

## **Supportive governance for city-scale low carbon building retrofits: A case study from Shanghai**

Zhongjue Yu<sup>a</sup>, Yong Geng<sup>b,a,c,d,\*</sup>, Qi He<sup>e</sup>, Lucy Oates<sup>f,g</sup>, Andrew Sudmant<sup>f,g</sup>, Andy Gouldson<sup>f,g</sup>, Raimund Bleischwitz<sup>h</sup>

<sup>a</sup> School of Environmental Science and Engineering, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, China

<sup>b</sup> School of International and Public Affairs, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, China

<sup>c</sup> China Institute for Urban Governance, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, China

<sup>d</sup> School of Management, China University of Mining and Technology, No. 1 Daxue Road, Xuzhou 221116, China

<sup>e</sup> Research Institute for Global Value Chains, University of International Business and Economics, 100029, Beijing, China

<sup>f</sup> School of Earth and Environment, University of Leeds, Leeds LS29JT, UK

<sup>g</sup> ESRC Centre for Climate Change Economics and Policy, University of Leeds, Leeds LS29JT, UK

<sup>h</sup> Institute for Sustainable Resources, University College London, London WC1H 0NN, UK

### **Abstract:**

There is significant potential for reducing energy use and emissions from buildings through energy efficiency retrofits. However, a number of barriers, including long payback periods and uncertainties around business models and technologies, restrict large scale implementation. A recent joint project, piloting green energy schemes and low-carbon investments in public and commercial buildings in the Changning district of Shanghai, China, indicated opportunities to break through these barriers. This study conducted a cost benefit analysis to investigate how an innovative combination of financial and non-financial supported retrofits, and could serve as a model for other urban areas. In total, 44 retrofit sub-projects were carried out and achieved energy savings of 30,217 tons of coal equivalent. The average payback period was 2.43 years, and with subsidies was further reduced to 1.79 years. The Changning Low Carbon Office

played a critical role in coordinating and supporting the uptake of retrofit measures but non-economic factors continue to restrict investment by financial institutions and the implementation of retrofits on a larger scale.

**Key policy insights:**

- Public and commercial building retrofits in Shanghai are found to generate commercially acceptable payback periods while having achieved significant energy and emissions reductions.
- Subsidies from the city and district governments significantly reduced the payback periods of energy efficiency retrofits, but may also crowd out investment by financial institutions.
- The Changning Low Carbon Office has coordinated energy efficiency retrofitting efforts, provided access to information, helped to connect investment funds with project opportunities and support project management.
- Achieving the deeper retrofits needed to achieve China's climate targets may require more substantial financial incentives.

Keywords: Energy efficiency, cost-benefit analysis, public and commercial buildings, urban climate action, urban governance

**1. Introduction**

Buildings in urban areas account for over 55% of electricity demand (IEA, 2017) and roughly one-third of the global energy consumption (Kammen and Sunter, 2016). The challenge of reducing the contribution of buildings to climate change is as much about the scope of energy use as it is about the scale of energy use.

Buildings use energy for lighting, cooling, heating, electronics, water heating, refrigeration and cooking, among other uses, leading to a complicated and interconnected set of points for intervention. Both the rebuild and retrofit of existing buildings have the potential to substantially improve the energy performance and sustainability. Replacing existing buildings may have higher potential to integrate more advanced technologies and achieve a deeper decarbonisation (Schwartz et al., 2018), but will likely also be more time-consuming, costly and disruptive. Furthermore, embodied greenhouse gases released during the extraction, processing, transport and construction of materials used in buildings typically account for 10 to 20 percent of a building's lifetime emissions. This share becomes substantially larger if buildings are

replaced before the end of their intended lifespan (Cabeza et al., 2014).

Cost-effective buildings retrofits are therefore seen as critical to mitigating dangerous climate change. In public and commercial buildings alone, implementing energy efficiency measures – for example, replacing lightbulbs with LEDs, insulating walls and heating systems, and installing energy-efficient appliances, can achieve 25 – 50 percent reductions in energy consumption (Lin and Liu, 2015; Lucon et al., 2014; Qian et al., 2019). Across global urban areas approximately one-quarter of the potential for greenhouse gas abatement can be found in buildings, in part because older and outdated buildings often have higher energy intensities than those constructed today (Sudmant et al., 2016). Beyond the benefits to the climate, such investments can generate substantial economic savings for businesses (Colenbrander et al., 2019, 2017; He et al., 2016), and wider non-economic benefits, including improved public health from clearer air and reduced exposure to heat and cold, increased employment, and higher workplace productivity (Gouldson et al., 2018).

While theoretical and forward-looking analyses of technical, policy, behavioural and practice-based measures have become relatively common (Colenbrander et al., 2016; Jones and Kammen, 2011; Sudmant et al., 2017), ex-post analysis of urban climate actions are relatively less common, and lacking for many types of interventions and regions of the world (Creutzig et al., 2019; Kallaos et al., 2018; Widerberg and Stripple, 2016). Furthermore, the cost-effectiveness of energy efficiency retrofits has in some places been called into question. For example, Galvin and Sunikka-Blank (2013) pointed out that it was beyond the limit of economically viable technologies to reach Germany's stringent target of 80% carbon reduction by 2050 compared to 1990 levels. This increases the necessity of a quantitative assessment of the economic cases of practical retrofit projects.

Scaling up the improvement of energy efficiency in existing commercial and public buildings, however, can be more challenging. Barriers to a larger scale roll out of energy efficiency retrofitting include split incentives between owners and occupiers, lack of awareness about opportunities, lack of available information on the success of technologies in real-life settings, high upfront transaction costs and inadequate access to financing (Climate Policy Initiative et al., 2013; World Bank, 2019). Similarly, Hou et al. (2016), investigating the commercial building retrofit market in China and Japan, found key barriers were

difficulties with the coordination of actors, imperfect market mechanisms, and unpredictable energy savings. Alam et al. (2019) used focus groups to investigate the key barriers to public building retrofits. In addition to the aforementioned aspects, they found complex and excessive approval procedures in energy efficiency procurement as another barrier.

Government support undertaken to break these barriers can be generally categorised into:

### 1) Mandatory instruments

Mandatory instruments dominate climate governance in the urban building sector (Trencher et al., 2016). They include mandatory building codes and energy efficiency standards (Sun et al., 2016), and periodic energy audits (Annunziata et al., 2014). Despite being widely applied, mandatory instruments usually have shortcomings such as requiring substantial time and institutional capital to develop and implement (Van der Heijden, 2016).

### 2) Market-based and fiscal instruments

Market-based and fiscal instruments usually include tax- and subsidy-based incentives to encourage building owners to take actions. Similarly, carbon permits were found to motivate actions for building energy efficiency retrofits in Tokyo (Nishida et al., 2016). In other cases, market-based instruments seek to attract financing. For example, the Billion Dollar Green Challenge adopted a revolving loan fund that was repaid by the cost of energy savings in the universities in the United States (Mero, 2012). Another financing instrument was climate bonds in the 1200 Buildings in Melbourne (Wilkinson, 2018), where the government acted as a “middle person”, took the risk from financial institutions, and recouped the loan through a property tax on the retrofitted buildings.

### 3) Information generation and dissemination

Energy efficiency certification and labelling are popular measures to assess and demonstrate buildings' achievements on energy saving and sustainability. In general, this would make those buildings stand out and raise awareness among other building owners, investors, and the public. Well known tools are the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method (BREEAM) and the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) (Cole and Jose Valdebenito, 2013); it should be noted that there are concerns about the difficulties of comparing between and across different assessment criteria (Van

der Heijden, 2015). Voluntary instruments also help to bridge the gap between the government and private sector standards, such as by encouraging friendly competition in neighbours (Trencher et al., 2016), developing intermediaries (Magnani et al., 2020), and sharing information and experiences (Dowling et al., 2018).

In practice, these instruments are usually combined and found to have complex interactions (Trencher and van der Heijden, 2019). In China, the building retrofit has been mainly driven by subsidies (Huang et al., 2016), but few studies have focused on the effect of subsidies on promoting commercial and public building retrofits. Rather, literatures focus on broader topics. For example, government fiscal support including subsidies has been found to improve the economic case and attract private investment (Olmos et al., 2012; Polzin, 2017). The focus, however, was generally on innovative or disruptive clean energy technologies in all industries. Studies on the effect of government support on the investment of building energy efficiency retrofits, particularly from the private sector and financial institutions, have been less common.

These uncertainties have served to limit the opportunity for the feedback and learning that is needed for more ambitious low carbon action (Gouldson et al., 2015), for assessing how socio-technical transitions align with low-carbon pathways (Widerberg and Stripple, 2016), and more generally, for the development of a coherent global urban sustainability science (Creutzig et al., 2019).

With these factors and the growing urgency of the climate emergency in mind, there is a continued need for assessment of the business case for building retrofits in different contexts and to understand the wider policy and governance landscapes that can be supportive or inhibitive to retrofitting. This study applies cost benefit analysis to assess the economic case of building energy efficiency retrofits and to explore the role of government support in a joint investment project initiated in Changning district of Shanghai, China. This study aims to elucidate: a) how much the subsidies have improved the business case; b) how Changning's local government combined the fiscal, technical, and coordinating support to promote building energy efficiency retrofits; and c) why an improved business case leveraged limited private investment by financial institutions in the Changning building energy efficiency retrofit project. This study contributes to the literature by providing quantitative evidence of the effect of subsidies on

the cost-effectiveness of building energy efficiency retrofits, and identifying the key factors that lead to the limited participation of investment by financial institutions.

This paper is organised as follows. Section 2 provides an overview of the policy background including the national and municipal plans, the subsidy system, and a narrative of the World Bank-supported Project. Section 3 introduces the methodology and data sources. Section 4 presents the results of the cost benefit analysis. Section 5 provides a further discussion on the successes and deficiencies of the case. Section 6 draws research conclusions and discusses policy implications from this study.

## **2. Background and context**

### **2.1. The city and district level subsidy**

China has been pursuing building energy saving for many years. In 2013, The Special Plan for Building Energy Conservation of China's 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan set a target of completing the retrofit of 60 million square metres in public and commercial buildings by the end of 2015. Cities are major players in the nation's climate action strategy. In 2011, four cities (Tianjin, Shanghai, Chongqing, Shenzhen) were chosen to be key cities to promote energy conservation in public and commercial buildings. A baseline subsidy of CNY 20 per square metre retrofitted (approximately \$3.05 USD) was promised to each city. Local governments were able to announce their own subsidy standards based upon this baseline.

As a municipality as well as a megacity, Shanghai has launched a set of policies to motivate energy efficiency projects in the built environment. In 2009, the Special Subsidy for Building Energy Efficiency Projects in Shanghai (Number 816) was established to create incentives for private investment in public and commercial building energy efficiency. Capital for the fund was provided in equal parts by the central and municipal governments. Central to the design of the project was to make the information generated by qualifying projects – known as “demonstration projects” – widely available to raise awareness about the potential for low carbon investment in buildings.

The subsidy was also designed to take into consideration changes in technologies and costs, and has seen a number of changes since 2009 (<Insert Fig. 1). Update Number 311, issued in 2013, supported building retrofits that

achieve a reduction of more than 20 percent in energy consumption per square metre. Qualifying projects received CNY 40 (approximately \$6.10 USD) per square metre if they applied energy performance contracting, in which an external energy savings company implements a project and recovers the costs from the savings, or CNY 35 (approximately \$5.30 USD) per square metre) if projects did not involve energy performance contracting. In addition, the total amount of the subsidy was set to not exceed 50% of the total investment in the project.

<Insert Fig. 1. here>

Changning, the case area, is located in the west of downtown Shanghai (Fig. S1). It has a land area of 38 square kilometres and a population of 690,000 in 2015. The floor area of buildings in Changning is roughly 40 million square metres, 60% of which are residential buildings. The district can be roughly divided into three zones - west, middle, east - which are the transportation centre, the economic development zone, and the residential area respectively. In 2015, the GDP of Changning was CNY 104 billion (approximately \$15.8 billion USD), dominated by service industry (93% of GDP in 2015) – mainly commerce and trade.

Independently, Changning established its own district-level subsidy for building energy efficiency retrofits with the support of the World Bank in 2013. The Changning District subsidy included CNY 1,000 (approximately \$152 USD) per ton of coal equivalent (tce) avoided, or CNY 450 (approximately \$68 USD) per ton of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent (tCO<sub>2</sub>e) emissions reduced on an annual basis for those building retrofits that saved at least 50 tce each year. It also provided 30% compensation for any losses incurred during a renovation project that interrupted normal business operations for 6 months or more. The total amount received by any one project was set to not exceed CNY 1 million (approximately \$152,000 USD).

## **2.2. Overcoming barriers to public and commercial building retrofitting in Changning, Shanghai**

Cooperation between the Shanghai Municipal Government and the World Bank began in 2012, with Changning District in Shanghai determined as an area of focus because of its concentration of relatively older buildings. A World Bank-

supported project was carried out, bringing grants and loans to support the capacity building and leverage low carbon investments in the building sector.

The grant was provided by the Global Environment Facility (GEF). A dedicated Low Carbon Office was formed in Changning District to coordinate energy efficiency retrofitting efforts, provide access to information, help to connect investment funds with project opportunities and support project management. With strong representation from local government leaders, the Changning Low Carbon Office also liaises with the District Development and Reform Commission, the Municipal Finance Bureau and national agencies, and carries out research related to energy efficiency in buildings. It is now called upon to support projects in other districts, serving as a key conduit for knowledge transfer.

Additionally, a building energy monitoring platform was established and scaled up during the project phase. In 2007, Changning District pioneered the country's first online platform for monitoring the energy performance of public and commercial buildings, strengthening data collection and evaluation capacities. The monitoring platform collects and analyses real-time energy use data at the building level. The platform was used as a model for the entire city in 2012 when, as part of the 12<sup>th</sup> Five Year Plan, the city government mandated that the programme should be scaled-up to the city level. With the support of the World Bank, the Shanghai State Office Building and Large Public Building Energy Monitoring Centre was successfully established and now monitors the energy consumption of 1,687 public and commercial buildings, accounting for 78 million square metres of floor space in Shanghai.

The loan was provided by The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD). The loan was expected to leverage the co-financing of two participating commercial banks - Shanghai Pudong Development Bank (SPDB) and Bank of Shanghai (BOS). The Funding for 67 sub-projects had been allocated within three years. Most of the sub-projects were energy efficiency retrofitting (44), others were new buildings of high energy standard (16), distributed generation centres (4), combined interventions (2), and a net-zero emission building (1). These actions cover 5.87 million square metres of floor area (including outside of Changning District). The locations of the 44 energy efficiency retrofitting sub-projects are shown in Fig. S1.



### **3. Method and data**

#### **3.1. Case study characteristics**

This analysis assesses 67 completed low-carbon building sub-projects supported by the project of International Bank for Reconstruction and Development Loan (ibrd-8233-cn) to the amount of \$100,000,000 USD and Global Environment Facility Grant (tf-14205-cn) to the amount of \$4,345,000 USD for the Green Energy for Low-carbon City in Shanghai (Project ID P127035). The geographical area of sub-projects was expanded from initially focusing on Changning District to also including 12 other districts out of the 16 districts of Shanghai Municipality. Those 67 sub-projects covered 10 types of public and commercial buildings, which we then categorised into five groups for convenience of comparison: offices, hotels, industry, schools & hospitals and others.

Analysis is conducted of energy efficiency (EE) retrofit activities in existing buildings, and new buildings, of large-scale distributed generation (DG) and of combined activities. “New EE buildings” refers to the new constructions of buildings with low carbon technologies beyond the requirement of the municipal building code. The investment of “new EE buildings” refers to the incremental cost of achieving such a higher energy conservation standard relative to a scenario without the project. In Shanghai, such a scenario is given by the Design Standard for Energy Efficiency of Public Buildings in Shanghai (DGJ 08-107-2012), which is equivalent to a 65% energy conservation rate compared with 1980s level. In the project, new buildings were upgraded to a 70% conservation rate compared with 1980s level (World Bank, 2019).

29 types of abatement technologies were deployed. These can be categorised into Heating, Ventilation and Air Conditioning (HVAC) and hot water supply systems, power supply and lighting, power and other equipment, applications of renewable energy, monitoring and control systems, management measures and building envelope actions. The range of demand-side building EE technologies includes lighting, HVAC, insulation, envelope, and energy management systems. Actions to reduce building energy demand are complemented by actions to generate low-carbon energy, as well as wider activities affecting the intensity of emissions from the electricity grid. Distributed generation (DG) activities include on-site production of electricity, and thermal energy.

### **3.2. Cost-benefit modelling**

To evaluate the cost effectiveness for energy efficiency measures in buildings in Shanghai, an integrated building/sub-project based cost and benefit assessment was carried out which builds on previous similar assessments in other contexts (He et al., 2016). The analysis involves aggregating potential economic savings from energy reductions by two kinds of energy types (namely, electricity and natural gas), and providing payback periods from energy efficiency measures adopted in the buildings in terms of reductions in energy bills. Due to a lack of data on the composition of energy use, estimates were based on data from the annual building energy consumption monitoring report from the Shanghai State Office Building and Large Public Building Energy Monitoring Centre (Shanghai Urban and Rural Construction and Management Committee, 2014). Specifically, we assume that the energy savings of all sub-projects were 100% electricity, excluding hotels which saved 70% electricity and 30% natural gas (Wei et al., 2016).

The costs of measures were held constant at the year of investment (most in 2014 or 2015). As measures could be in place for many years, an annual increase in real energy prices, an annual discount rate and an annual inflation rate should be considered during the 20 years life span of the measures. However, due to these numbers being relatively close (around 5%) according to recent trends in China since 2015, no special handling has to be done to the data during estimation.

This study did not include the potential co-benefits of energy savings with regard to other externalities, such as the reduction of greenhouse gases, or of air pollution (Bin and Parker, 2012; Brown et al., 2013; Hasik et al., 2019), as this study only focuses on financial costs and benefits. It is therefore expected that this study underestimates the full range of benefits of these investments.

### **3.3. Data sources**

The research presented here draws on data from the Shanghai State Office Building and Large Public Building Energy Monitoring Centre (available at: <http://www.shjzjn.org>), and the World Bank's Implementation Completion and Results Report of the project "Green Energy for Low-Carbon City in Shanghai", hereinafter referred to as the "World Bank report" (World Bank, 2019).

The data of subsidies from Changning District were derived from the World

Bank report. The data of subsidies from Shanghai Municipality were derived from the information disclosure of the Shanghai State Office Building and Large Public Building Energy Monitoring Centre (available at: <http://www.shzjn.org/#/remouldshowcases>). Some of the sub-projects were actually supported by both Shanghai and Changning subsidies, but the World Bank report only included the subsidies from Changning District. Thus, we aggregated the subsidies from both sources (Supplementary S2). All monetary values in CNY are changed into USD with an exchange rate of 6.5795 CNY/USD, which is consistent with the World Bank report on this project.

#### 4. Results

The efficiency of low carbon investment, illustrated by the ratio of per area energy savings to the per area investment of each sub-project, is presented in <Insert Fig. 2.

<Insert Fig. 2. here>

Across all sub-projects, EE retrofits are notably less capital intensive than projects in new buildings, but also resulted in a larger impact on energy savings per unit area. EE retrofits have an average cost of 23.92 USD/m<sup>2</sup> and achieved an average energy savings of 10.73 kgce/m<sup>2</sup>. A special case is the Hongqiao Airport Terminal 1, the only airport building in this project, which achieved 38.69 kgce/m<sup>2</sup> of energy saving annually from 157.51 USD/m<sup>2</sup> of investment. The average investment in new buildings was 67.10 USD/m<sup>2</sup>, and the average annual energy saving was 8.51 kgce/m<sup>2</sup>. While retrofitting existing buildings is found to be relatively more cost effective, the similarity in cost savings per unit area between options for retrofitting existing buildings and those for “pre-fitting”<sup>1</sup> new buildings emphasises the range of possible intervention points for reducing the energy use from buildings.

<Insert Fig. 3. here>

Assessing the financial cases for retrofitting, the results reveal a notably shorter payback period for retrofit projects as compared with investments in new

---

<sup>1</sup> Pre-fitting refers to investments made to reduce the environmental footprint of a building that would not otherwise be made and that are made before the buildings is complete. These are list as ‘EE new’ in the figure.

buildings. This can be seen by comparing “EE retrofit” with “EE new” in <Insert Fig. 3, where average payback periods are 2.43 and 7.69 years, respectively. While variation between projects should be noted, the fact that new buildings had longer payback periods on average in part reflects the relatively high energy efficiency standard already applied to newer buildings. At the same time, the relatively shorter payback periods for existing buildings suggests an opportunity for cost effective investment.

Assessing the ex-post retrofit data also provides an opportunity to assess the role of government subsidies in supporting retrofit investments. Results show that subsidies have had a substantial effect on the financial case for low carbon investment in both existing and new public buildings ( <Insert Fig. 3). The average payback periods of EE new and EE retrofit declined by 0.57 and 0.64 years, respectively, due to the subsidies. DGs (Distributed Generations) and other sub-projects were not included in the government subsidy and thus have the same payback periods.

One case, the Near-Zero-Emission (NZE) building – Hongqiao State Guest Hotel Building 9 (marked on <Insert Fig. 2) was excluded from the assessment as it applies a much higher retrofitting standard – no more than 35 kWh/m<sup>2</sup> of electricity consumption. The building achieved 49 tce/year of energy savings with 1.12 million USD of investment within the 3063 m<sup>2</sup> floor area. The payback period was 29.40 years without subsidy, and 16.03 years with subsidy, which is notably longer than other retrofits or even new buildings. The additional cost of this retrofit indicates the longer-term challenge of meeting the need for deep reductions in emissions.

<Insert Fig. 4. here>

Assessing the financial case of EE retrofit by building type, the strongest case is found on industrial properties and in schools and hospitals ( <Insert Fig. 4). For industrial properties, relatively short payback periods reflect the high energy needs of these properties and the energy-intensity of property use: while other properties, including offices and homes are frequently unoccupied for a large portion of the day, industrial properties, by contrast, may be in use 24 hours a day. The relatively short payback periods for investments in schools and hospitals suggest an unrealised opportunity for public buildings to consider more aggressive retrofit options. On the other hand, offices and

hotels have relatively longer payback periods, while also having a greater reduction in payback periods thanks to the subsidy (by 0.82 and 0.54 years, respectively). These findings suggest that subsidies have had the greatest impact on investments with relatively higher payback periods, which may potentially compensate the lower incentive for office and hotel owners on their energy bills: for example, offices and hotels may both see energy efficiency as a secondary concern to the comfort of their employees and guests. “Other” seems to have a quite long payback period, but this set comprises several diverse types of buildings, including the Hongqiao Airport Terminal 1 - a case that required much more investment compared to other retrofitting examples ( <Insert Fig. 2).

<Insert Fig. 5. here>

Assessing the composition of the investment in EE retrofits and EE new (Fig. 5), the loan from World Bank (IBRD) and investment from project developers clearly played a key role, while the two commercial banks (SPDB and BOS), were more active in investing in EE new buildings than in EE retrofit. The total investment in EE retrofit and EE new buildings were \$105.23 and \$242.04 USD, respectively (including government subsidies). The SPDB and BOS accounted for nearly half of the investment in EE new buildings but less than 2% in EE retrofit.

Our findings are broadly consistent with other studies that have adopted a cost benefit analysis framework to explore the economically feasible opportunities for carbon reduction in building sectors in cities. For example, Krarti and Dubey (2018) estimated that a basic energy retrofit program applied to existing building stock in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) could achieve savings of 7550 GWh/year in electricity consumption, 1400 MW in peak electricity demand and reduce carbon emissions by 4.5 million tons on a yearly basis. The estimated average payback period was less than six months. Jo et al. (2010) conducted a 20-year cost benefit analysis to estimate the return on investment for solar reflective roof technologies on commercial buildings based on the energy simulation results. The results of the simulation modelling revealed that reductions of 1.3–1.9% and 2.6–3.8% of the total monthly electricity consumption can be achieved from the 50% cool roof replacement already implemented and a 100% roof replacement in the future, respectively. This corresponds to a saving of approximately \$22,000 USD per year in energy costs at current prices and a consequent 9-year payback period for the added cost

of installing the 100% cool roof.

## **5. Discussions**

The World Bank-supported project (the project) in Changning, Shanghai achieved modest building energy savings and revealed that for some investments the payback periods may be compatible with private investors' expected returns. If the average energy saving rate (approximately 20%) of the retrofit sub-projects can be realised at a city scale in Shanghai, with a rough estimation, the energy efficiency retrofitting of buildings could save 6 million tce of energy and reduce 12 million tons of carbon dioxide each year; this is about 6% of Shanghai's total carbon emission in 2015, and would require a further investment of CNY 90 billion (approximately \$13.67 billion USD). A tremendous amount of investment needs to be financed by both government fiscal support as well as private investment to realise retrofits at such a scale. The collaboration developed between governments and NGOs in the project seems to be a good start. In two key areas, however, a review of the project raises concerns around constraints that limited the performance of the project.

The first is the limited extent to which government support was able to leverage investment by financial institutions via participating commercial banks. While the investment by financial institutions contributed significantly to new building investments, less than 2% of retrofit investment in existing buildings came from commercial financial institutions, in spite of the relatively higher return on investment these measures ultimately yielded. One explanation could be that setting up new EE buildings is essentially real estate development rather than an energy efficiency measure, and thus may be more predictable, familiar and preferable to the banks. A second possible explanation is that the loan from the World Bank and subsidies from the government left too small of an investable proposition for commercial financial institutions to be interested. This aligns with evidence from the financing of China's energy service companies (ESCOs) showing that the key barrier exists in the local implementation of programs rather than with the construction of overarching policies (Zhang et al., 2020). In addition, there has also been a lack of tools and knowledge to assess the default risk of retrofits, and a lack of verification and monitoring standards to evaluate projects (Shen et al., 2013), discouraging activity from the finance sector. Whatever the reason, investment by financial institutions played a relatively limited role in EE retrofits during the project, at odds with the intention of the project and a missed opportunity for increasing the role of commercial financial

institutions in financing building retrofits.

The second concern relates to the project's influence on low carbon action in the building sector as part of the Shanghai carbon trading pilot. Carbon trading has been found to be effective in creating incentives for reducing energy consumption and in driving behavioural changes in buildings (Nishida et al., 2016); for this reason, integration with the carbon trading system to stimulate investment was one objective of this project. However, almost all sub-projects were ultimately excluded from participating in Shanghai's trading pilot. This is in part a consequence of the small size of many sub-projects. Another possible contributing factor may have been intervention from the Changning government. Participating in the Shanghai's trading pilot requires the permission from the government. The Changning government may have had concerns about losing competitiveness to other districts or provinces, which would have negative impact on regional GDP (Zhang and Duan, 2020) as well as tax revenues for the local government.

While the project may have faced challenges increasing private investment in building retrofits, its influence on the wider governance of urban low carbon investment may both be more significant and lasting. Changning's Low Carbon Office played a critical role in the project, acting as an "intermediary" that brought together the stakeholders (de Wilde and Spaargaren, 2019; Magnani et al., 2020). It provided technical support for ex-ante evaluations of the costs and benefits of the cases. It also helped identify cases with higher energy saving potential and financial viability and promoted coordination between local government, financial institutions, energy service companies, and building owners, managers and users. At the same time the building energy monitoring platform developed in conjunction with the project has significantly increased data availability on energy performance, helping investors to identify energy saving opportunities.

Scaling investment in building retrofits will require substantial increases in investment, almost by necessity requiring greater participation from private actors and less dependence on development organisations (such as the World Bank) and government subsidies. In equal measure scaling action will also require a tremendous increase in the availability and accessibility of information on low carbon actions, including information that is financial, technical, and economic, relating to energy use and financial performance. In this context, this

project and its influence on the governance of low carbon action in Shanghai may help to establish the foundations for private actors to play a larger role in building retrofits in China.

## **6. Conclusions and policy implications**

This study conducted an ex-post analysis and investigation on the World Bank-supported project in Changning, Shanghai. The analysis results show that energy efficiency (EE) retrofits had a relatively short average payback period of 2.43 years, and government subsidies managed to significantly reduce the payback period to 1.79 years. The Low Carbon Office played an important role as an intermediary that provided technical and coordinating support. However, the subsidy and other government support did not leverage investment by commercial financial institutions. Scaling up similar activities in Shanghai and realising wider impacts will require further actions from urban and national policymakers in line with the following policy recommendations.

### **(1) Strengthening and improving economic incentives**

Economic incentives could be strengthened by externality pricing, through the expansion of carbon taxation and/or the emissions trading market (Nishida et al., 2016). In this way concerns about competitiveness from cities and regions can be turned into opportunities for investment. Although government subsidies did not manage to bring the expected level of investment by commercial financial institutions into EE retrofits, such subsidies are still critical for encouraging project developers. The government could further consider a progressive (performance-based) subsidy scheme that links the subsidy level to the energy savings achieved.

### **(2) Scaling up support from intermediaries like Changning's Low Carbon Office**

Wider local governance support combined with smarter financing is suggested to scale up building retrofits. Local governments can help cities to establish dedicated umbrella agencies – like Changning's Low Carbon Office – which provide technical and coordinative supports. These agencies could also help to build up the so called “one-stop-shop”, which provides a range of comprehensive services to reduce the transaction cost and diversify the risks of investing in buildings' energy efficiency (Pardo-Bosch et al., 2019). Further roles that such an office could assume in this context include facilitating research and knowledge transfer by identifying and communicating best



practices, and raising awareness and education about green design.

### (3) Better information on energy performance of the building stock

Better information on the energy performance of the building stock remains a barrier to academic inquiry and business activity in retrofitting. Expanding the coverage of the building energy performance monitoring system, specifically in public and commercial buildings, would require more mandatory measures to complement economic incentives (Liu et al., 2020). The improved data sets would support more targeted interventions, improved modelling, and would enable planners to design interventions across entire neighbourhoods rather than single homes or offices, vastly improving the financial case, and also support improvements in the level of achievable impact.

### (4) Raising building standards

Building standards also need to be raised for both existing and new buildings. Mandatory standards are usually considered inefficient policy measures, but will be a strong force to promote building retrofits (Huang et al., 2016). The national government should consider making retrofitting compulsory for old buildings that do not meet the energy performance standards. Furthermore, China has been developing the “Three Star” system for energy performance assessment and certification, which is currently voluntary. (Geng et al., 2012). Expanding this kind of certification can be combined with density bonus initiatives to generate interest for developers to promote investment in building retrofits (Schmitt et al., 2007).

## Acknowledgement

This study was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of China (71810107001, 72088101, 71690241), and BEIS Business Energy Industrial Strategy Grant (115857).

## References

- Alam, M., Zou, P.X.W., Stewart, R.A., Bertone, E., Sahin, O., Buntine, C., Marshall, C., 2019. Government championed strategies to overcome the barriers to public building energy efficiency retrofit projects. *Sustain. Cities Soc.* 44, 56–69. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scs.2018.09.022>
- Annunziata, E., Rizzi, F., Frey, M., 2014. Enhancing energy efficiency in public buildings: The role of local energy audit programmes. *Energy Policy* 69, 364–373.
- Bin, G., Parker, P., 2012. Measuring buildings for sustainability: Comparing the initial and retrofit ecological footprint of a century home - The REEP House. *Appl. Energy* 93, 24–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2011.05.055>
- Brown, N.W.O., Malmqvist, T., Bai, W., Molinari, M., 2013. Sustainability assessment of renovation packages for increased energy efficiency for multi-family buildings in Sweden. *Build. Environ.* 61, 140–148.
- Cabeza, L.F., Rincón, L., Vilariño, V., Pérez, G., Castell, A., 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>
- Climate Policy Initiative, Amecke, H., Deason, J., Hobbs, A., Novikova, A., Xiu, Y., Shengyuan, Z., 2013. Buildings Energy Efficiency in China, Germany, and the United States.
- Cole, R.J., Jose Valdebenito, M., 2013. The importation of building environmental certification systems: international usages of BREEAM and LEED. *Build. Res. Inf.* 41, 662–676.
- Colenbrander, S., Gouldson, A., Sudmant, A.H., Papargyropoulou, E., Chau, L.W., Ho, C.S., 2016. Exploring the economic case for early investment in climate change mitigation in middle-income countries: a case study of Johor Bahru, Malaysia. *Clim. Dev.* 8, 351–364.
- Colenbrander, S., Sudmant, A., Chilundika, N., Gouldson, A., 2019. The scope for low - carbon development in Kigali, Rwanda: An economic appraisal. *Sustain. Dev.* 27, 349–365.
- Colenbrander, S., Sudmant, A.H., Gouldson, A., Albuquerque, I.R. de, McAnulla, F., Sousa, Y.O. de, 2017. The economics of climate mitigation: exploring the relative significance of the incentives for and barriers to low-carbon investment in urban areas. *Urbanisation* 2, 38–58.
- Creutzig, F., Lohrey, S., Bai, X., Baklanov, A., Dawson, R., Dhakal, S., Lamb, W.F., McPhearson, T., Minx, J., Munoz, E., 2019. Upscaling urban data

- science for global climate solutions. *Glob. Sustain.* 2.
- de Wilde, M., Spaargaren, G., 2019. Designing trust: how strategic intermediaries choreograph homeowners' low-carbon retrofit experience. *Build. Res. Inf.* 47, 362–374.
- Dowling, R., McGuirk, P., Maalsen, S., 2018. Multiscalar governance of urban energy transitions in Australia: The cases of Sydney and Melbourne. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.* 44, 260–267.
- Galvin, R., Sunikka-Blank, M., 2013. Economic viability in thermal retrofit policies: Learning from ten years of experience in Germany. *Energy Policy* 54, 343–351. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2012.11.044>
- Geng, Y., Dong, H., Xue, B., Fu, J., 2012. An overview of Chinese green building standards. *Sustain. Dev.* 20, 211–221.
- Gouldson, A., Colenbrander, S., Sudmant, A., McAnulla, F., Kerr, N., Sakai, P., Hall, S., Papargyropoulou, E., Kuylensstierna, J., 2015. Exploring the economic case for climate action in cities. *Glob. Environ. Chang.* 35, 93–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.07.009>
- Gouldson, A., Sudmant, A., Khreis, H., Papargyropoulou, E., 2018. The economic and social benefits of low-carbon cities: a systematic review of the evidence. *Coalit. Urban Transitions* Washington, DC, USA.
- Hasik, V., Escott, E., Bates, R., Carlisle, S., Faircloth, B., Bilec, M.M., 2019. Comparative whole-building life cycle assessment of renovation and new construction. *Build. Environ.* 161, 106218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2019.106218>
- He, Q., Jiang, X., Gouldson, A., Sudmant, A., Guan, D., Colenbrander, S., Xue, T., Zheng, B., Zhang, Q., 2016. Climate change mitigation in Chinese megacities: A measures-based analysis of opportunities in the residential sector. *Appl. Energy* 184, 769–778. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.07.112>
- Hou, J., Liu, Y., Wu, Y., Zhou, N., Feng, W., 2016. Comparative study of commercial building energy-efficiency retrofit policies in four pilot cities in China. *Energy Policy* 88, 204–215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2015.10.016>
- Huang, B., Mauerhofer, V., Geng, Y., 2016. Analysis of existing building energy saving policies in Japan and China. *J. Clean. Prod.* 112, 1510–1518. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.07.041>
- IEA, 2017. *Energy Technology Perspectives 2017, Technology.* [https://doi.org/10.1787/energy\\_tech-2017-en](https://doi.org/10.1787/energy_tech-2017-en)
- Jo, J.H., Carlson, J.D., Golden, J.S., Bryan, H., 2010. An integrated empirical

and modeling methodology for analyzing solar reflective roof technologies on commercial buildings. *Build. Environ.* 45, 453–460.

- Jones, C.M., Kammen, D.M., 2011. Quantifying carbon footprint reduction opportunities for U.S. households and communities. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 45, 4088–4095. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es102221h>
- Kallaos, J., Sudmant, A., Driscoll, P.A., Ahlers, D., Gouldson, A., 2018. C-Valuate: Improving City-Scale Low-Carbon Investment Decision-Making.
- Kammen, D.M., Sunter, D.A., 2016. City-integrated renewable energy for urban sustainability. *Science* (80-. ). 352, 922–928. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad9302>
- Krarti, M., Dubey, K., 2018. Review analysis of economic and environmental benefits of improving energy efficiency for UAE building stock. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* 82, 14–24.
- Lin, B., Liu, H., 2015. CO2 emissions of China's commercial and residential buildings: Evidence and reduction policy. *Build. Environ.* 92, 418–431.
- Liu, Xiaojun, Liu, Xiaodan, Luo, X., Fu, H., Wang, M., Li, L., 2020. Impact of Different Policy Instruments on Diffusing Energy Consumption Monitoring Technology in Public Buildings: evidence from Xi' an, China. *J. Clean. Prod.* 251, 119693. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.119693>
- Lucon, O., Üрге-Vorsatz, D., Zain Ahmed, A., Akbari, H., Bertoldi, P., Cabeza, L.F., Eyre, N., Gadgil, A., Harvey, L.D.D., Jiang, Y., others, 2014. Buildings, Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Magnani, N., Carrosio, G., Osti, G., 2020. Energy retrofitting of urban buildings: A socio-spatial analysis of three mid-sized Italian cities. *Energy Policy* 139, 111341. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2020.111341>
- Mero, T., 2012. The Billion Dollar Green Challenge. *Sustain. J. Rec.* 5, 17–20.
- Nishida, Y., Hua, Y., Okamoto, N., 2016. Alternative building emission-reduction measure: outcomes from the Tokyo Cap-and-Trade Program. *Build. Res. Inf.* 44, 644–659.
- Olmos, L., Ruester, S., Liong, S.J., 2012. On the selection of financing instruments to push the development of new technologies: Application to clean energy technologies. *Energy Policy* 43, 252–266. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2012.01.001>
- Pardo-Bosch, F., Cervera, C., Ysa, T., 2019. Key aspects of building retrofitting: Strategizing sustainable cities. *J. Environ. Manage.* 248,

109247. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2019.07.018>

- Polzin, F., 2017. Mobilizing private finance for low-carbon innovation – A systematic review of barriers and solutions. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* 77, 525–535. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.04.007>
- Qian, D., Li, Y., Niu, F., O'Neill, Z., 2019. Nationwide savings analysis of energy conservation measures in buildings. *Energy Convers. Manag.* 188, 1–18.
- Schmitt, Y., Troj, A., Sparber, G.P.W., 2007. KlimaHaus CasaClima—a regional energy certification system stimulates low energy architecture, in: *Proceedings of PLEA2007-The 24th Conference on Passive and Low Energy Architecture*, Singapore. pp. 22–24.
- Schwartz, Y., Raslan, R., Mumovic, D., 2018. The life cycle carbon footprint of refurbished and new buildings—A systematic review of case studies. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev.* 81, 231–241.
- Shanghai Urban and Rural Construction and Management Committee, 2014. *Annual Energy Consumption Monitoring Report of Shanghai State Office Building and Large Public Building* (in Chinese).
- Shen, B., Wang, J., Li, M., Li, J., Price, L., Zeng, L., 2013. China's approaches to financing sustainable development: policies, practices, and issues. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Energy Environ.* 2, 178–198.
- Sudmant, A., Colenbrander, S., Gouldson, A., Chilundika, N., 2017. Private opportunities, public benefits? The scope for private finance to deliver low-carbon transport systems in Kigali, Rwanda. *Urban Clim.* 20, 59–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.uclim.2017.02.011>
- Sudmant, A., Millward-Hopkins, J., Colenbrander, S., Gouldson, A., 2016. Low carbon cities: is ambitious action affordable? *Clim. Change* 138, 681–688.
- Sun, X., Brown, M.A., Cox, M., Jackson, R., 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.
- Trencher, G., Castán Broto, V., Takagi, T., Sprigings, Z., Nishida, Y., Yarime, M., 2016. Innovative policy practices to advance building energy efficiency and retrofitting: Approaches, impacts and challenges in ten C40 cities. *Environ. Sci. Policy* 66, 353–365. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2016.06.021>
- Trencher, G., van der Heijden, J., 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>
- Van der Heijden, J., 2016. The new governance for low-carbon buildings:

mapping, exploring, interrogating. *Build. Res. Inf.* 44, 575–584.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09613218.2016.1159394>

- Van der Heijden, J., 2015. On the potential of voluntary environmental programmes for the built environment: a critical analysis of LEED. *J. Hous. Built Environ.* 30, 553–567.
- Wei, G., Ye, Q., Zhu, W., Dong, G., 2016. Analysis on energy consumption characteristic of star hotels in Shanghai (In Chinese). *Energy Sav. Build.* 8, 37–42.
- Widerberg, O., Stripple, J., 2016. The expanding field of cooperative initiatives for decarbonization: a review of five databases. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Clim. Chang.* 7, 486–500. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.396>
- Wilkinson, S., 2018. Sustainable office retrofit in Melbourne. *Routledge Handb. Sustain. Real Estate* 70–82.
- World Bank, 2019. China - Green Energy for Low-carbon City in Shanghai Project. Available at:  
<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/998261563296152552/China-Green-Energy-for-Low-carbon-City-in-Shanghai-Project>.
- Zhang, H., Duan, M., 2020. China's pilot emissions trading schemes and competitiveness: An empirical analysis of the provincial industrial sub-sectors. *J. Environ. Manage.* 258, 109997.
- Zhang, M., Lian, Y., Zhao, H., Xia-Bauer, C., 2020. Unlocking green financing for building energy retrofit: A survey in the western China. *Energy Strateg. Rev.* 30, 100520. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esr.2020.100520>