \)
# \( A_6 = (T_d+T_s)/(R_d+T_d+T_s) = 0.5333 \)
# \( A_5 = S_r = 0 \)
# \( A_1 = A_2 = A_3 = R_d/((1-R_s)*(1-A_6)) = 0.48913 \)
# \( S_t = A_6*A_7*(1-A_1)*A_4 = 0 \)
# resulting Radiance material:
void trans PANEL
0
0
7 0.48913 0.48913 0.48913 0.08 0 0.5333 0
# A1 A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 A7
# RADIANCE "trans" model of a translucent panel assuming
# only direct normal hemispherical transmittance is available
# R_d = C_r = C_g = C_b = 0.21 = diffuse reflectance
# R_s = A_4 = 0.08 = specular reflectance
# S_r = 0.0 = surface roughness
# T_d = 0.16 = diffuse - diffuse transmittance
# T_s = 0 = transmitted specularity (ideal diffuser)
# ...

void trans PANEL
0
0
0
7 0.40446 0.40446 0.40446 0.08 0 0.435635 0
# A1 A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 A7
void transdata PANEL
4 noop refl.dat rang.cal rang
0
6 0.40446 0.40446 0.40446 0.08 0.435635 1

refl.dat

##### HEADER ######
# one-dimensional data array
1
# irregularly spaced axis:
# two zeros – number of divisions – division values
0 0 17
0 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 50 55 60 65 70 75 90
##### Body ######
# Data values:
0.471279687 0.471279687 0.471279687 0.471279687
0.467352356 0.467352356 0.467352356 0.467352356
0.461461360.461461360.461461360.46146136
0.449679368 0.449679368 0.449679368 0.449679368
0.43593371 0.43593371 0.43593371 0.43593371
0.418260722 0.418260722 0.418260722 0.418260722
0.398624068 0.398624068 0.398624068 0.398624068
0.377023749 0.377023749 0.377023749 0.377023749
0.353459765 0.353459765 0.353459765 0.353459765
0.327931838 0.327931838 0.327931838 0.327931838
0.302404466 0.302404466 0.302404466 0.302404466
0.274913151 0.274913151 0.274913151 0.274913151
0.249385501 0.249385501 0.249385501 0.249385501
0.223857851 0.223857851 0.223857851 0.223857851
0.198330201 0.198330201 0.198330201 0.198330201
0.166911556 0.166911556 0.166911556 0.166911556

rang.cal

{ Compute incident angle in degrees (from either side) }
rang(dx,dy,dz) = 180/Pi*acos(abs(Nx*dx+Ny*dy+Nz*dz));
Validation Measurements

NRC Daylighting Lab

“hedge” with black cloth
5 indoor illuminance sensors, 1 façade illuminance sensor, direct and diffuse irradiance... 19 days... 30 sec measurement interval... >120,000 illuminance measurements
Partly Cloudy Day

- excellent agreement
- “trans_{16%}” and “transdata” model nearly identical
Sunny Day - Outside

![Graph showing illumination levels over time for a sunny day on May 19, 2005. The graph compares measurement and simulation data.](image-url)
Sunny Day - Inside

- "transdata" & "trans_{16\%}" better than "trans_{24\%}"

Graph: Desk 1 - May 19 2005 (sunny day)

- Measurement
- trans_{24\%}
- trans_{16\%}
- transdata

Illuminance [lux] vs. time of day [h]
## MBE & RMSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sensor</th>
<th>trans(_{24%})</th>
<th>trans(_{16%})</th>
<th>transdata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DESK1</td>
<td>MBE [%]</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSE [%]</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEIL1</td>
<td>MBE [%]</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMSE [%]</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Error Distribution Spectra
Radiance & Perez

76% to 86% of simulations lie in 20% error band
Practical Considerations:

How significant is a 20% error?
Practical Considerations: Daylight Factor (10% error)

- 10% since no sky error
- Apply LEED analysis
Practical Considerations:
Daylight Autonomy (20% error)

Different results than DF analysis.
Practical Considerations: Electric Lighting Use (20% error)

- Ottawa... Mo-Fr. 8.30 to 4.30... 450 lux min. ill... ideally photocell control
- translucent panel always lower than tinted glazing with roller blinds.
Conclusion

- We now have a validated Radiance model of a translucent material (more to follow).

- Accuracy as good as in earlier studies for “glass”, “plastic”, and “metal”.

- Method developed can be used for other materials and products such as a photocell.