

IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science



ISSN: 1755-1315

OPEN ACCESS

The open access *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science (EES)* provides a fast, versatile and cost-effective proceedings publication service.



RSS



Sign up for new issue notifications

Latest published conferences

Vol 1289



Go

Conference archive

2023



Go

[View forthcoming volumes](#) accepted for publication.

If you would like more information regarding *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* please visit conferenceseries.iop.org, and if you are interested in publishing a proceedings with IOP Conference Series please visit our page for [conference organizers](#).

Conference organizers can use our [online form](#) and we will get in touch with a quote and further details.

NOTICE: Ukraine: Read IOP Publishing's statement.

Table of contents

Volume 907

2021

◀ Previous issue Next issue ▶

Digital and Empathic Engagement in the New Era for Architecture and Civil Engineering 20-21 August 2021, Surabaya, Indonesia

Accepted papers received: 28 October 2021

Published online: 12 November 2021

Open all abstracts

Preface

OPEN ACCESS 011001

Preface

+ Open abstract  View article  PDF

OPEN ACCESS 011002

Peer review declaration

+ Open abstract  View article  PDF

Structural Engineering and Materials

OPEN ACCESS 012001

A comparative study of several bio-inspired algorithms in cost optimization of cellular beams

A Tjahjono, E J Wijayanti, D Prayogo and F T Wong

+ Open abstract  View article  PDF

OPEN ACCESS 012002

The study of shear wall uses in buildings during the architecture design process

Livian Teddy, Husnul Hidayat and Dessu Andriyali A

+ Open abstract  View article  PDF

OPEN ACCESS 012003

Modified Partial Capacity Design (M-PCD): achieving partial sidesway mechanism by using two steps design approach

L S Tanaya, H Herryanto and P Pudjisuryadi

+ Open abstract  View article  PDF

OPEN ACCESS 012004

Comparison reinforcement design shear wall modelling planar and assembly in elevator shaft

Daud Rahmat Wiyono, Roi Milyardi, Yosafat Aji Pranata and Anang Kristianto

+ Open abstract  View article  PDF

OPEN ACCESS 012005

A comparative study of several nature-inspired algorithms in steel deck floor system cost optimization

This site uses cookies. By continuing to use this site you agree to our use of cookies. To find out more, see our Privacy and Cookies policy.

T Emanuel, Hadrian, D Prayogo and F T Wong



A Juniwati, D S Mintorogo, A E Abednego, S Kurnia and E A Handoyo

[+ Open abstract](#) [View article](#) [PDF](#)

OPEN ACCESS

012016

Comparison of simulation-based methods and metaheuristic optimization algorithms for optimizing window design by considering daylighting and heat transfer in a tropical region of Indonesia

A Budhiyanto, A Oktavianus, B Tedjokusumo, K Harsono and I T Yang

[+ Open abstract](#) [View article](#) [PDF](#)

OPEN ACCESS

012017

The uniformity concept of urban design: impact of cultural traditions on the meaning of Balinese town

E D Mahira, B Soemardiono and E B Santoso

[+ Open abstract](#) [View article](#) [PDF](#)

OPEN ACCESS

012018

Reinterpreting local wisdom of *Rumah Kaki Seribu* as sustainable architecture

B C Prabaswara, L Hariyanto and L S Arifin

[+ Open abstract](#) [View article](#) [PDF](#)

OPEN ACCESS

012019

An investigation into the effectiveness of student-led experiential learning for UG architects and the implications of incorporating AR into such pedagogical exercises

M Wallwork, M A Tedjosaputro and Weishun Xu

[+ Open abstract](#) [View article](#) [PDF](#)

OPEN ACCESS

012020

A study of multi-sensory senses in museum virtual-visits

Rully Damayanti, Bramasta Putra Redyantanu and Florian Kossak

[+ Open abstract](#) [View article](#) [PDF](#)

Construction Management

OPEN ACCESS

012021

Empowering female students to be successful professionals in the construction industry

C. Liem, R.Y. Sunindijo and C.C. Wang

[+ Open abstract](#) [View article](#) [PDF](#)

OPEN ACCESS

012022

Intellectual intelligence and emotional intelligence of project manager

G Reinaldo, A Andi and V Ong

[+ Open abstract](#) [View article](#) [PDF](#)

OPEN ACCESS

012023

Causes of work accidents and its impact on the road and bridge construction projects

Josefine Ernestine Latupeirissa, Irwan Lie K Wong and Herby C P Tiwow

[+ Open abstract](#) [View article](#) [PDF](#)

OPEN ACCESS

012024

Lean construction and project performance in the Australian construction industry

M Fauzan and R Y Sunindijo

[+ Open abstract](#) [View article](#) [PDF](#)

This site uses cookies. By continuing to use this site you agree to our use of cookies. To find out more, see our [Privacy and Cookies policy](#).

OPEN ACCESS



Preface

The Proceeding contains papers based on invited keynote speeches and oral presentations at the International Conference on **Digital & Empathic Architecture & Civil Engineering (DEACE 2021)** and International Student Workshop. The event was organized by the Faculty of Civil Engineering & Planning, **Petra Christian University (PCU), Surabaya, Indonesia** on **August 20th-21st, 2021** for the international conference and August 12th-21st, 2021 for the workshop as a series of events celebrating the 60th Anniversary of Petra Christian University.

The event covered several topics: ‘Structural Engineering and Materials’, ‘Building Science and Technology’, ‘Construction Management’, and ‘Architecture and Urban Development’. DEACE presented a theme: “Digital and Empathic Engagement in the New Era for Architecture and Civil Engineering”. Digital engagement can revolutionize approach to design and engineering while supporting opportunities to accommodate the implementation of advanced technology. While empathic engagement reflects not only on effectively design and build infrastructure to meet safety and other regulatory requirements, but also understanding customer essential needs. DEACE aimed to gather researchers, scholars, and practitioners all over the world to share and exchange their knowledge and breakthrough in the fields of Architecture and Civil Engineering especially toward the new era.

As the event was approaching and there was no sign of the Covid-19 pandemic slowing down earlier that year, it was decided not to postpone the event but to hold it virtually instead. The conference started with plenary sessions with four keynote speakers, and followed by parallel sessions in two rooms with four sessions. Each keynote speech took 45 minutes and 30 minutes for presentation and discussion, respectively. While speakers in parallel sessions were given 15 minutes and 5 minutes for presentation and discussion. There were 30 presenters out of 159 participants in total, consist of both academicians and professionals. They came from Indonesia as well as some other countries such as China, Taiwan, Germany, Japan and Australia. Zoom video conferencing application was used in the event which served the event very well.

Editor of DEACE 2021,
Dr. Antoni Antoni
Dr. Pamuda Pudjisuryadi



Welcome Speech

On behalf of the organizing committee, we would like to extend our warmest welcome to you to the Digital & Empathic Architecture & Civil Engineering (DEACE) International Conference.

DEACE International Conference and International Student Workshop on Bamboo Gridshell Computational Design are Virtual Events being held by the Faculty of Civil Engineering & Planning as a series of events celebrating the 60th Anniversary Petra Christian University, “The Rock Turns Diamond!”

DEACE aims to gather researchers, scholars, and practitioners all over the world to share and exchange their knowledge and breakthrough in the fields of Architecture and Civil Engineering especially toward the new era.

We would like to thank all keynote speakers, workshop speakers, scientific committee, session chairs, authors/presenters, participants, sponsors, conference & workshop coordinators, and everybody who has all contributed to this conference with great efforts for months.

We do hope that you enjoy your attendance at the DEACE 2021!

The chair of DEACE 2021,

Dr. Rudy Setiawan

DEACE 2021 Scientific Committee

- Prof. Lilianny Sigit Arifin, Ph.D. (*Petra Christian University, Indonesia*)
- Prof. Dr. Djwantoro Hardjito (*Petra Christian University, Indonesia*)
- Prof. Benjamin Lumentarna, Ph.D. (*Petra Christian University, Indonesia*)
- Ts. Dr. Joewono Prasetyo (*Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, Malaysia*)
- Prof. Yusak Octavius Susilo, D.Eng. (*KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden*)
- Kardi Teknomo, Ph.D. (*Petra Christian University, Indonesia*)
- Hartanto Wibowo, Ph.D. (*Iowa State University, United States of America*)
- Prof. Dr. Indarto, DEA (*Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember, Indonesia*)
- Prof. I Nyoman Arya Thanaya, Ph.D. (*Universitas Udayana, Indonesia*)
- Dr. Ria Asih Aryani Soemitro (*Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember, Indonesia*)
- Arif Budi Setiawan, Ph.D. (*Kennesaw State University, USA*)
- Connie Susilawati, Ph.D. (*Queensland University of Technology, Australia*)
- Dr. Camelia Kusumo (*Taylor's University, Malaysia*)
- Prof. Ts. Dr. Mohd Hamdan Bin Haji Ahmad (*Universiti Teknologi, Malaysia*)
- Dr. Riza Yosia Sunindijo (*The University of New South Wales, Australia*)
- Leonardus Setia Budi Wibowo, Ph.D. (*Universitas Widya Kartika, Indonesia*)
- Timoticin Kwanda, Ph.D. (*Petra Christian University, Indonesia*)
- Danny Santoso Mintorogo, Ph.D. (*Petra Christian University, Indonesia*)
- Dr. Pamuda Pudjisuryadi (*Petra Christian University, Indonesia*)
- Wong Foek Tjong, Ph.D. (*Petra Christian University, Indonesia*)
- Dr. Rudy Setiawan (*Petra Christian University, Indonesia*)
- Andi, Ph.D. (*Petra Christian University, Indonesia*)
- Doddy Prayogo, Ph.D. (*Petra Christian University, Indonesia*)
- Jimmy Chandra, Ph.D. (*Petra Christian University, Indonesia*)
- Effendy Tanojo, M.Eng. (*Petra Christian University, Indonesia*)
- Paulus Nugraha, M.Eng., M.Sc. (*Petra Christian University, Indonesia*)
- Dr. Antoni Antoni (*Petra Christian University, Indonesia*)
- Gogot Setyo Budi, Ph.D. (*Petra Christian University, Indonesia*)
- Dr. Daniel Tjandra (*Petra Christian University, Indonesia*)
- Gunawan Budi Wijaya, M.Eng. (*Petra Christian University, Indonesia*)
- Willy Husada, M.T., M.Sc. (*Petra Christian University, Indonesia*)
- Agie Vianthi, M.S. (*Petra Christian University, Indonesia*)

DEACE 2021 Conference and Workshop Coordinator

Chairman

- Dr. Rudy Setiawan

Secretary

- Angela Christysonia Tampubolon, M.T.(Secretary I)
- Angela Jasmine Tanya Tjahyana, M.T. (Secretary II)
- Vino Daniel Alexander Yogantoro, S.E. (Secretary III)

Treasurer

- Anik Juniwati, M.T. (Treasurer I)
- Luciana Kristanto, M.T. (Treasurer II)

Conference Content Division

- Dr. Antoni Antoni (Coordinator)
- Dr. Pamuda Pudjisuryadi (Member)

Conference Technical Event Division

- Doddy Prayogo, Ph.D. (Coordinator)
- Willy Husada, M.T., M.Sc. (Member)
- Elvina Shanggrama Wijaya, M.T. (Member)

Workshop Content and Technical Division

- Rully Damayanti, Ph.D. (Coordinator)
- Bram Michael Wayne, M.Ars. (Member)

Exhibition Event Division

- Prof. Lilianny Sigit Arifin, Ph.D. (Coordinator of Exhibition)
- Feny Elsiana, M.T. (Coordinator Technical Exhibition)

Sponsorship Division

- Dr. Daniel Tjandra (Coordinator)
- Agie Vianthi, M.S. (Member)

Publication, Decoration and Documentation Division

- Bramasta Putra Redyantanu, M.T. (Coordinator)
- Jimmy Chandra, Ph.D. (Member)

DEACE 2021 Documentation


Keynote speakers




Best Paper Awards





Best Workshop Design




Participants











International Student Workshop

PLENARY COURSE DAY 1

Bamboo as Building Material




Your microphone is muted.



Participants: +36, MS, H, FP, KW, VA, CY, CL, SO, KS, AJ, TL, EW, WT, SD, BW.

PLENARY COURSE DAY 2




The University of Sheffield.

Steel example:
Fabricate pieces
and weld together
British Museum - Great Court

Wen-Shao Chang (Guest)

19/05/2021 © The University of Sheffield

Participants: +16, SC, RB, VA, AJ, TL, EW, WT, EJ, SD, WC, E.



PLENARY COURSE DAY 4

Physical model

- Hanging model
Use chain, the loads are purely in tension; the pure compression model occurs when the model is turned upside down.
e.g. Mannheim gridshell
- Tension model
Use soap film of gauze within pre-set boundaries of minimal surface to find equilibrium shape.
e.g. concept of main station in Stuttgart.
- Pneumatic model
Use a membrane as a mould. The membrane is blown up to a certain shape.
e.g. COOP Distribution Centre in Switzerland (by Heinz Isler)

Liddell, 2015


Li, 2018, p.96

<https://www.railwaypro.com/wp/stuttgart-21-railway-station-project-costs-surpass-eur-8-billion/>

Poinet (2016)

Li, 2018, p.96

PLENARY COURSE DAY 5



PAPER • OPEN ACCESS

Comparison of simulation-based methods and metaheuristic optimization algorithms for optimizing window design by considering daylighting and heat transfer in a tropical region of Indonesia

To cite this article: A Budhiyanto *et al* 2021 *IOP Conf. Ser.: Earth Environ. Sci.* **907** 012016

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.

You may also like

- [Metaheuristic optimization approaches to predict shear-wave velocity from conventional well logs in sandstone and carbonate case studies](#)
Mohammad Emami Niri, Rasool Amiri Kolajoobi, Mohammad Khodaiy Arbat et al.
- [Metaheuristic layout design of a 2 billion euro science facility](#)
P M Bentley and U Filges
- [A preliminary study to metaheuristic approach in multilayer radiation shielding optimization](#)
Muhammad Arif Sazali, Nahrul Khair Alang Md Rashid and Khaidzir Hamzah



The Electrochemical Society
Advancing solid state & electrochemical science & technology

241st ECS Meeting

Vancouver, BC, Canada. May 29 – June 2, 2022



ECS Plenary Lecture featuring
Prof. Jeff Dahn,
Dalhousie University



Register now!



4/24/25, 2:12 PM

IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science

SJR

SI

SR

CR

G

EPI

SJR

Scimago Journal & Country Rank

Enter Journal Title, ISSN or Publisher Name

Home

Journal Rankings

Journal Value

Country Rankings

Viz Tools

Help

About Us

CS DENTAL

4.8

(225)

pembedahan geraham bungsu - painless surgery

BUKA

08.00–22.00

Ruko Panji Makmur, Jalan Panjang Jiwo No.48 Blok B No. 3, Panjang Jiwo, Kecamatan Tenggilis Mejoyo

Situs








Rute


IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science

<div>COUNTRY</div> <div>United Kingdom</div> <div><div><div></div><div>Universities and research institutions in United Kingdom</div></div><div><div></div><div>Media Ranking in United Kingdom</div></div></div>	<div>SUBJECT AREA AND CATEGORY</div> <div>Earth and Planetary Sciences</div> <div><div>Earth and Planetary Sciences (miscellaneous)</div><div>Environmental Science</div><div>Environmental Science (miscellaneous)</div><div>Physics and Astronomy</div><div>Physics and Astronomy (miscellaneous)</div></div>	<div>PUBLISHER</div> <div>Institute of Physics</div>	<div>SJR 2024</div> <div>0.214</div> <div>H-INDEX</div> <div>58</div>
<div>PUBLICATION TYPE</div> <div>Conferences and Proceedings</div>	<div>ISSN</div> <div>17551307, 17551315</div>	<div>COVERAGE</div> <div>2010-2025</div>	<div>INFORMATION</div> <div><div>Homepage</div><div>How to publish in this journal</div><div>ees@ioppublishing.org</div></div>
<div>SCOPE</div>			

The open access IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science (EES) provides a fast, versatile and cost-effective proceedings publication service.

Join the conversation about this journal





RIBKA ROSARI NABABAN 6 months ago

What is the quartal of this journal?

← reply



Melanie Ortiz 6 months ago

SCImago Team

Dear Ribka,
Thank you for contacting us. Please see comments below.
Best regards, SCImago Team



Source details

IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science

Years currently covered by Scopus: from 2010 to 2025

ISSN: 1755-1307 E-ISSN: 1755-1315

Subject area: Earth and Planetary Sciences: General Earth and Planetary Sciences
Environmental Science: General Environmental Science

Source type: Conference Proceeding

[View all documents >](#) [Set document alert](#) [Save to source list](#)

CiteScore 2023
1.0 ⓘ

SJR 2023
0.199 ⓘ

SNIP 2023
0.325 ⓘ

CiteScore CiteScore rank & trend Scopus content coverage

CiteScore 2023

1.0 = $\frac{68,990 \text{ Citations } 2020 - 2023}{66,209 \text{ Documents } 2020 - 2023}$

Calculated on 05 May, 2024

CiteScoreTracker 2024 ⓘ

1.3 = $\frac{73,923 \text{ Citations to date}}{55,167 \text{ Documents to date}}$

Last updated on 05 April, 2025 • Updated monthly

CiteScore rank 2023 ⓘ

Category	Rank	Percentile
Earth and Planetary Sciences	#139/195	28th
General Earth and Planetary Sciences		
Environmental Science	#180/233	22nd

[View CiteScore methodology >](#) [CiteScore FAQ >](#) [Add CiteScore to your site](#)



CERTIFICATE

This certificate is awarded to:

Aris Budhiyanto

as **PRESENTER**, in:

**DIGITAL AND EMPATHIC ENGAGEMENT
IN THE NEW ERA FOR
ARCHITECTURE AND CIVIL ENGINEERING
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
20-21 AUGUST 2021**

CUMULATIVE POINT :

Chairman of Indonesian Institute of Architect
East Java Chapter



Tuli Kalson Sagala, M.Ars., IAI, AA

Conference Chairman



Dr. Rudy Setiawan

FACULTY OF CIVIL ENGINEERING & PLANNING
PETRA CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY

KUM IAI : 4

Comparison of simulation-based methods and metaheuristic optimization algorithms for optimizing window design by considering daylighting and heat transfer in a tropical region of Indonesia

A Budhiyanto^{1,2,6}, A Oktavianus³, B Tedjokusumo⁴, K Harsono⁴ and I T Yang⁵

¹ Department of Architecture, National Taiwan University of Science and Technology, Taipei, Taiwan

² Department of Architecture, Petra Christian University, Surabaya, Indonesia

³ Department of Civil Engineering, National Taiwan University, Taipei, Taiwan

⁴ Department of Architecture, National Taiwan University of Science and Technology, Taipei, Taiwan

⁵ Department of Civil and Construction Engineering, National Taiwan University of Science and Technology, Taipei, Taiwan

⁶ Corresponding author: arisb@petra.ac.id

Abstract. This study presents evaluation and comparison of simulation-based methods and metaheuristic optimization algorithms on building design models, focussing on daylight availability maximization and energy consumption minimization. The simulation-based method was presented using Rhino/Grasshopper software supported by the Ladybug, Honeybee, and Octopus optimization plugins; while MOPSO was chosen to calculate the metaheuristic optimization algorithm. The result indicated that OTTV values of the optimum design were respectively in the range of 24.06 W/m² to 34.15 W/m² for Octopus optimization and 25.19 W/m² to 34.99 W/m² for MOPSO; and the WWR value for Octopus optimization and MOPSO were in the range 15% to 23% and 15% to 26%, respectively. While both methods showed similar results, the time duration for simulating in Rhino/Grasshopper was much longer compared to calculating the algorithm using MATLAB, indicating that simulation-based was less effective.

1. Introduction

United Nation Environment Programme [1] stated that buildings and the construction sector accounted for 36% of final energy use and 39% of energy and process-related carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions. The highest energy consuming component in a building is Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC) systems, which is affected by the indoor temperature setpoint, air infiltration, window type, window wall ratio [2, 3]. Budhiyanto [4] stated that increasing 10% window area will result in about 5.67% cooling energy usage and 0.35°C temperature increase. However, reducing the window areas will affect less daylight penetration into buildings. As glazing systems influence building lighting requirements and energy usage as the solar radiation that enters the building, window design is essential for optimally calculated to reduce energy consumption in a building.



Optimizing the window design by looking at increasing the size of the window will benefit the availability of daylight but increasing the amount of energy lost through it is a challenging task [2, 5]. Window design optimization considers many factors and constraints, especially in tropical countries that have excessive sunlight. Several studies have explored the optimization of windows by calculating the thermal gain, wind pressure, solar radiation, and the shape and slope of the facade against the window. Qingsong and Fukuda [6] found the optimum window area on each different orientation wall which minimizes the energy consumption and maximises the useful daylight illuminance using simulation-based methods. The same method is also used by Lukmanto [7] to select a type of glass facade that optimizes both energy saving and construction cost, considering solar radiation and wind pressure. Cheng et al. [8] investigated the optimization of daylight and energy performance for residential buildings, with building orientation, wall and glazing properties and window areas as the parameters. A study conducted [9] in Iran which has four climates stated that the optimum window area for north, south and east and west building facade were about 20-30%, 20-50% and 20-70%, respectively, and the energy saving was around 20-100% and 16-25% based on the local climate; while in Australia [10] achieved up to 8.57% energy saving by applied 20-40% window area on building envelopes.

It was apparent that previous studies have focused on optimizing window designs based on daylight and heat gain mostly in sub-tropical countries using a simulation-based method, carried out in Revit/Dynamo and Rhino/Grasshopper simulation software. However, a simulation-based method is not the only way for solving optimization problems. Metaheuristic optimization algorithms emerged as another option for solving optimization problems [11]. The use of metaheuristics in the solution of optimization problems is impressive with very important improvements and new algorithms being proposed every day [12]. Several metaheuristic applications for optimization in buildings have been carried out in calculating window design, building energy performance, and indoor thermal [13, 14].

While the window design optimization is mostly done using simulation software or manual calculations, both the simulation-based and metaheuristic algorithm methods are used to optimize window designs, including window-to-wall ratio (WWR) and glazing properties, such as glass U value and visual transmittance value (VT). The objective of this study is to investigate the optimum design for minimizing energy consumption as well as maximizing daylight penetration by comparing two different methods.

2. Methodology

2.1. Optimization framework

The stages carried out in this study are divided into four stages. The first stage is identifying the design variables to be examined and building a design model followed by developing the daylight and energy analysis model for simulation as well as the objective function for metaheuristic optimization. The second stage is the simulation work stage using Rhino/Grasshopper software. The third stage is the metaheuristic analysis process using Multi-Objective Particle Swarm Optimization. This stage proceeds in parallel with the second stage. The fourth stage is to compare and discuss the results obtained to obtain conclusions. Figure 1 illustrates the framework of this study according to the explanation of the four stages.

2.2. Case study

In this study, the design problem is considered a simple box shape building with 6m length x 5m width x 4m height, located in Jakarta, Indonesia. The building has one window on the south facade without a shading device (Fig 2). The wall material has U value = 1.7152 Watt/m²K and α = 0.86, while the window area and glazing properties will be obtained through simulation and calculation.




Figure 1. Optimization framework.




Figure 2. A simple box shape model building.

2.3. Optimization problem

Two optimization objectives, which are minimum Overall Thermal Transfer Value (OTTV) and maximum Daylight Autonomy (DA) represent the optimal energy and daylight performance in simulation-based methods. However, in a metaheuristic optimization algorithm, Effective Aperture (EA) is used to measure the daylight availability replacing DA due to the complexity of DA calculation. Based on building envelope design regulation in SNI [15], which refers to the ASHRAE standard, the OTTV equation is:

$$OTTV = \alpha [(UW * (1 - WWR) * TDek] + (Uf * WWR * \Delta T) + (SC * WWR * SF) \quad (1)$$

OTTV = overall thermal transfer value (Watt/m²)

α = wall color absorbance

UW = wall thermal transmittance (Watt/m²K)

WWR = window-to-wall ratio (%)

TDek = equivalent temperature difference (K)

Uf = glazing thermal transmittance (Watt/m²K)

ΔT = highest indoor-outdoor temperature difference (K)

SC = shading coefficient

SF = solar radiation factor (W/m^2)

In this model, only the south wall façade has a window without a shading device, therefore the OTTV calculation only considers south wall heat gain. As wall thermal properties have been determined ($U_w = 1.7152 \text{ Watt/m}^2\text{K}$, $\alpha = 0.86$, $\text{TDeK} = 10$), the highest indoor-outdoor temperature difference in Indonesia is around 5°C and south wall solar radiation factor is 97 W/m^2 , so the equation of metaheuristic optimization algorithm can be simplified as:

$$\text{OTTV} = 14.75 + \text{WWR} * U_f * 411.25 \quad (2)$$

Daylight autonomy (DA) is the percentage of occupied time when an illuminance threshold (300 lux) can be met by daylight alone under continuous overcast sky conditions throughout the year. Simulation-based or numerical-based methods are usually considered to measure daylight availability [16]. However, because the DA calculation is very complex, the metaheuristic optimization uses the Effective Aperture (EA) algorithm to calculate daylight availability. EA is defined as the product of WWR and VT (Equation 3) and is often used as an indicator of daylight availability [10]. Although DA and EA have different calculation methods, both have the same objective, which is to measure daylight availability in the buildings.

$$\text{EA} = \text{VT} * \text{WWR} \quad (3)$$

EA = effective aperture (%)

VT = glazing visual light transmittance

WWR = window-to-wall ratio (%)

2.4. Model constraints

Three types of constraints are defined in this optimization framework. The first constraint defined the glazing material properties, which are glass U value and visual light transmittance. The second constraint defined the WWR range to prevent overglazing. The third constraint is the maximum OTTV allowed. In this study, the properties of glazing material are determined based on Stopsol glass created by AGC Glass Europe. The glass U_f adopted can be as low as $1.25 \text{ Watt/m}^2\text{K}$ and go up to $6.45 \text{ Watt/m}^2\text{K}$, while the glass VT adopted can vary from 0.15 to 0.75.

The glazed area restriction is determined based on the window-to-floor ratio (WFR) [9]. Equation 4 shows the restriction of the glazed area by setting lower and upper bounds for the WFR, which are 10% and 50%, respectively.

$$\underline{\text{WFR}} \leq \frac{\text{WWR} * A}{F} \leq \overline{\text{WFR}} \quad (4)$$

$\underline{\text{WFR}}$ = minimum window-to-floor ratio (%)

WWR = window-to-wall ratio (%)

A = wall area (m^2)

F = floor area (m^2)

$\overline{\text{WFR}}$ = maximum window-to-floor ratio (%)

Based on Indonesia National Standard [15], the maximum OTTV allowed is 35 W/m^2 . Therefore, the OTTV results obtained higher than 35 W/m^2 are considered violating the constraint and a penalty leading to termination of its evaluation process will be applied.

3. Simulation and metaheuristic optimization

3.1. Rhino/ Grasshopper simulation

In architectural research, optimization of sustainable design can be done through numerical-based and simulation-based methods. In terms of aperture optimization, both optimization methods can be performed. BIM software packages, such as Rhino/ Grasshopper and Revit/ Dynamo, are often used to perform this optimization simulation with the presence of plugins, such as the Octopus and Galapagos plugins in the Rhino software [17]. The simulation framework is shown in figure 3.




Figure 3. Simulation process and tools.

The model geometry is built in Rhinoceros (Rhino) software with Grasshopper plugin. Grasshopper, a parametric modelling plugin for Rhinoceros 3D modelling software developed by David Rutten at Robert McNeel & Associates in 2007 has the capability to quickly generate parametric shapes based on generative algorithms. Grasshopper plugins Ladybug and Honeybee are used to run daylight and energy simulation based on Radiance and EnergyPlus program, Octopus, a multi-objective optimization plugin is applied to perform the optimization. The genetic input of Octopus is connected to the design variables, while Fitness input is connected to daylight and energy optimization objectives. If the optimization result is terminated, Octopus will execute it and if it is not terminated, Octopus will automatically reset the design variables values for the next design option and continue the simulation [18].

In Octopus, the setting of population size, crossover rate, mutation rate, mutation probability and elitism are 100, 0.8, 0.09, 0.2 and 0.5, respectively. Since Octopus can only solve minimization problems, the value of DA is multiplied by -1. Jakarta, a major city in the tropical region of Indonesia is chosen for simulation. The climate condition of Jakarta is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Average hourly global horizontal radiation, air temperature and relative humidity.

Month	Global Horizontal Radiation (Wh/sq.m)	Air Temperature (°C)	Relative Humidity (%)
Jan	557	28	78
Feb	578	28	76
Mar	617	28	77
Apr	663	29	73
May	624	29	72
Jun	617	29	68
Jul	616	28	69
Aug	682	29	67
Sep	693	29	65
Oct	646	29	68
Nov	617	29	71
Dec	601	28	75

3.2. Metaheuristic optimization algorithm

Kennedy and Eberhart [19] first introduced Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) as a simplified algorithm based on the movement of organisms in a flock of birds or schools of fish for optimization. The algorithm of PSO describes a possible solution as a particle that moves through the search area in a certain variable domain range and evaluates each particle to get a fitness value. Conceptually, PSO records the best individual solution of a particle as pBest and the best global solution among all particles as gBest to determine how each particle moves in the next iteration. The movement of the particles is carried out in a set number of iterations. In each iteration, the algorithm evaluates each solution and updates the pBest and gBest values if there is a better solution.

Multi-Objective Particle Swarm Optimization (MOPSO) is heuristically extended by PSO to effectively deal with multi-objective optimization problems [20, 21]. The approach of MOPSO uses the Pareto dominance concept to determine the flying direction of the particle and maintains the non-dominance vector found previously in the global repository which is then used by other particles to guide their flight, then validated using several standard test functions from the specialized literature.




Figure 4. MOPSO process.

3.3. Setting MOPSO

From figure 4 above, it can be seen that the first step of MO-PSO is generated the initial population by randomizing from the range of the upper bound and the lower bound. In this study, a population of 100 particles was determined. The initial velocity is also randomized determined, by the range of 0-1. Each particle fitness value is calculated using the objective function, which is the minimum value of equation (2) above and also the maximum value of equation (3). The result is analysed by its position, to see whether the solution is being dominated by other solutions. The particle that is not being dominated by other particles will be stored in an archive.

In this study, the number of archives is 20 particles. The Gbest and Pbest is also selected for each iteration. 100 iteration is used to reach the optimum solution. For each iteration, the velocity is updated using the single objective PSO formula. The inertia weight is determined before which is 0.3. The solution should maintain the speed, to keep the solution from reaching global optima too quickly. Therefore, maximum velocity is needed. For this study, the maximum velocity is 0.1 of the range. The

PSO algorithm requires the solution inside the boundary, so if there any particle go beyond the boundary, adhere strategy will be implemented. After the algorithm set, each particle is evaluated for determining the Pbest, which is if the new solution dominated the old one, the new solution would replace the current Pbest. When the particle updates its velocity, a random number is generated, and if the number is bigger than the pre-determined threshold, which is 0,15, the velocity will change by a random value. Later, each particle will be evaluated according to the dominance status, if there is any dominated solution in the archive or the Pareto front, the solution will be eliminated. Finally, Gbest will be selected randomly among the Pareto front.

4. Result and discussion

4.1. Rhino/ Grasshopper simulation

The simulation is run using a computer with AMD Quad Core R5-2500U, 3.6 GHz, 8 GB memory. It takes 100 - 150 seconds to run one simulation. In this simulation, 100 generations with 100 populations in each generation are simulated, so in total the time needed for simulating all generations is around 277 - 416 hours.

The Pareto front solutions of generations 1, 25, 50, 75 and 100 are shown in Figure 5. It's obvious after generation 25, the positions of Pareto front doesn't change and it's already converged. Since Octopus optimization plugin is only able to solve minimization, the maximization DA objective shown is multiplied by -1.




Figure 5. Pareto front solution of generation by Rhino/Grasshopper.

The minimum OTTV value is 24.06 W/m² obtained by presenting 15% WWR, while the maximum DA value is 97.02%, obtained by presenting 23% WWR. The balanced design option is obtained when OTTV and DA values are 29.11 W/m² and 90.75%, respectively, by presenting 23% WWR. Table 2 shows the design variable values and optimization objectives of the best design option.

Table 2. Design variable values and optimization objectives of best design options.

	Optimization objectives		Design variables		
	OTTV (W/m ²)	DA (%)	WWR (%)	Uf (Watt/ m ² K)	VT
Min OTTV	24.06	78.78	15	1.25	0.75
Max DA	34.15	97.02	23	1.25	0.75
Balanced	29.11	90.75	19	1.25	0.75

4.2. Metaheuristic optimization algorithm

Matlab software is used to run the metaheuristic algorithm. In a computer with the same specification, Matlab need 12 – 15 seconds to run the algorithm with 100 generations, each one has 100 populations. The Pareto front solutions of generations 1, 25, 50, 75 and 100 are shown in Figure 6. It's obvious after generation 25, the positions of the Pareto front doesn't change and it's already converged.

The minimum OTTV value is 25.19 W/m² obtained by presenting 15% WWR, while the maximum EA value is 19.26%, obtained by presenting 23% WWR. The balanced design option is obtained when OTTV and DA values are 30.02 W/m² and 15.20%, respectively, by presenting 26% WWR. Table 3 shows the design variable values and optimization objectives of the best design option.




Figure 6. Pareto front solution of generation by MOPSO.

Table 3. Design variable values and optimization objectives of best design options.

	Optimization objectives		Design variables		
	OTTV (W/m ²)	DA (%)	WWR (%)	Uf (Watt/m ² K)	VT
Min OTTV	25.19	11.25	15	1.25	0.75
Max DA	34.99	19.26	26	1.25	0.75
Balanced	30.02	15.20	20	1.25	0.75

4.3. Metaheuristic optimization algorithm

Table 2 and 3 shows that the result of Octopus optimization and MOPSO is slightly different for OTTV and WWR values but for Uf and VT values are the same. The difference can be explained as Rhino/Grasshopper simulating and calculating more factors than the objective function equations in MOPSO. However, both results are still in line, indicating that both methods are quite reliable. The optimum design options presented WWR in the range 15% to 26%, Uf is 1.25 (Watt/m²K) and VT is 0.75. The WWR value

The design variables of best design options indicated that the WWR plays an important role to maintain daylight availability as well as energy consumption, compared to Uf and VT.

Comparing the running time of both Rhino/Grasshopper simulation and Matlab algorithm calculation, it's obvious that the simulation based method consumes much more time. Therefore metaheuristic optimization algorithm is more effective to solve an optimization problem with simple objective functions.

5. Conclusion

This study focuses on evaluating and comparing simulation-based methods and metaheuristic optimization algorithms on building design models. Daylight availability maximization and energy consumption minimization were selected as multi-objective optimization. The simulation-based method was presented using Rhino/Grasshopper software supported by the Ladybug, Honeybee and Octopus optimization plugins. MOPSO was chosen to calculate the metaheuristic optimization algorithm.

This study uses OTTV and DA to measure energy and daytime performance for Octopus optimization, while EA replaces DA for MOPSO optimization. The results of Octopus and MOPSO optimization show similar values. The OTTV values are in the range of 24.06 W/m² to 34.15 W/m², respectively, for Octopus optimization and 25.19 W/m² to 34.99 W/m² for MOPSO. The DA value for Octopus optimization is in the range of 78.78% to 97.02%, while the EA value for MOPSO is in the range of 11.25% to 19.26%.

As for design variables, the WWR value for Octopus optimization and MOPSO is in the range 15% to 23% and 15% to 26%, respectively. While both methods show the same value for Uf of 1.25 Watt/m²K and VT of 0.75. Among the design variables, it is evident that WWR is the most important variable affecting the energy and daylight performance of the building.

Based on the running time, the simulation based method needs much more time compared to metaheuristic optimization algorithm, indicating that the latter is more effective to solve an optimization problem with simple objective functions.

References

- [1] United Nations Environment Programme 2019 *Global Status Report for Buildings and Construction Sector: Towards a zero-emission, efficient and resilient buildings and construction sector* p 3
- [2] Pérez-Lombard L, Ortiz J and Pout, C 2008 *Energy Build.* **40** 394
- [3] Ruparathna R, Hewage K and Sadiq R 2016 *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Rev.* **53** 1032–1045.
- [4] Budhiyanto A 2017 *Dimensi J. Archit. Build. Environ.* **44** 189-194
- [5] Lin H-W and Hong T. 2013 *Appl. Energy* **111** 515–528.
- [6] Ma Q and Fukuda H 2016 *Procedia Soc. Behav. Sci.* **216** 818–828.
- [7] Lukmanto C M E 2020 *Multi-objective Optimization of Facade Glazing: Considering Solar Radiation, Wind Pressure, and Cost Estimation Analysis* (Taipei) National Taiwan University of Science and Technology
- [8] Cheng C Ninic J and Tizani W 2019 Parametric Virtual Design-Based Multi-Objective Optimization for Sustainable Building Design *EG-ICE 2019 Workshop on Intelligent Computing in Engineering* (Leuven, Belgium)
- [9] Shaeri J, Habibi A, Yaghoubi M and Chokhachian, A 2019 *Environ.* **6(4)** 1-16
- [10] Chen Z, Hammad A W A, Kamardeen I and Haddad A 2020 *Buildings* **10(11)** 206
- [11] Yang X S 2011 Metaheuristic Optimization: Algorithm Analysis and Open Problems *SEA 2011 LNCS* 6630 21–32
- [12] Dokeroglu T, Sevinc E, Kucukyilmaz T and Cosar A 2019 *Comput. Ind. Eng.* **137** 106040
- [13] Delgarm N, Sajadi B, Kowsary F and Delgarm S 2016 *Appl. Energy* **170** 293–303
- [14] Zhai Y, Wang Y, Huang Y and Meng X 2019 *Renewable Energy* **134** 1190–1199
- [15] Standardization Agency of Indonesia 2011 SNI 6390:2011 Energy conservation of the building's air-conditioning system (Jakarta, Indonesia)
- [16] Acosta I, Campano M A, Domínguez S and Fernández-Agüera J 2019 *LEUKOS - J. Illum. Eng. Soc. N. Am.* **15(3)** 1-19
- [17] Touloupaki E and Theodosiou T 2017 *Energies* **10** 637
- [18] Fang Y and Cho S 2019 *Sol. Energies* **10** 1-18
- [19] Kennedy J and Eberhart R 1995 Particle swarm optimization *Proc. International Conference on Neural Networks* **4** 1942–1948

- [20] Parsopoulos K E and Vrahatis M N 2002 Particle swarm optimization method in multiobjective problems *ACM symp. on Applied computing* (New York: Association for Computing Machinery) p 603–607
- [21] Coello Coello C A and Lechuga M S 2002 MOPSO: a proposal for multiple objective particle swarm optimization *Proc. Evolutionary Computation IEEE Computer Society* **2** 1051–1056