

# **A life-cycle cost analysis (LCCA) for setting energy-efficiency standards in Brazil: The case of residential refrigerators.**

Gilberto De M. Jannuzzi, Department of Energy/Universidade Estadual de Campinas (UNICAMP) and International Energy Initiative  
Guilherme de C. Queiroz, International Energy Initiative  
Edson A. Vendrusculo, International Energy Initiative and Faculdade de Engenharia Elétrica e Computação (UNICAMP)  
Thomaz Borges, International Energy Initiative  
José A. Pomílio, Faculdade de Engenharia Elétrica e Computação (UNICAMP)

## **ABSTRACT**

The Brazilian law 10.295/2001 set the principles for the “National Energy Conservation Policy and Rational Use of Energy”. The law requires the development of energy standards for all of energy consuming equipment commercialized in the country. This paper presents the impacts of introducing cost-effective improvements in domestic refrigerators that were determined by means of a LCCA analysis. The analytical approach and computer simulation tool used in the study are the ones employed for the US DOE as well as the European Commission.

The results were used to estimate the impacts of efficiency standards on new refrigerators up to year 2020 assuming two hypothetical cases. Case A assumes that all new refrigerators sold have the efficiency innovations proposed here, Case B assumes that part of these innovations would be included in a first mandatory standard enforced in year 2005 and in 2010 a second mandatory standard would consider all the innovations analyzed.

The electricity consumption per refrigerator in *Case A* can be reduced by 43% (in 2005) with currently known and available technologies. The payback time to the consumer (12% interest rate) is calculated to be 7 years (lower than the 16 years average life time). Over 2005-2020 period, Brazil would save around 80 TWh, Brazilian consumers would save more than 12 Billion R\$ on their electricity bills and the nation would save 38,000 GgCO<sub>2</sub> (due to avoided CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from natural gas power plants).

In *Case B*, we assume two mandatory standards, one enforced in year 2005 that yields a 24% reduction. A second mandatory standard set in 2010 reduces by 48% (compared to the base year 2000 refrigerator consumption). The payback time was calculated as 7 and 12 years, respectively. Over 2005-2020 period, Brazil would save 70 TWh, the consumers would save 9 billion R\$ and the nation would save 34,000 GgCO<sub>2</sub>.

## **INTRODUCTION**

The main objective of this study is the application of the LCCA methodology as a tool to propose efficiency standards for the Brazilian residential refrigerators. Some assumptions were adopted in order to allow the construction of all methodological stages. In

some cases it was necessary to rely on numerical estimates to supply missing data. For instance, as it will be seen, the choice of the 2 cases (Case A and Case B) was based on sales of the two most popular refrigerator manufacturer brands in the country (both represent 93% of the market<sup>1</sup>).

The CLASP (2001) manual “Energy Efficiency Labels and Standard - a guidebook for appliances, equipment and lighting” presents three approaches/analysis for the establishment of minimum efficiency standards. A statistical approach is one option for analyzing the desirable level of a proposed standard. For each refrigerator model, energy use is plotted as a function of adjusted volume<sup>2</sup> and a linear regression analysis is performed. The two other approaches are engineering/economic and LCCA/payback (consumer, industry, national, and environmental impacts). In the case of the methodology using the statistical approach, the criteria for minimum appliance efficiency is recommended to be based on the possibilities of technical improvements for the whole stock of refrigerators, or at least a significant portion of them. In this study, it was used the economic/engineering and LCCA/payback approaches to create the % energy saving lines based in two models improvements, reducing substantially the number of necessary simulations for the establishment of efficiency criteria. Whenever data on production costs were missing, we based our estimates based on literature or information from North American refrigerator industry.

### **The Brazilian electricity market: general issues**

In year 2000, a total of 306.3 TWh of electricity was produced in Brazil, 43% of this was consumed by the industrial sector, 27% by the residential and 15% by the commercial sector.


The residential refrigerator is the largest user of electricity in the residential sector (32% of residential consumption), according to the PROCEL - National Program of Electric Power Conservation (Figure 1).

---

<sup>1</sup> Statistics on market share sales by refrigerator models are not available in Brazil. The percentages presented in this report refer to manufacturers participation in total annual sales. This report assumes that manufacturers' one-door model maintain these proportions.

<sup>2</sup> Adjusted volume = Refrigerator Volume +1.42 *Congelador* Volume. *Congelador* is a small freezer compartment placed inside the refrigerator and present in Brazilian one-door models.

**Figure 1. Brazilian residential sector: end-use participation (%).**



Source: (BEN 2001; PROCEL 1998).

The national electricity system is mainly based on hydroelectricity. It consists of two different grid systems: the interconnected national system and the isolated system. The former consists of two subsystems that are operated independently: South/Southwest/Center-west and North-northeast. Both systems are interconnected.

The interconnected grid system supplies most of the national market, and responds for great part of the installed capacity (~96% - 62.463 MW), while approximately the 4% (2.287 MW) remaining refer to the isolated system, which included more than 330 electrically areas isolated one of the other, most in the Northern Area. Regarding the supply base, the installed capacity of the interconnected system is practically all based on hydroelectricity, while the isolated system is largely thermal.

### **Main characteristics of Brazilian refrigerators**

The most sold refrigerators in the country are popular models suited to the lower purchasing power of the population. They are one-door models with a self-contained small freezer compartment (*congelador*) inside the refrigerator. They have a single cooling cycle, where the evaporator and the condenser operate by natural convection. In general, most of these models do not have complex controls or accessories; however, this is changing recently as new manufacturers are competing in the domestic market. The average electricity consumption of these popular models is about 1kWh per day.

INMETRO (National Institute of Metrology, Standards and Industry Quality), in partnership with PROCEL, has a labeling energy efficiency program that now has the voluntary participation of a single-door refrigerator models. This program is further described in the Internet site of INMETRO ([www.inmetro.gov.br](http://www.inmetro.gov.br)).

Table 1 presents the mains characteristics of one-door refrigerators as analyzed by INMETRO.

**Table 1: single-door refrigerators analyzed by INMETRO/Procel Label**

Brand	Model	VOLUMES			Electricity consumption (kWh/month)	Procel Label
		Refrigerator	Freezer	Adjusted volume = Refrigerator +1.42 Congelador		
BOSCH	RB 31	297	00	297	24.5	A
BOSCH	RB 38	367	00	367	27.0	A
BRASTEMP	BRA31A	253	33	300	32.0	C
BRASTEMP	BRA35A	296	33	343	36.0	C
BRASTEMP	BRB35A	329	00	329	36.5	D
BRASTEMP	BRF36A	330	00	330	29.5	A
CCE	R31L	263	30	306	30.0	B
CCE	R32SL	268	30	311	30.0	B
CCE	R26L	224	30	267	32.0	D
BLUE SKY	R31L	263	30	306	30.0	B
HOUSTON	R31L	263	30	306	30.0	B
CONSUL	CRB23B	223	00	223	32.0	F
CONSUL	CRC24B	191	22	222	30.5	F
CONSUL	CRA32A	272	31	316	26.6	A
CONSUL	CRA32B	272	30	315	24.9	A
CONSUL	CRC32A	272	31	316	28.8	A
CONSUL	CRA36A	312	30	355	31.5	A
CONTINENTAL	RC 27	223	29	264	23.7	A
CONTINENTAL	RC 30	257	29	298	27.0	A
CONTINENTAL	RC 37	324	33	371	33.0	A
ELECTROLUX	R250	214	26	251	24.6	B
ELECTROLUX	R280	237	26	274	25.0	A
ELECTROLUX	R310	263	31	307	30.0	B
ELECTROLUX	R330	286	31	330	30.2	A
ELECTROLUX	R360	312	31	356	32.4	A
ESMALTEC	RG3100E	283	27	321	34.8	B
GE	GE310A	263	31	307	30.0	B

Source: INMETRO, 2001.

## METHODOLOGY

### The choice of the two refrigerator models and the LCCA method

In order to choose refrigerator models as base-cases, or references, for this study, we observed the market share of the various existing models. As explained previously, available Brazilian statistical information suggested that the refrigerator model that is currently the market leader (53% of annual sales) already incorporates several technological innovations and is quite efficient from its competitors. The choice of a refrigerator that already had several innovations could not be a representative case to illustrate the LCCA method used. The second best selling model chosen has 29% of the current market and is less efficient than the market leader, but it allows illustrating the impacts of technological innovations and the LCCA method. This model is also more representative of other one-door refrigerators.

The analysis for the whole stock of refrigerators is based on these two models and considered two scenarios, namely Case A and Case B.

### **The Cases considered**

Case A scenario assumes that all refrigerators in the one-door category sold in the country are the same as the second model described.

Case B scenario is more realistic and assumes that improvements suggested are applicable only to 47% of the existing market; and therefore the standard is set at a lower efficiency level as the one considered in Case A, as will be presented later. At a later stage further improvements are enforced to all refrigerators. Case B therefore simulates the application of two standards over time.

Therefore, the analysis presented is based on the first and the second best selling model, as of year 2000.

### **LCC Method**

We follow the methodological itinerary proposed by the CLASP (2001) manual, as detailed in the Chapter 6 – “Analyzing and Setting Standards”. The results presented here were obtained from the application of the methodology there described. The two approaches adopted in this study are an engineering/economic and LCCA/payback analysis. An engineering/economic analysis shows the extra manufacturing costs that accompany increases in energy efficiency. These must be weighted against the target reductions in energy costs. The engineering/economic approach does not prescribe that manufacturers meet the standard using the technical options used in the analysis. It simply ensures that there is at least one practical way to meet the standard. Once the engineering/economic analysis is completed, it is customary to analyze the economic impact of potential efficiency improvements on consumers by analyzing consumer payback period and life cycle cost (LCC). There are separate methodologies for estimating consumer LCC and payback period, national energy savings and economic impact, manufacturer impact, energy supply impacts, and environmental impacts.

Another support document which we relied on, especially with regards to the format of presenting our results, was “Technical Support Document: Energy Efficiency Standards for consumer products: Refrigerators, Refrigerator-Freezers, & Freezers” of IEA (2000).

The LCC is the sum of the purchase cost (P) and the annual operating costs (O) discounted over the lifetime (N, in years) of the appliance (see Box 1). Compared to the payback period, LCC includes consideration of two additional factors: lifetime of the appliance and consumer discount rate.

### Box 1 - Calculating LCC and Payback Period.

The equation for LCC is a function of price (P) and annual operating cost (O):

$$LCC = P + \sum_{t=1}^N \frac{O_t}{(1+r)^t}$$

P = retail price to the consumers (R\$)

O = operating costs (electricity tariff etc.)

r = discount rate (real to the consumers)

t = time (years) from the base case (appliance acquisition)

N = life time (years)

If operating expenses are constant over time, the above equation reduces to:

$$LCC = P + PWF * O$$

where the PWF (present worth factor) equals:

$$PWF = \sum_{t=1}^N \frac{1}{(1+r)^t} = \frac{1}{r} \left[ 1 - \frac{1}{(1+r)^N} \right]$$

Payback period (PAY) is found by solving the equation:

$$\Delta P + \sum_{t=1}^{PAY} \Delta O_t = 0$$

for PAY. The Delta signifies the difference from the base case to the standards case. Delta P is an increase in price and Delta O is a decrease in operating costs. In general, PAY is found by interpolating between the two years when the above expression changes sign. If the operating cost (O) is constant over time (t), the equation has the simple solution:

$$PAY = - \frac{\Delta P}{\Delta O}$$

Source: (CLASP 2001; Biermayer 2001).

## RESULTS

### Costs and Performance Analysis

#### *Technical alternatives*

Based on the INMETRO data, manufacturers and literature, simulations of technical improvements were analyzed using the software ERA/EPA. The Brazilian refrigerator used in Case A was a model of 330 liters of adjusted volume and 360 kWh/year of electric power consumption. In Case B, a 320-liter model of adjusted volume and 320 kWh/year of electric power consumption was analyzed. The technical innovations chosen for the analysis are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2: Efficiency, consumption, standard and cost of the technological innovations.**

Description		% Energy Savings (a)		Payback (Years)		Cost (R\$)
		Case A	Case B	Case A	Case B	
Base-case (C0)	Existing voluntary Procel label A set as a Mandatory Efficiency Standard	4.0 %	4.0 %	0	0	0
Innovation 1 (C1)	Base-case + more efficient compressor	20.7 %	16.1 %	4	6	60
Innovation 2 (C2)	Innovation 1 + increase of the door insulating thermal thickness - 1,27cm	3.8 %	3.9 %	5	7	20
Innovation 3 (C3)	Innovation 2 + increase of the wall insulating thermal thickness - 1,27cm	14.0 %	12.0 %	7	9	67
Innovation 4 (C4)	Innovation 3 + increase of the door insulating thermal thickness - 2,54cm	2.8 %	2.9 %	8	10	18
Innovation 5 (C5)	Innovation 4 + increase of the wall insulating thermal thickness - 2,54cm	10.0 %	9.2 %	9	12	53

Source: innovations costs in dollars using the exchange of 21/august/2002 US\$ 1.00 = R\$ 3,30 (DOE 1995).  
 (a) Efficiency values were estimated using the simulation software ERA/EPA (Merriam, Verone & Feng nd).

## LCCA Results


### *Statistical method*

Data presented in Table 1 was used to fit a liner regression given by:

$$\text{Consumption (KWh/month)} = 21.1678 + 0.0279 \times \text{adjusted volume}$$

Figure 2 presents the INMETRO data and the regression results. The refrigerator model used in the calculations is also represented on the graph, together with the results obtained introducing the technical improvements.

**Figure 2 - Linear regression using INMETRO refrigerators (Table 1) data, and possible technological innovations – Case A.**



These statistical regressions performed using INMETRO data can be converted into standards recommendations for minimum energy consumption of energy. All the curves (C1, C2 etc.) are results of the new linear regressions that substitute the real models by the more efficient models in accordance with the suggested innovations (described in C1, C2, etc) in case A and case B (weighted efficiency index).

The C0 line regression, suggested that it is possible to get 4%<sup>3</sup> reduction if the Procel label A is a mandatory standard (all less efficient models - represented by the points above the solid line - will be forced to come down to the mandatory standard line). The second refrigerator model used as base-case (Case B hypothesis) lies exactly on the segment of straight line of the regression (C0).

According to the statistical methodology, in order to use regression results as recommendation for minimum standards, we should perform new simulations for each set of technical innovations for all models and then run a new regression based on the simulation results. These calculations are displayed as lines C1, C2, ..., C5, where 1,2,..5 represent the innovations presented in Table 2.

Table 2 presents the simulations results obtained using the ERA computer model<sup>4</sup> and available cost data. The percentage energy savings represent the average values per refrigerator for cases A and B.

**Engineering/Economic Analysis**


<sup>3</sup> This is the arithmetic average of the reduction in electricity consumption of all the models above the regression line. We have not considered the market share participation of each model.

<sup>4</sup> The ERA model was adapted to incorporate as close as possible the technical characteristics of Brazilian refrigerators considered.




Assuming a retail price of R\$ 699.00 (14 August 2002) for a 330 and 320 liter refrigerator, the innovations costs described as in the Table 2, and the factor 2.42 - the Brazilian markup factor (consumer cost / manufacturer cost of refrigerators) - it is possible; assuming a 12% per year discount rate, to calculate the Payback Period curve (Figure 3), and to build the curve for the engineering/economic analysis (Figure 4) of refrigerator efficiency standards.

**Figure 3: Payback Period Analysis.**



**Figure 4: Engineering/Economic calculations.**




As expected, manufacturer's costs increases as innovations are introduced and electricity consumption is reduced (Figure 4). When all innovations are considered the total payback period rises to 12 years approximately, which is high, but less than the expected 16 years of useful refrigerator lifetime assumed by manufacturers (Figure 3).

**Life cycle cost (LCC) Method for the consumer**

Assuming a 16-year useful lifetime for the refrigerator model, a 12% return rate and the electricity price 252 R\$/MWh, including the 18%<sup>5</sup> of tax on the tariff of *Agência Nacional de Energia Elétrica* (ANEEL 2002), it is possible to construct Figure 5 of LCC for the consumer:

**Figure 5 – Life Cycle Cost (LCC) - Popular Brazilian Refrigerators.**




The life-cycle cost analysis performed for Case A (Figure 6) which considered the popular Brazilian one-door refrigerator model suggests that the standard has to be set at the C3 (MEPS - *minimum energy performance standards* of 43%) level. MEPS is the point of the lowest LCC to consumers and has, in this case, a 7 years payback period. However, with a sensitivity analysis (changing the USA costs of improvements to a better change/exchange

<sup>5</sup> It is assumed tax of 18% as a national average, because there are different estate taxes in Brazil.

rate – 1US\$ = 2 R\$), it is possible to propose a mandatory standard of 55% (C5) to 2005 (that maintains a LCC to the consumer lower than the base-case LCC).

**Figure 6 – LCC Sensitivity Analysis – Case A - Popular Brazilian model.**



In the Case B Life Cycle Cost Analysis it was used the same structure of the linear regression of the refrigerator units sold in Brazil (with the lifetime calculation of the refrigerators based on these vintages and the household penetration too).

The Case B hypothesis incorporates in the analysis the 4% obtained from the mandatory standard based on the existing Procel label A (innovation C0 in Table 2) and 20% from innovations C1 and C2 (Table 2), totaling 24% (MEPS = C2) for a first standard in 2005. The second standard would be 48% assuming all improvements (Table 3).

**Table 3 – Summary Results:**

Indicators	Case A	Case B
Mandatory Standards (energy reduction)	43% (year 2005) (*)	24% (first standard in 2005)(*) 48% (second standard in 2010)(*)
Payback Period	7 years	7 years (first standard)/12 years (second standard)
Improvements	- Voluntary Procel label A like a mandatory standard, new compressor, increase of the door and walls insulating thermal thickness - 1/2".	- Voluntary Procel label A like a mandatory standard, new compressor, increase of the door insulating thermal thickness - 1/2" (first standard); - All improvements analyzed (second standard).
Energy saved (TWh)	12 (until year 2010) 80 (until year 2020)	7 (until year 2010) 70 (until year 2020)
CO <sub>2</sub> Conservation (Gg)	38,160	33,759
Billion R\$ saved on the electricity bill	12	9

Notes: It was assumed a coefficient 0.48 kg CO<sub>2</sub>/kWh (emission from Natural gas fuelled thermoelectric plant). All values were calculated in R\$ (2000). (\*) compared to the 2000 refrigerator model.

## CONCLUSIONS

The use of tools and methods that simulate the refrigerator performance according to proposed technical innovations and the use of life cycle cost analysis show that it is possible to obtain significant reductions in electricity consumption in Brazilian refrigerators.

The results represent important inputs to subsidy further discussion with manufacturers in the process of setting-up efficiency standards for Brazilian refrigerators.

## References

Lei 10.295 2001. *Dispõe sobre a Política Nacional de Conservação e Uso Racional de Energia e dá outras providências*. Subsecretaria de Informações do Senado Federal, 17/outubro/2001. Decreto 4.059 - *Regulamenta a Lei nº 10.295*. Subchefia para Assuntos Jurídicos da Casa Civil da Presidência da República, 19/dezembro/2001.

BEN 2001. *Balanço Energético Nacional – ano base 2000*. Disponível na [www.mme.gov.br](http://www.mme.gov.br).

PROCEL 1998. *Resultados de 1998*. Programa Nacional de Conservação de Energia (PROCEL/Eletróbras). Disponível em: <http://www.eletrabras.gov.br/procel/1.htm> [acesso em 4/julho/2001].

INMETRO 2001. *Produtos Etiquetados*. Instituto Nacional de Metrologia, Normalização e Qualidade Industrial. [acesso em 08/agosto/2002] [www.inmetro.gov.br/consumidor/prodEtiquetados.asp#pbe](http://www.inmetro.gov.br/consumidor/prodEtiquetados.asp#pbe).

CLASP 2001. *Energy-Efficiency Labels and Standards: A Guidebook for Appliances, Equipment, and Lighting*. Lead authors: Stephen Wiel and James E. McMahon, Collaborative Labeling and Appliance Standards Program (CLASP), 205p. February.

IEA 2000. *Energy Labels & Standards: energy efficiency policy profile*. International Energy Agency, OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development), 194 pgs.

Merriam, Verone & Feng nd. *EPA refrigerator Analysis (ERA) program: User's manual*, version 1.2E, Cambridge, Mass: Arthur D. Little, Inc.

Biermayer 2001. *Life-Cycle Cost Analysis: Refrigerators*. Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL), second regional workshop on energy efficiency standards and labels, IRAM, Buenos Aires, 23 march.

ANEEL 2002. *Tarifas de energia elétrica*. Acesso ao site [www.aneel.gov.br](http://www.aneel.gov.br) em 24/07/2002.

IEA 2000. *Energy Labels & Standards: energy efficiency policy profile*. “Technical Support Document: Energy Efficiency Standards for consumer products: Refrigerators, Refrigerator-Freezers, & Freezers” of the North American Department of Energy of July/1995.

DOE 1995. *Technical Support Document: Energy Efficiency Standards for consumer products: Refrigerators, Refrigerators-Freezers, & Freezers*. U.S. Department of Energy, 391 p., July.

## Acknowledgements:

The authors would like to thank the financial support received from the the International Energy Agency/Climate Technology Initiative, the International Energy Initiative, the Environmental Protection Agency and the São Paulo Research Council (FAPESP).