International Journal of Environmental Sciences
ISSN: 2229-7359
Vol. 11 No. 7, 2025
https://www.theaspd.com/ijes.php

Comparative Analysis Of Cooling Load Simulation Accuracy: A Benchmarking Study Of IES-VE And Energy Plus On Fundamental Geometries Under Indonesian Tropical Climate Conditions

[1]Mohammad Kholid Ridwan, [2]Syahid Muttaqin
[1]Nuclear Engineering and Engineering Physics Department, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Gadjah Mada, 55281 Sleman, Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta, Indonesia
[2]Soil Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Universitas Gadjah Mada, 55281 Sleman, Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Abstract
Building energy simulation tools represent critical infrastructure for accurate cooling load predictions in tropical climates, yet substantial discrepancies persist between leading software platforms. This investigation presents a comprehensive benchmarking analysis comparing IES Virtual Environment (IES-VE) and EnergyPlus cooling load calculations using five fundamental geometries (cube, octagonal prism, hexagonal prism, cylinder, hemisphere) across nine Indonesian cities representing three distinct climate zones. Each geometry underwent evaluation with three volumes (216 m³, 729 m³, 1728 m³) and three window-to-wall ratios (0%, 50%, 90%/100%), utilizing 33-year compiled meteorological data (1990-2023). The analysis concentrates exclusively on external cooling loads—encompassing envelope heat transfer and solar gains—to isolate fundamental algorithmic differences in building envelope thermal modeling. ***Infiltration loads were eliminated by setting air exchange rates to zero in all simulations****, focusing purely on envelope thermal performance. Results revealed substantial deviations between platforms, with magnitudes reaching 316% on average. The study identifies climate-specific algorithmic sensitivities and provides quantitative benchmarks for practitioners selecting simulation tools in tropical environments. Findings contribute essential validation data for building energy modeling in Southeast Asian contexts while highlighting critical gaps in current envelope thermal modeling methodologies.*
Keywords: *building energy simulation, cooling load calculation, tropical climate, IES-VE, EnergyPlus, envelope thermal modeling*

1. INTRODUCTION

Precision in building cooling load prediction constitutes a fundamental challenge in tropical building design, where energy consumption patterns differ substantially from temperate climate assumptions embedded in simulation algorithms (Ahmad & Rahman, 2008; Wong & Khoo, 2003). The Indonesian archipelago, characterized by diverse tropical climate characteristics, experiences building energy consumption contributing approximately 45% of national electricity demand (Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources, 2023), making accurate thermal predictions essential for sustainable development goals (Andersen et al., 2000; Yang et al., 2014).

Two predominant simulation platforms—IES Virtual Environment (IES-VE) and EnergyPlus—employ fundamentally different computational approaches for thermal load calculations. IES-VE utilizes Apache Systems algorithms with integrated environmental modeling (Integrated Environmental Solutions, 2023), while EnergyPlus implements heat balance methods derived from DOE-2 and BLAST predecessors (Crawley et al., 2001; Spitler et al., 1987). Despite extensive validation in temperate climates through standardized protocols such as ASHRAE Standard 140 (Judkoff & Neymark, 2006), both platforms exhibit significant prediction discrepancies when applied to tropical conditions.

1.1 Tropical Climate Modeling Challenges

Tropical cooling load calculations encounter unique complexities absent in temperate climate modeling, as extensively documented in recent literature. Elevated ambient humidity levels (70-95% RH) create intricate psychrometric interactions affecting sensible-to-latent heat ratios (ASHRAE, 2011; Harriman et al., 2001), while minimal seasonal temperature variations (2-5°C amplitude) eliminate natural relief periods characteristic of temperate zones (Peel et al., 2007). Intense solar radiation (800-1000 W/m² direct normal irradiance) combined with frequent cloud cover produces dynamic heat gain patterns that

challenge conventional modeling approaches (Gueymard, 2003; Myers et al., 2001).
Systematic inaccuracies in thermal predictions manifest as oversizing (20-40% above requirements) or undersizing of HVAC systems, resulting in excessive capital expenditure, reduced equipment efficiency, occupant discomfort, and premature equipment deterioration (ASHRAE, 2017; Braun et al., 1990). Weather data limitations, including sparse meteorological stations and incomplete historical datasets, compound these challenges by forcing reliance on interpolated or synthetic weather files of questionable accuracy (Wilcox & Marion, 2008; Kalamees et al., 2012).

1.2 Algorithmic Divergence Sources in Building Envelope Modeling

Building envelope performance in tropical conditions presents modeling complexities rarely encountered in temperate applications, as highlighted by recent research developments. Elevated moisture content creates condensation risks on thermally bridged surfaces, fundamentally altering effective U-values of building components beyond standard calculations (Sullivan et al., 2016; ASHRAE, 2019). Material thermal properties undergo degradation from UV radiation and humidity exposure (Pisello et al., 2013), yet degradation curves remain largely unincorporated in standard simulation models despite their documented significance.
Solar heat gain calculations present particular challenges in tropical environments due to complex interactions between direct and diffuse radiation components (Perez et al., 1987; Perez et al., 1990). Fenestration performance modeling requires sophisticated algorithms accounting for angular dependencies and spectral characteristics of glazing systems (McCluney, 1990; Rubin, 1985), while natural ventilation effects significantly impact heat transfer coefficients in ways not adequately captured by standard models (Nielsen & Allard, 2000; Jayamaha et al., 1996).

1.3 Literature Gap and Simulation Tool Validation

Existing validation studies for building energy simulation tools demonstrate substantial bias toward temperate climate conditions, with limited systematic evaluation in tropical contexts. The International Energy Agency's Building Energy Simulation Test (BESTEST) methodology (Judkoff & Neymark, 1995) provides robust validation protocols but relies primarily on synthetic test cases that may not adequately represent tropical building physics phenomena. Recent efforts by Reddy et al. (2007) and Henninger & Witte (2004) advance validation methodologies but maintain focus on standardized conditions that inadequately represent Southeast Asian climate characteristics.
Comparative studies between major simulation platforms reveal significant discrepancies in temperate climates (Crawley et al., 2008; Fumo, 2014), yet systematic evaluation under tropical conditions remains limited. Clarke et al. (2001) establish theoretical foundations for building energy simulation but acknowledge limitations in hot-humid climate applications. The gap between simulation predictions and measured performance in tropical buildings has been documented (Chua & Chou, 2010; Zhou et al., 2009) but lacks systematic attribution to specific algorithmic sources.

1.4 Research Objectives and Scope

This investigation addresses critical knowledge gaps regarding comparative accuracy of leading simulation platforms in tropical contexts through systematic benchmarking using fundamental geometries. The research objectives encompass: (1) quantification of magnitude and patterns of deviation between IES-VE and EnergyPlus across various geometric configurations and climatic conditions; (2) identification of potential sources of algorithmic divergence through computational methodology analysis; (3) evaluation of climate-specific performance to guide practitioner tool selection; and (4) establishment of validation benchmarks for tropical building energy simulation.
The investigation employs five archetypal geometries strategically selected to eliminate architectural complexity variables while exposing core computational differences at fundamental algorithmic levels. Geographic scope encompasses nine Indonesian cities representing distinct Köppen-Geiger climate classifications (Peel et al., 2007), ensuring comprehensive coverage of thermal diversity across the archipelago while maintaining statistical rigor through extensive temporal datasets.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Study Area and Climate Zone Classification

The investigation encompasses three distinct climate zones based on modified Köppen-Geiger classification systems specifically calibrated for Southeast Asian tropical conditions (Peel et al., 2007), with additional consideration of local microclimate factors documented by the Indonesian Meteorological, Climatological, and Geophysical Agency (2022).

Monsoon Climate Zone (Am): Represented by Surabaya (East Java), Semarang (Central Java), and Bandung (West Java). This zone exhibits distinct wet-dry seasonal patterns with pronounced rainfall variations, moderate-to-high humidity levels, and significant seasonal temperature fluctuations within tropical ranges. The monsoon climate presents unique modeling challenges due to seasonal psychrometric variations that affect latent heat load calculations (de Dear & Brager, 1998).

Equatorial Climate Zone (Af): Encompasses Mamuju (West Sulawesi), Padang (West Sumatra), and Pontianak (West Kalimantan). These locations exemplify classic equatorial characteristics with minimal seasonal temperature variations, consistently high humidity (80-95% RH), year-round precipitation, and intense solar radiation with frequent cloud cover. The equatorial zone represents the most challenging modeling environment due to persistent high moisture conditions (Givoni, 1998).

Local Climate Zone (Aw/As): Includes Palu (Central Sulawesi), Ambon (Maluku), and Sorong (West Papua). These sites represent specialized microclimatic conditions influenced by topographical features, maritime effects, and regional weather patterns deviating from typical tropical classifications, presenting unique validation challenges for simulation algorithms.

Table 1: Climate Zone Characteristics and Representative Cities

Climate Zone	Köppen Classification	Representative Cities	Key Characteristics	Mean Annual Temp (°C)	Mean RH (%)
Monsoon	Am	Surabaya, Semarang, Bandung	Distinct wet-dry seasons, moderate humidity variations	26.8-28.2	75-85
Equatorial	Af	Mamuju, Padang, Pontianak	Minimal seasonal variation, consistently high humidity	26.5-27.8	80-95
Local	Aw/As	Palu, Ambon, Sorong	Specialized microclimates, maritime influences	25.9-28.5	70-88

2.2 Meteorological Data Development and Quality Assurance

Comprehensive meteorological datasets were compiled from 33-year records (1990-2023) obtained from Indonesian Meteorological, Climatological, and Geophysical Agency (BMKG) archives, supplemented by NOAA Global Summary and World Meteorological Organization databases following established protocols (World Meteorological Organization, 2018).

This extended temporal coverage ensures statistical robustness while capturing long-term climate variability including El Niño/La Niña cycles and Indian Ocean Dipole effects documented in regional climate studies.

Weather file development employed advanced statistical methodologies following NREL protocols (Stoffel & Andreas, 1991) to create representative meteorological years for each location. Primary parameters included dry-bulb temperature, wet-bulb temperature, relative humidity, atmospheric pressure, wind conditions, solar radiation components (direct normal, diffuse horizontal, global horizontal), cloud cover, and precipitation data. Quality control procedures involved extensive validation, gap-filling using interpolation algorithms developed by Kusuda & Achenbach (1965), and cross-verification with satellite-derived meteorological data.

2.3 Geometric Model Configuration and Rationale

Five fundamental geometries were selected following established benchmarking protocols (International Energy Agency, 2020) to test algorithmic differences while maintaining geometric purity: cube (baseline with equal surface exposure), octagonal prism (angular variation testing), hexagonal prism (moderate angular complexity), cylinder (continuous surface modeling), and hemisphere (curved surface with varying orientations).

Each geometry underwent evaluation across three volumes (216 m^3, 729 m^3, 1728 m^3) and three window-to-wall ratios (0%, 50%, 90% for EnergyPlus/100% for IES-VE), generating 135 scenarios per location. Building envelope specifications were standardized using typical Indonesian commercial assemblies with reinforced concrete structure, lightweight concrete block infill, and appropriate thermal insulation following Green Building Council Indonesia (2014) guidelines.

Table 2: Geometric Model Specifications and Testing Parameters

Geometry Type	Volume Range (m^3)	Surface Area to Volume Ratio (m^{-1})	WWR Configurations (%)	Number of Test Cases per Location
Cube	216, 729, 1728	2.77	0, 50, 90/100	9
Octagonal Prism	216, 729, 1728	2.95	0, 50, 90/100	9
Hexagonal Prism	216, 729, 1728	3.12	0, 50, 90/100	9
Cylinder	216, 729, 1728	3.60	0, 50, 90/100	9
Hemisphere	216, 729, 1728	4.84	0, 50, 90/100	9
Total	5 geometries	Range: 2.77-4.84	3 configurations	225 per location

Table 3: Building Envelope Materials

Building Construction	Layer/Type	Thickness (mm)	Property	U-Value Total ($W/m^2 \cdot K$)
Wall	Outer plaster	25	Conductivity: 0.4086	2.7929
	Brick	115	Conductivity: 1.15	
	Inner plaster	25	Conductivity: 0.53	
	Inner plaster	25	Conductivity: 0.4086	
Roof	Brick	115	Conductivity: 1.15	2.8925
	Inner plaster	25	Conductivity: 0.53	
	Insulation	98.2	Conductivity: 0.025	
Floor	Concrete	100	Conductivity: 2.3	0.2209
	Wood board	20	Conductivity: 0.13	
Window	Double glazing with air gap	24	Reflectance: 0.3254; SHGC: 0.3945; Transmittance: 0.3993; Emissivity: 0.837	1.6799

2.4 Building Envelope Material Specifications

Material properties were selected based on comprehensive analysis of typical Indonesian commercial construction practices, with thermal characteristics validated against published databases (ASHRAE, 2021). Wall assemblies consist of outer plaster (25mm, k=0.4086 $W/m \cdot K$), brick masonry (115mm, k=1.15 $W/m \cdot K$), and inner plaster (25mm, k=0.53 $W/m \cdot K$), resulting in overall U-value of 2.7929 $W/m^2 \cdot K$. Roof construction incorporates additional insulation layer (98.2mm, k=0.025 $W/m \cdot K$) to achieve U-value of 2.8925 $W/m^2 \cdot K$.

Fenestration systems employ double glazing with air gap (24mm overall thickness) featuring measured optical properties: solar reflectance 0.3254, Solar Heat Gain Coefficient (SHGC) 0.3945, visible transmittance 0.3993, and thermal emissivity 0.837, resulting in center-of-glass U-value of 1.6799 $W/m^2 \cdot K$. These specifications align with established fenestration performance modeling protocols (Lee et al., 1998; Sullivan et al., 1997).

2.5 Simulation Protocol and Quality Assurance

Identical boundary conditions, internal heat gains, schedules, and HVAC configurations were implemented across both platforms following established benchmarking protocols (Brandemuehl et al., 1993). Internal gains were calibrated based on Indonesian building operation patterns documented by Sekhar & Willem (2004), including occupancy densities, lighting power densities, and equipment loads appropriate for tropical commercial applications.

Quality assurance protocols incorporated multiple model verification levels following ASHRAE Guideline 14 methodologies (ASHRAE, 2002), including energy balance checks and sensitivity analyses to confirm model integrity and numerical stability. Thermal mass calculations employed validated algorithms documented by Seem et al. (1989).

2.6 External Cooling Load Focus and Infiltration Elimination

This investigation concentrates exclusively on **external cooling loads** calculated by both simulation platforms, encompassing envelope heat transfer calculated through Hottel & Sarofim (1967) radiation algorithms and solar heat gain through windows using established solar transmission models (Tregenza & Sharples, 1992). **Infiltration loads were set to zero in all simulations** to eliminate air exchange variables and focus purely on building envelope thermal performance.

Infiltration Rate Settings: All simulations were conducted with infiltration rates set to zero (0 ACH) in both IES-VE and EnergyPlus to eliminate air exchange heat loads and focus exclusively on building envelope thermal performance. This approach isolates conductive heat transfer through wall, roof, and floor assemblies, and solar heat gains through fenestration systems, enabling direct comparison of envelope thermal modeling algorithms between platforms.

This limitation enables focused evaluation of envelope thermal algorithms while eliminating variables from air movement calculations that vary between platforms. External cooling loads in this study represent thermal gains from conductive heat transfer through building envelope components, solar heat gain through glazed surfaces, and thermal bridging effects computed through established heat transfer methodologies (Ferziger & Perić, 2002). **All air exchange heat loads were excluded by setting infiltration rates to zero** in both simulation platforms to isolate envelope-specific thermal modeling differences.

2.7 Simulation Boundary Conditions and Climate Data Application

Air Exchange Rate Settings: All simulations were conducted with infiltration rates set to zero (0 ACH) to eliminate air exchange heat loads and focus exclusively on building envelope thermal performance. This approach isolates conductive heat transfer through wall, roof, and floor assemblies, and solar heat gains through fenestration systems, enabling direct comparison of envelope thermal modeling algorithms between platforms without confounding effects from air movement calculations.

Climate Data Application: Meteorological data were applied directly to building surfaces using weather station measurements as recorded to maintain consistency across all simulation scenarios. This approach ensures that observed deviations reflect fundamental differences in envelope thermal modeling algorithms rather than external environmental adjustments.

HVAC System Configuration: Identical ideal air systems were implemented in both platforms with unlimited heating and cooling capacity to capture total envelope thermal loads without equipment limitations affecting results.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Overall Performance Deviation Analysis

The comprehensive benchmarking analysis of 110 valid cooling load predictions reveals systematic and substantial deviations between IES-VE and EnergyPlus across all tested configurations, significantly exceeding acceptable engineering tolerances established by ASHRAE Guideline 14 (ASHRAE, 2014) for hourly data (CV-RMSE < 30%). The overall mean deviation of 316.18% (σ = 116.74%) indicates that IES-VE consistently predicts external cooling loads approximately 4.16 times higher than EnergyPlus for identical building configurations and boundary conditions.

This magnitude of discrepancy substantially exceeds variations documented in previous comparative studies conducted under temperate conditions (Crawley et al., 2008), suggesting fundamental algorithmic differences specifically manifesting under tropical climate conditions rather than parametric sensitivity variations. The deviation distribution exhibits right-skewed characteristics with median values (307.84%) closely aligned with mean values, indicating consistent rather than sporadic algorithmic divergence patterns in envelope thermal modeling.

3.2 Climate Zone Dependencies and Envelope Thermal Algorithm Performance

International Journal of Environmental Sciences
ISSN: 2229-7359
Vol. 11 No. 7, 2025
https://www.theaspd.com/ijes.php

Climate zone analysis reveals significant regional sensitivity in algorithmic performance, with equatorial zones exhibiting the highest mean deviations (368.1% ± 81.6%) compared to monsoon (280.5% ± 124.3%) and local climate zones (356.5% ± 90.8%). The reduced standard deviation in equatorial zones (81.6%) suggests more consistent but systematically elevated discrepancies in envelope thermal calculations, while monsoon zones display greater variability (124.3%), indicating climate-dependent algorithmic sensitivity consistent with findings from previous tropical climate studies (Schiavon & Melikov, 2008).

The elevated deviations in equatorial zones correlate directly with consistent high humidity conditions (80-95% RH) and minimal diurnal temperature variations characteristic of these regions. This pattern strongly suggests that envelope surface heat transfer calculations and thermal property algorithms differ substantially between platforms under high moisture conditions, as predicted by theoretical analyses (Harriman et al., 2001). The observed sensitivity aligns with documented challenges in envelope thermal modeling under persistent humid conditions.

Table 4: Climate Zone Performance Analysis

Climate Zone	**n**	**Mean Deviation (%)**	**Std Dev (%)**	**Min (%)**	**Max (%)**	**Dominant Error Sources**
Monsoon	62	280.5	124.3	24.6	465.2	Seasonal humidity variations
Equatorial	24	368.1	81.6	235.8	499.3	High latent loads, psychrometric algorithms
Local	24	356.5	90.8	198.7	487.1	Maritime effects, microclimate complexity
Overall	110	316.2	116.7	24.6	499.3	Fundamental algorithmic differences

*p < 0.001 for inter-zone differences (ANOVA)

Table 5: Regional Cities Detailed Performance Matrix

City	**Climate Zone**	**Mean Temp (°C)**	**Mean RH (%)**	**Mean Deviation (%)**	**Std Dev (%)**	**Local Factors**
Monsoon Zone:						
Surabaya	Am	28.2	78	285.3	118.7	Coastal, industrial
Semarang	Am	27.6	82	276.8	125.2	Port city, moderate elevation
Bandung	Am	26.8	85	279.4	129.8	Highland, cooler temperatures
Equatorial Zone:						
Mamuju	Af	27.8	89	372.5	78.9	Coastal, high humidity
Padang	Af	26.5	92	365.8	82.4	West coast, monsoon interaction
Pontianak	Af	27.2	91	366.0	83.5	Equatorial, river delta
Local Zone:						
Palu	Aw	28.5	70	348.2	95.6	Valley, rain shadow

						effect
Ambon	As	25.9	88	361.7	87.3	Island, maritime climate
Sorong	Aw	27.1	85	359.6	89.5	Coastal, transitional climate

3.3 Geometric Configuration Sensitivity and Surface Heat Transfer Modeling

The analysis reveals geometry-dependent algorithmic sensitivity patterns that illuminate underlying computational differences between platforms in surface-to-surface heat transfer modeling. Hemisphere geometries demonstrated the lowest mean deviation (253.9% ± 93.3%), suggesting that curved surface discretization algorithms in both platforms achieve relatively better convergence compared to angular geometries, consistent with computational heat transfer principles (Ferziger & Perić, 2002).

Conversely, cylindrical geometries exhibited the highest deviations (346.1% ± 129.6%), followed closely by hexagonal (342.7% ± 124.2%) and octagonal prisms (333.4% ± 129.1%). The progressive increase in deviation with geometric complexity suggests that surface-to-surface radiation algorithms and view factor calculations contribute significantly to observed discrepancies in envelope thermal modeling, as theoretically predicted by radiative heat transfer analysis (Hottel & Sarofim, 1967).

Table 6: Geometric Configuration Sensitivity Analysis

Geometry	**n**	**Mean Deviation (%)**	**Std Dev (%)**	**Relative Performance***	**Key Algorithmic Challenges**
Hemisphere	26	253.9	93.3	Best	Curved surface discretization
Cube	40	329.6	102.9	Moderate	Baseline geometric complexity
Octagonal Prism	14	333.4	129.1	Poor	Multi-faceted view factors
Hexagonal Prism	17	342.7	124.2	Poor	Angular radiation calculations
Cylinder	13	346.1	129.6	Worst	Continuous curved surfaces

*Relative to overall mean deviation (316.2%)

3.4 Fenestration Ratio Impact and Solar Heat Gain Algorithm Analysis

Window-to-Wall Ratio analysis reveals systematic escalation in deviations correlated with increased glazing ratios: WWR 0% (247.0% ± 100.1%), WWR 50% (308.3% ± 110.6%), and WWR 90-100% (334.0% ± 118.1%). This progressive increase pattern strongly indicates fundamental differences in solar heat gain calculations, particularly in algorithms governing direct and diffuse solar radiation transmission through glazing systems following established solar transmission models (McCluney, 1994; Li & Lau, 2007).

The substantial deviation magnitude even in opaque configurations (WWR 0%) suggests that discrepancies extend beyond fenestration-related calculations to include fundamental differences in envelope conduction and thermal mass modeling, as documented in thermal analysis literature (Walton & Deru, 2003). However, the 35% increase in mean deviation from WWR 0% to WWR 90-100% configurations isolates solar heat gain algorithms as a primary source of computational divergence, consistent with theoretical expectations from solar modeling studies (Reinhart & Walkenhorst, 2001).

3.5 Scale Independence and Thermal Mass Algorithm Validation

Volume-dependent analysis across the tested range (216 m^3 to 1728 m^3) reveals minimal systematic variation in deviation patterns, with mean deviations remaining within 15% variance across all volume categories. This scale independence indicates that observed algorithmic differences are not primarily attributable to thermal mass calculations or scale-dependent heat transfer coefficients, but rather represent fundamental differences in envelope heat transfer modeling approaches at the algorithmic level. The scale independence validates the selected geometric approach for isolating fundamental algorithmic differences while eliminating architectural complexity variables. This finding contrasts with expectations based on thermal mass modeling theory (Seem et al., 1989) and suggests that the primary sources of deviation lie in envelope surface heat transfer calculations rather than thermal storage algorithms.

3.6 Practical Implications and Engineering Applications

The identified deviation patterns carry significant implications for HVAC system design and energy performance predictions in tropical climates, with potential economic and environmental consequences. The consistent IES-VE over-prediction pattern suggests potential for systematic equipment oversizing when using IES-VE predictions for envelope thermal loads, which could lead to reduced efficiency, increased capital costs, and suboptimal humidity control in actual installations, as documented in HVAC performance studies (Huang et al., 1987).

These findings necessitate development of climate-specific correction factors for envelope thermal load predictions, while acknowledging that total building cooling load assessment requires separate evaluation of internal heat gains following established protocols (Spitler et al., 1992). The documented systematic biases highlight critical needs for algorithm validation and calibration specifically targeting tropical climate applications in building envelope thermal modeling.

4. CONCLUSIONS

This systematic benchmarking investigation provides the first comprehensive quantitative assessment of envelope thermal load prediction discrepancies between IES-VE and EnergyPlus under Indonesian tropical climate conditions, revealing substantial and systematic algorithmic divergences that significantly exceed acceptable engineering tolerances established by international standards.

4.1 Principal Findings and Algorithmic Implications

The analysis of 110 valid comparisons across five fundamental geometries, three climate zones, and multiple fenestration configurations demonstrates that IES-VE consistently predicts envelope thermal loads 316.18% higher than EnergyPlus, with systematic bias factor of 4.16:1. This magnitude of deviation represents substantial algorithmic differences between platforms specifically in building envelope thermal modeling, exceeding variations documented in previous comparative studies conducted under temperate conditions.

4.2 Climate-Specific Performance Validation

Equatorial climate zones exhibit the most pronounced algorithmic divergences (368.1% ± 81.6%), suggesting that high humidity conditions and minimal diurnal temperature variations particularly challenge convergence between platforms for envelope thermal calculations. Monsoon climate zones demonstrate lower mean deviations (280.5%) but higher variability (124.3%), indicating that seasonal thermal transitions trigger inconsistent algorithmic responses between platforms in envelope heat transfer modeling, consistent with psychrometric modeling challenges documented in tropical climate literature.

4.3 Geometric and Fenestration Algorithm Dependencies

The progressive increase in deviations with window-to-wall ratios (247.0% for WWR 0% to 334.0% for WWR 90-100%) isolates solar heat gain algorithms as primary sources of computational divergence, while geometric sensitivity analysis reveals that curved surfaces (hemispheres: 253.9%) achieve better algorithmic convergence than angular geometries (cylinders: 346.1%) for envelope thermal calculations.

4.4 Research Limitations and Future Directions

This investigation's focus on envelope thermal loads with zero infiltration means that findings represent isolated envelope thermal modeling performance and cannot be directly extrapolated to total building energy consumption without separate analysis of internal heat gains and air exchange effects. Future research priorities include comprehensive total cooling load validation incorporating internal heat gains, extension to complex building geometries, investigation of dynamic operation patterns, and detailed algorithm-level analysis of heat transfer calculation methodologies.

4.5 Recommendations for Practice and Development

For Building Design Practitioners: Apply documented correction factors specifically for envelope thermal load predictions from IES-VE, recognize that total cooling loads require separate internal load and air exchange calculations, use EnergyPlus as baseline reference for envelope thermal modeling in tropical climates, and conduct sensitivity analyses across multiple platforms for critical envelope design decisions.

For Simulation Software Developers: Investigate systematic bias in envelope thermal algorithms for hot-humid climates, focus particularly on solar heat gain calculations and surface heat transfer algorithms, develop tropical climate-specific calibration protocols for envelope modeling, and establish standardized benchmarking protocols for building envelope thermal calculations.

This research establishes quantitative benchmarks specifically for envelope thermal load predictions in tropical climates while highlighting critical needs for comprehensive total building load validation studies. The documented systematic biases in envelope thermal modeling provide essential guidance for practitioners and developers working to improve building energy simulation accuracy in Southeast Asian contexts.

REFERENCES

1. Ahmad, A., & Rahman, A. (2008). Experimental study on thermal performance of the double-skin facade with Venetian blind. *Energy and Buildings*, 40(8), 1423-1429.
2. Andersen, K. K., Madsen, H., & Hansen, L. H. (2000). Modelling the heat dynamics of a building using stochastic differential equations. *Energy and Buildings*, 31(1), 13-24.
3. ASHRAE. (2002). Measurement of Energy and Demand Savings (ASHRAE Guideline 14-2002). Atlanta: ASHRAE.
4. ASHRAE. (2011). Advanced Energy Design Guide for Medium to Big Box Retail Buildings. Atlanta: ASHRAE.
5. ASHRAE. (2014). Measurement of Energy, Demand, and Water Savings (ASHRAE Guideline 14-2014). Atlanta: ASHRAE.
6. ASHRAE. (2017). Standard Method of Test for the Evaluation of Building Energy Analysis Computer Programs (ASHRAE Standard 140-2017). Atlanta: ASHRAE.
7. ASHRAE. (2019). Energy Standard for Buildings Except Low-Rise Residential Buildings (ASHRAE Standard 90.1-2019). Atlanta: ASHRAE.
8. ASHRAE. (2021). ASHRAE Handbook – Fundamentals. Atlanta: ASHRAE.
9. Attia, S., et al. (2013). Assessing gaps and needs for integrating building performance optimization tools in net zero energy buildings design. *Energy and Buildings*, 60, 110-124.
10. Brandemuehl, M. J., et al. (1993). HVAC 2 toolkit: A toolkit for secondary HVAC system energy calculations. ASHRAE.
11. Braun, J. E., et al. (1990). Reducing energy costs and peak electrical demand through optimal control of building thermal storage. *ASHRAE Transactions*, 96(2), 876-888.
12. Chua, K. J., & Chou, S. K. (2010). Energy performance of residential buildings in Singapore. *Energy and Buildings*, 42(10), 1756-1770.
13. Clarke, J. A., et al. (2001). *Energy simulation in building design* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
14. Crawley, D. B., et al. (2001). EnergyPlus: creating a new-generation building energy simulation program. *Energy and Buildings*, 33(4), 319-331.
15. Crawley, D. B., et al. (2008). Contrasting the capabilities of building energy performance simulation programs. *Building and Environment*, 43(4), 661-673.
16. de Dear, R., & Brager, G. S. (1998). Developing an adaptive model of thermal comfort and preference. *ASHRAE Transactions*, 104(1a), 145-167.
17. Ferziger, J. H., & Perić, M. (2002). *Computational methods for fluid dynamics* (3rd ed.). Berlin: Springer-Verlag.
18. Fumo, N. (2014). A review on the basics of building energy estimation. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 31, 53-60.
19. Givoni, B. (1998). *Climate considerations in building and urban design*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
20. Green Building Council Indonesia. (2014). Greenship Rating Tools Version 1.2. Jakarta: GBCI.
21. Gueymard, C. A. (2003). Direct solar transmittance and irradiance predictions with broadband models. Part I: detailed theoretical performance assessment. *Solar Energy*, 74(5), 355-369.
22. Harriman, L. G., et al. (2001). *The dehumidification handbook* (2nd ed.). Munters Corporation.
23. Henninger, R. H., & Witte, M. J. (2004). EnergyPlus Testing with ANSI/ASHRAE Standard 140-2001 (BESTEST). Ernest Orlando Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.
24. Hottel, H. C., & Sarofim, A. F. (1967). *Radiative transfer*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
25. Huang, Y. J., et al. (1987). Methodology and assumptions for evaluating heating and cooling energy requirements in new single-family residential buildings (LBL-19128). Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory.
26. Indonesian Meteorological, Climatological, and Geophysical Agency. (2022). Climate Data Coverage Assessment Report. Jakarta: BMKG.
27. Integrated Environmental Solutions. (2023). IES Virtual Environment User Guide: Apache Systems Thermal Analysis. Glasgow: IES Ltd.
28. International Energy Agency. (2020). Energy Conservation in Buildings and Community Systems Programme: Validation of Building Energy Simulation Tools (IEA ECBCS Annex 21). Paris: IEA.
29. Jayamaha, S. E. G., et al. (1996). Measurement and prediction of indoor air motion in a naturally ventilated office. *Building and Environment*, 31(4), 333-342.
30. Judkoff, R., & Neymark, J. (1995). International Energy Agency Building Energy Simulation Test (BESTEST) and Diagnostic Method (NREL/TP-472-6231).
31. Judkoff, R., & Neymark, J. (2006). Model validation and testing: The methodological foundation of ASHRAE Standard 140. *ASHRAE Transactions*, 112(2), 367-376.
32. Kalamees, T., et al. (2012). Development of weighting factors for climate variables for selecting the energy reference year

according to the EN ISO 15927-4 standard. *Energy and Buildings*, 47, 53-60.
33. Kusuda, T., & Achenbach, P. R. (1965). Earth temperature and thermal diffusivity at selected stations in the United States. *ASHRAE Transactions*, 71(1), 61-75.
34. Lee, E. S., DiBartolomeo, D. L., & Selkowitz, S. E. (1998). Thermal and daylighting performance of an automated venetian blind and lighting system in a full-scale private office. *Energy and Buildings*, 29(1), 47-63.
35. Li, D. H., & Lau, J. C. (2007). Development of solar heat gain factors for climate-specific glazing. *Applied Energy*, 84(9), 941-953.
36. McCluney, R. (1990). Fenestration solar gain analysis (FSEC-CR-293-90). Florida Solar Energy Center.
37. McCluney, R. (1994). *Introduction to radiometry and photometry*. Boston: Artech House.
38. Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources. (2023). Indonesia Energy Outlook 2023. Jakarta: Government Press.
39. Myers, D. R., et al. (2001). Broadband model performance for an ensemble of meteorological and geographic sites. *Solar Energy*, 71(5), 297-311.
40. Nielsen, P. V., & Allard, C. (2000). Air distribution in rooms ~ research and design methods (REHVA Guidebook No. 1). Brussels: REHVA.
41. Peel, M. C., Finlayson, B. L., & McMahon, T. A. (2007). Updated world map of the Köppen-Geiger climate classification. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 11(5), 1633-1644.
42. Perez, R., et al. (1987). A new simplified version of the Perez diffuse irradiance model for tilted surfaces. *Solar Energy*, 39(3), 221-231.
43. Perez, R., et al. (1990). Modeling daylight availability and irradiance components from direct and global irradiance. *Solar Energy*, 44(5), 271-289.
44. Pisello, A. L., Rossi, F., & Cotana, F. (2013). Summer and winter effect of innovative cool roof tiles on the dynamic thermal behavior of buildings. *Applied Energy*, 104, 756-764.
45. Prianto, E., & Depecker, P. (2002). Characteristic of airflow as the effect of balcony, opening design and internal division on indoor velocity: A case study of traditional dwelling in urban living quarter in tropical humid region. *Energy and Buildings*, 34(4), 401-409.
46. Reddy, T. A., et al. (2007). Procedures for reconciling computer-calculated results with measured energy data (ASHRAE Research Project 1051-RP).
47. Reinhart, C. F., & Walkenhorst, O. (2001). Validation of dynamic RADIANCE-based daylight simulations for a test office with external blinds. *Energy and Buildings*, 33(7), 683-697.
48. Rubin, M. (1985). Optical properties of soda lime silica glasses. *Solar Energy Materials*, 12(4), 275-288.
49. Schiavon, S., & Melikov, A. K. (2008). Energy saving and improved comfort by increased air movement. *Energy and Buildings*, 40(10), 1954-1960.
50. Seem, J. E., et al. (1989). Transfer functions for efficient calculation of multidimensional transient heat transfer. *Journal of Heat Transfer*, 111(1), 5-12.
51. Sekhar, S. C., & Willem, H. C. (2004). Impact of airflow profile on indoor air quality and energy consumption of tropical buildings. *Building and Environment*, 39(3), 255-266.
52. Spitler, J. D., et al. (1987). Building loads analysis and system thermodynamics (BLAST) users manual. University of Illinois.
53. Spitler, J. D., et al. (1992). The comparative performance of three thermal analysis methods for windows. *ASHRAE Transactions*, 98(2), 897-907.
54. Stoffel, T., & Andreas, A. (1991). NREL Solar Radiation Research Laboratory (SRRL): Baseline Measurement System (BMS) (NREL/TP-463-4627). National Renewable Energy Laboratory.
55. Sullivan, R., et al. (1997). Rating the thermal performance of windows. *ASHRAE Journal*, 39(3), 56-61.
56. Sullivan, R., et al. (2016). Moisture effects on building envelope thermal performance in hot humid climates. *Building and Environment*, 104, 85-94.
57. Tregenza, P. R., & Sharples, S. (1992). Daylight algorithms (ETSU S 1350). Energy Technology Support Unit.
58. Walton, G. N., & Deru, M. P. (2003). Passive solar design techniques for commercial buildings (NREL/TP-550-33633). National Renewable Energy Laboratory.
59. Wilcox, S., & Marion, W. (2008). Users manual for TMY3 data sets (NREL/TP-581-43156). National Renewable Energy Laboratory.
60. Wong, N. H., & Khoo, S. S. (2003). Thermal comfort in classrooms in the tropics. *Energy and Buildings*, 35(4), 337-351.
61. World Meteorological Organization. (2018). Guide to Meteorological Instruments and Methods of Observation (WMO-No. 8). Geneva: WMO Press.
62. Yang, L., et al. (2014). Building energy simulation tools for adaptive thermal comfort model implementation: A comparative study. *Automation in Construction*, 45, 80-92.
63. Zhou, J., et al. (2009). Energy simulation in the variable refrigerant flow air-conditioning system under cooling conditions. *Energy and Buildings*, 41(10), 1067-1073.