

Valuing Energy Performance Certificates in the Portuguese Residential Sector

(Work in progress)

Perez-Alonso,A.¹, Ramos,A.¹, Silva,S.²

VI Atlantic Workshop on Energy and Environmental Economics

A Toxa 2014

¹Universidade de Vigo and Economics for Energy

²Universidade Lusíada, FCT and Economics for Energy

Motivation

- Buildings have the largest potential for cost-effective energy savings through energy efficiency (EE) measures.
- There is a large number of market barriers that prevent agents from taking optimal decisions regarding EE, in particular in the residential sector, resulting in a suboptimal level of EE.
- There are evidences suggesting that informational and behavioral failures lead agents to take inefficient decisions regarding EE in the residential sector.

Motivation: labels

- Many governments have adopted informational instruments to mitigate the negative effects generated by both types of failures.
- They have the objective to promote EE by providing agents with necessary information that helps them to take efficient decisions.
- Labeling systems for buildings have experienced a rapid diffusion.

Motivation: the European Energy Performance Certificate System.

- The Energy Performance of Buildings Directive (Directive 2002/91/CE, then recast into the Directive 2010/31/EU) requires owners to show an Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) in the moment the building is sold or rented out.
- This EPC is the product of a common methodology that classifies the building according to its structural characteristics into EE categories (going from A or A+ to G).
- There are similar mechanisms in many other countries (EnergyStar and the LEED programm in the U.S.).



**Certificação Energética
e Ar Interior
EDIFÍCIOS**

Nº CER 1234567/2007



CERTIFICADO DE DESEMPENHO ENERGÉTICO E DA QUALIDADE DO AR INTERIOR

TIPO DE EDIFÍCIO: EDIFÍCIO HABITAÇÃO UNIFAMILIAR / FRACÇÃO AUTÓNOMA DE EDIF. MULTIFAMILIAR

Morada / Situação: _____

Localidade _____ Freguesia _____

Concelho _____ Região _____

Data de emissão do certificado _____ Validade do certificado _____

Nome do perito qualif. _____ Número do perito qualif. _____

Imóvel descrito na Conservatória do Registo Predial de _____
sob o nº Art. matricial nº _____ Fração autón. _____

Este certificado resulta de uma verificação efetuada ao edifício ou fracção autónoma, por um perito devidamente qualificado para o efeito, em relação aos requisitos previstos no Regulamento das Características de Comportamento Térmico dos Edifícios (RCCTE, Decreto-Lei 80/2008 de 4 de Abril), classificando o imóvel em relação ao respetivo desempenho energético. Neste certificado poderão estar identificadas possíveis medidas de melhoria de desempenho aplicáveis à fracção autónoma ou edifício, suas partes e respectivos sistemas energéticos e ventilação, quer no que respeita ao desempenho energético, quer no que respeita à qualidade do ar interior.

1. ETIQUETA DE DESEMPENHO ENERGÉTICO

INDICADORES DE DESEMPENHO

Necessidades anuais globais estimadas de energia útil para climatização e águas quentes kWh/m².ano

Necessidades anuais globais estimadas de energia primária para climatização e águas quentes kgep/m².ano

Valor limite máximo regulamentar para as necessidades anuais globais de energia primária para climatização e águas quentes kgep/m².ano

Emissões anuais de gases de efeito estufa associadas à energia primária para climatização e águas quentes Toneladas de CO₂ equivalentes por ano

CLASSE ENERGÉTICA



2. DESAGREGAÇÃO DAS NECESSIDADES NOMINAIS DE ENERGIA ÚTIL

| Necessidades nominais de energia útil para... | Valor estimado para as condições de conforto térmico de referência | Valor limite regulamentar para as necessidades anuais |
|---|--|---|
| Aquecimento | kWh/m ² .ano | kWh/m ² .ano |
| Arrefecimento | kWh/m ² .ano | kWh/m ² .ano |
| Preparação das águas | kWh/m ² .ano | kWh/m ² .ano |

Research question

- Despite the high adoption of labeling systems for buildings, little is known about their effectiveness.

We estimate consumers WTP for dwellings with a high EPC (A+, A or B) in the Portuguese residential sector. Portugal was one of the early adopters of the European EPC system, creating a considerable amount of data that allows us to contribute to the previous literature by:

- Providing the second study on the effectiveness of the European EPC system in the residential sector.
- Providing the first case study for the residential sector of a Southern European member state.
- Using quantile regression.

Literature review

- In the U.S. commercial sector Eichholtz, et al., 2010; Fuest and McAllister, 2011a; and Wiley et al., 2010 found a positive WTP for rated commercial buildings going from 16-25%.
- For the European commercial building, Fuerst and McAllister 2011b did not find any effect for the case of U.K.
- Regarding the residential sector, Brounen and Kok, 2011 found that dwellings with an European EPC A, B or C had a price premium of 3.7% in the Netherlands.
- Other researchers (Deng et al., 2012; Yoshida and Sugiura, 2011; Zheng et al., 2012) have studied the effects of different Asian labeling initiatives finding mixed results, what might be due to the own nature of those systems.

Data

- The lack of data represents the largest handicap for this research.
- Our sample consists of dwellings for sale with information about the EPC.
- The data was gathered from the web page of one of the most important real estate companies in Portugal during January-February 2013.
- Unique cross-sectional database with more than 5.300 observations containing a set of detailed dwelling characteristics, including asking price, size, age, location, the EPC, etc.

Data

| Variable | Level | Official data | Our sample |
|---|----------------------|---------------|------------|
| Average price per squared meter | | 1741 | 1452 |
| EPC | A+ | 0.5% | 2.2% |
| | A | 4.4% | 10.3% |
| | B and B- | 31.8% | 26.9% |
| | C | 32.3% | 32.4% |
| | D | 14.4% | 16.5% |
| | E | 8.1% | 7.3% |
| | F | 2.5% | 2.7% |
| | G | 6% | 1.5% |
| Average year | | 33.92 | 20.08 |
| Average area | | 109.9 | 140.4 |
| Concentration of dwellings in the coast | coast | 67.9% | 88.8% |
| Construction type | apartment | 66.2% | 70.7% |
| General condition | no reparation needed | 73% | 94% |

Data

| Variable | Level | Portuguese housing stock | Our sample |
|-------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|------------|
| Geographic distribution | Aveiro | 6.2% | 1.7% |
| | Beja | 1.9% | 0.7% |
| | Braga | 6.9% | 2.4% |
| | Bragança | 1.8% | 0.3% |
| | Castelo Branco | 2.6% | 0.6% |
| | Coimbra | 4.7% | 2.8% |
| | Evora | 1.7% | 0.6% |
| | Faro | 6.8% | 14% |
| | Guarda | 2.3% | 0.1% |
| | Leiria | 5.1% | 3.7% |
| | Lisboa | 21% | 45.3% |
| | Portalegre | 1.4% | 0.4% |
| | Porto | 15% | 11.9% |
| | Santarem | 4.8% | 2.8% |
| | Setubal | 8.3% | 11.8% |
| | Viana do Castelo | 2.7% | 0.5% |
| | Vila Real | 2.5% | 0.1% |
| Viseu | 4.3% | 1.5% | |

The initial model

Following previous literature, we define the following price function:

$$\begin{aligned}
 l(\text{pricem2}_i) = & \alpha + \beta AAB_i + \delta_1 \text{year}_i + \delta_2 l(\text{size}_i) + \delta_3 \text{rooms}_i + \\
 & + \delta_4 \text{baths}_i + \delta_5 \text{extra}_i + \delta_6 \text{apart}_i + \delta_7 \text{renov}_i + \\
 & + \delta_8 \text{needswork}_i + \delta_9 \text{capital}_i + \delta_{10} \text{othercenter}_i + \delta_{11} \text{privilege}_i + \\
 & + \delta_{12} \text{coast}_i + \delta_{13} \text{urban}_i + \gamma D_1 + \epsilon_i(1)
 \end{aligned}$$

$l(\text{pricem2})$: logarithm of price per squared meter.

AAB : dummy equal to 1 if house has label either A+, A or B.

year : categorical variable for construction year.

$l(\text{size})$: logarithm of size in squared meters.

rooms : number of rooms.

baths : number of baths.

extra : dummy equal to 1 if house has any extra feature.

apart : dummy equal to 1 if house is apartment.

floor : number of floor.

renov : dummy equal to 1 if house has been renovated.

needswork : dummy equal to 1 if house needs work.

The initial model

Dummies for location:

- *capital*: dummy equal 1 if the house is located in the district's capital
- *othercenter*: dummy equal 1 if the house is located close to other center.
- *privilege*: dummy equal 1 if the house is located in the beach or historic area.
- *coast*: dummy equal 1 if the house is located in the coast.
- *urban*: dummy equal 1 if the house is located in an urban area.

Table : The value of EPC with OLS

| Variable | Coefficient | (Std. Err.) |
|----------------|-------------|-------------|
| AAB | 0.169*** | (0.014) |
| 1960.yearcat1 | 0.039 | (0.044) |
| 1970.yearcat1 | -0.012 | (0.043) |
| 1980.yearcat1 | -0.045 | (0.039) |
| 1990.yearcat1 | 0.010 | (0.037) |
| 2000.yearcat1 | 0.060 | (0.038) |
| 2005.yearcat1 | 0.164*** | (0.039) |
| 2010.yearcat1 | 0.264*** | (0.039) |
| 2014.yearcat1 | 0.296*** | (0.040) |
| lsize | -0.392*** | (0.024) |
| rooms | 0.037*** | (0.009) |
| baths | 0.161*** | (0.009) |
| extra | 0.094*** | (0.014) |
| apart | -0.126*** | (0.019) |
| floor | 0.010*** | (0.003) |
| renov | 0.037* | (0.022) |
| needswork | -0.226*** | (0.030) |
| capital | 0.379*** | (0.023) |
| othercenter | 0.070*** | (0.020) |
| privilege | 0.223*** | (0.018) |
| coast | 0.138*** | (0.030) |
| urban | 0.080** | (0.034) |
| dummy district | YES | |
| Intercept | 7.744*** | (0.117) |
| N | 4251 | |
| R-squared | 0.566 | |

t statistics in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

THE VALUE OF EPC VIA OLS AND QR

| | OLS | Q(0.10) | Q(0.25) | Q(0.5) | Q(0.75) | Q(0.90) |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| AAB | 0.169*** (11.91) | 0.190*** (7.82) | 0.171*** (9.74) | 0.168*** (14.03) | 0.174*** (9.91) | 0.176*** (6.54) |
| lsize | -0.392*** (-16.07) | -0.498*** (-13.19) | -0.436*** (-17.17) | -0.398*** (-24.27) | -0.316*** (-13.03) | -0.349*** (-9.70) |
| rooms | 0.0369*** (3.98) | 0.0514*** (3.61) | 0.0411*** (4.22) | 0.0367*** (5.71) | 0.0245* (2.52) | 0.0286* (2.08) |
| baths | 0.161*** (17.28) | 0.162*** (11.87) | 0.159*** (15.76) | 0.163*** (24.52) | 0.162*** (16.34) | 0.159*** (10.45) |
| extra | 0.0942*** (6.91) | 0.0504* (2.16) | 0.0480** (2.74) | 0.0587*** (5.05) | 0.106*** (6.28) | 0.111*** (4.66) |
| apart | -0.126*** (-6.53) | -0.0413 (-1.27) | -0.0931*** (-3.94) | -0.126*** (-7.77) | -0.127*** (-5.29) | -0.243*** (-7.07) |
| floor | 0.0102*** (3.91) | 0.0133** (2.74) | 0.0101** (2.75) | 0.0103*** (4.08) | 0.00764* (2.03) | 0.00981 (1.84) |
| renov | 0.0373 (1.73) | 0.0278 (0.79) | 0.0212 (0.83) | 0.0274 (1.59) | 0.0486 (1.94) | 0.0750* (2.00) |
| needswork | -0.226*** (-7.49) | -0.214*** (-5.17) | -0.227*** (-7.12) | -0.232*** (-10.44) | -0.181*** (-5.66) | -0.172*** (-3.56) |
| capital | 0.379*** (16.72) | 0.389*** (10.08) | 0.344*** (12.07) | 0.360*** (19.00) | 0.418*** (15.81) | 0.384*** (10.28) |
| othercenter | 0.0703*** (3.56) | 0.103** (3.23) | 0.0729** (3.04) | 0.0709*** (4.38) | 0.0611** (2.66) | 0.0310 (0.97) |
| privilege | 0.223*** (12.35) | 0.205*** (8.06) | 0.202*** (10.08) | 0.194*** (13.27) | 0.228*** (10.08) | 0.245*** (7.15) |
| coast | 0.138*** (4.66) | 0.0920 (1.78) | 0.143*** (3.81) | 0.176*** (7.00) | 0.192*** (5.26) | 0.216*** (4.29) |
| urban | 0.0804* (2.39) | 0.163*** (3.74) | 0.0827* (2.41) | 0.0311 (1.31) | -0.0356 (-1.03) | 0.0223 (0.44) |
| dummy for year | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| dummy for district | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| N | 4251 | 4251 | 4251 | 4251 | 4251 | 4251 |

t statistics in parentheses

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Next steps

- Analysis of potential sample selection bias in the data collection.
- More specific analysis of the subsample of dwellings located in Lisbon.

Conclusions

- According to our database, Portuguese consumers value the information provided by the EPC.
- The WTP found is much higher than the one previously found for the Netherlands during the early stage of the Energy Performance of Building Directive.
- This result goes in line with previous literature on consumers WTP for energy products with a high EPC.
- More research is needed on the field of informational instruments.

Thank you for attention!

anaramos@uvigo.es

Table : The effect of District in the initial OLS estimation

| Variable | Coefficient | (Std. Err.) |
|------------------|-------------|-------------|
| AAB | 0.169** | (0.014) |
| capital | 0.379** | (0.023) |
| othercenter | 0.070** | (0.020) |
| privilege | 0.223** | (0.018) |
| coast | 0.138** | (0.030) |
| urban | 0.080* | (0.034) |
| Aveiro | 0.000 | (0.000) |
| Beja | 0.325** | (0.072) |
| Braga | -0.115* | (0.057) |
| Braganca | 0.344** | (0.106) |
| Castelo Branco | -0.097 | (0.088) |
| Coimbra | -0.015 | (0.046) |
| Faro | 0.154** | (0.039) |
| Guarda | -0.100 | (0.169) |
| Leiria | 0.002 | (0.048) |
| Lisboa | 0.468** | (0.035) |
| Portalegre | -0.086 | (0.098) |
| Porto | 0.124** | (0.037) |
| Santarem | -0.016 | (0.054) |
| Setubal | 0.169** | (0.038) |
| Viana do Castelo | 0.097 | (0.085) |
| Vila Real | 0.180 | (0.326) |
| Viseu | -0.054 | (0.060) |
| Evora | 0.225** | (0.083) |
| Intercept | 7.744** | (0.117) |
| N | 4251 | |

Table : Results for the initial OLS model excluding FARO

| Variable | Coefficient | (Std. Err.) |
|--------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| AAB | 0.239** | (0.017) |
| 1945b.yearcat1 | 0.000 | (0.000) |
| 1960.yearcat1 | 0.038 | (0.047) |
| 1970.yearcat1 | -0.003 | (0.045) |
| 1980.yearcat1 | -0.049 | (0.044) |
| 1990.yearcat1 | -0.038 | (0.041) |
| 2000.yearcat1 | -0.012 | (0.042) |
| 2005.yearcat1 | 0.071 [†] | (0.043) |
| 2010.yearcat1 | 0.169** | (0.043) |
| 2014.yearcat1 | 0.219** | (0.044) |
| lsize | -0.350** | (0.027) |
| rooms | 0.031** | (0.011) |
| baths | 0.168** | (0.010) |
| extra | 0.048** | (0.017) |
| apart | -0.087** | (0.023) |
| floor | 0.010** | (0.003) |
| renov | 0.076** | (0.025) |
| needswork | -0.182** | (0.034) |
| capital | 0.490** | (0.025) |
| othercenter | 0.151** | (0.020) |
| privilege | 0.260** | (0.021) |
| coast | 0.375** | (0.021) |
| urban | 0.056 | (0.036) |
| Intercept | 7.581** | (0.121) |
| dummy for district | YES | |
| N | 3629 | |

Table : Results for the initial OLS regression including only FARO

| Variable | Coefficient | (Std. Err.) |
|--------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| AAB | 0.070* | (0.032) |
| 1945b.yearcat1 | 0.000 | (0.000) |
| 1960.yearcat1 | 0.045 | (0.214) |
| 1970.yearcat1 | -0.031 | (0.191) |
| 1980.yearcat1 | 0.225 | (0.186) |
| 1990.yearcat1 | 0.330 [†] | (0.184) |
| 2000.yearcat1 | 0.396* | (0.183) |
| 2005.yearcat1 | 0.415* | (0.182) |
| 2010.yearcat1 | 0.432* | (0.181) |
| 2014.yearcat1 | 0.384* | (0.184) |
| lsize | -0.573** | (0.060) |
| rooms | 0.051* | (0.025) |
| baths | 0.184** | (0.024) |
| extra | 0.190** | (0.029) |
| apart | -0.119** | (0.046) |
| floor | 0.002 | (0.006) |
| renov | -0.034 | (0.060) |
| needswork | -0.295** | (0.104) |
| capital | 0.175 | (0.110) |
| othercenter | 0.151 | (0.106) |
| privilege | 0.001 | (0.062) |
| coast | -0.003 | (0.203) |
| urban | 0.098 | (0.109) |
| Intercept | 8.734** | (0.343) |
| dummy for district | YES | |
| N | 622 | |

Table : Results for the initial OLS model including only LISBON

| Variable | Coefficient | (Std. Err.) |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------|
| AAB | 0.184** | (0.023) |
| 1945b.yearcat1 | 0.000 | (0.000) |
| 1960.yearcat1 | 0.065 | (0.052) |
| 1970.yearcat1 | -0.011 | (0.047) |
| 1980.yearcat1 | -0.018 | (0.046) |
| 1990.yearcat1 | 0.036 | (0.044) |
| 2000.yearcat1 | 0.082† | (0.048) |
| 2005.yearcat1 | 0.139** | (0.050) |
| 2010.yearcat1 | 0.241** | (0.050) |
| 2014.yearcat1 | 0.313** | (0.051) |
| lsize | -0.296** | (0.036) |
| rooms | 0.026* | (0.012) |
| baths | 0.179** | (0.014) |
| extra | 0.064** | (0.021) |
| apart | -0.092** | (0.030) |
| floor | 0.014** | (0.004) |
| renov | 0.036 | (0.027) |
| needswork | -0.176** | (0.037) |
| capital | 0.626** | (0.037) |
| othercenter | 0.203** | (0.034) |
| privilege | 0.198** | (0.022) |
| coast | 0.397** | (0.104) |
| urban | 0.337** | (0.091) |
| Intercept | 7.027** | (0.207) |
| dummy for district | YES | |
| N | 1883 | |

Table : Regression excluding price and age outlier

| Variable | Coefficient | (Std. Err.) |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------|
| AAB | 0.165** | (0.014) |
| 1945b.yearcat1 | 0.000 | (0.000) |
| 1960.yearcat1 | 0.056 | (0.043) |
| 1970.yearcat1 | 0.022 | (0.044) |
| 1980.yearcat1 | -0.021 | (0.040) |
| 1990.yearcat1 | 0.044 | (0.038) |
| 2000.yearcat1 | 0.096* | (0.039) |
| 2005.yearcat1 | 0.206** | (0.039) |
| 2010.yearcat1 | 0.307** | (0.039) |
| 2014.yearcat1 | 0.340** | (0.040) |
| lsize | -0.424** | (0.023) |
| rooms | 0.038** | (0.009) |
| baths | 0.152** | (0.009) |
| extra | 0.083** | (0.014) |
| apart | -0.137** | (0.019) |
| floor | 0.010** | (0.003) |
| renov | 0.036† | (0.021) |
| needswork | -0.218** | (0.030) |
| capital | 0.367** | (0.022) |
| othercenter | 0.063** | (0.020) |
| privilege | 0.205** | (0.018) |
| coast | 0.140** | (0.029) |
| urban | 0.077* | (0.033) |
| Intercept | 7.906** | (0.115) |
| dummy for district | YES | |
| N | 4164 | |