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ABSTRACT
This article discusses the design, prototype development and an experimental study of facade-integrated thermoelectric (TE) materials. TEs are semiconductors that have the ability to produce a temperature gradient when electricity is applied, exploiting the Peltier effect, or to generate a voltage when exposed to a temperature gradient, utilizing the Seebeck effect. TEs can be used for heating, cooling, or power generation. In this research, heating and cooling applications of these novel systems were explored. Initially, we designed and constructed two prototypes, where one prototype was used to study integration of TE modules (TEM) as stand-alone elements in the facade, and one prototype was used to explore integration of TEMs and heat sinks in facade assemblies. We tested both prototypes, where a thermal chamber was used to represent four different exterior environmental conditions (0°F, 30°F, 60°F and 90°F). The interior ambient conditions were kept constant at room temperature. The supplied voltage to facade-integrated TEMs varied from 1 to 8 V. We measured temperature outputs of TEMs for all investigated thermal conditions using thermal imaging, which are discussed in detail in this article. The results indicate that while stand-alone facade-integrated TEMs are not stable, addition of heat sinks improves their performance drastically. Facade-integrated TEMs with heatsinks showed that they would operate well in heating and cooling modes under varying exterior environmental conditions.

INTRODUCTION
Buildings consume 40% of energy in the United States, and influence greenhouse gas emissions. High demand for energy used for lighting, heating, ventilation, and air conditioning leads to significant amount of carbon dioxide emissions. According to the U.S. Department of Energy, 15% of global electricity is consumed by various refrigeration and air-conditioning processes, and 46% of the energy used in household and commercial buildings is attributed to heating, ventilation and air-conditioning (HVAC) systems (DOE, 2011). Given the high energy usage and inefficiencies found in conventional HVAC systems, new heating and cooling sources are needed in order to reduce buildings’ carbon footprint. Moreover, integration of different building systems, particularly building envelope and HVAC, are essential.
for high-performance buildings. Thermoelectrics are one example of a promising technology with potential architectural applications. Research and development has largely focused on thermoelectric modules (TEMs) that convert heat energy into electrical energy (Montecucco et al., 2012; Yilmazoglu, 2016). Heating and cooling modes can be switched by reversing the current direction (Fig. 1), while the “Power Input” supply module can be microprocessor-controlled to make the TEM responsive to the environment through a combination of sensors and closed-loop digital control. TEMs can offer small-scale and relatively low-cost electricity generation without the use of mechanical parts or production of toxic wastes (Seetawan et al., 2014). The optimal performance of TEMs depends on many factors, ranging from material selection to operation strategy (Twaha et al., 2016).

TEMs can be used for heating, cooling, or power generation (Fig. 2). TEMs consist of arrays of N and P type semiconductors. When a heat source is applied on one side of the semiconductor and the other side is exposed to a cooler temperature, electric power is produced (and can be generated in reverse). Electricity supply can actively provide cooling or heating by reversing the current direction (Zheng et al., 2014). In this research, cooling and heating potentials were explored.

**Figure 1** Thermoelectric materials produce electricity when exposed to thermal gradient, and cooling/heating when voltage is applied.

**Figure 2** Potential use of TE materials in exterior walls for energy generation, heating and cooling.
Most research into thermoelectrics (TE) conducted before 2005 concentrated on increasing the TE figure-of-merit ZT, a dimensionless measure of conversion efficiency, through materials selection. Research focused on variations of geometric features such as shape, size, and orientation to the flow in heat transfer systems. More recently, research on TE applications has gained momentum (Twaha et al., 2016; Zhao and Tan, 2014). A promising, but not widely researched area, includes use of TEs for targeted, localized heating and cooling in buildings. In the past 15 years, significant growth of research into thermolectric energy conversion is reflected in the increase in related annual publications (Bell, 2008). TEMs have been used for cooling and heating applications in the military and aerospace fields, and for electronic instruments (Kraemer et al., 2011). Since TEMs do not contain any moving parts, they are very compact in size, while their operation is quite reliable and stable. This greatly reduces maintenance costs when compared to other types of air conditioning systems (Shen et al., 2013). It is possible to use TEMs as an alternative to HVAC applications with properly designed heat exchangers (Yilmazoglu, 2016).

Thermoelectric heating and cooling has several advantages over conventional counterparts. The compact size, light weight, reliability, lack of mechanical parts and elimination of the need for chlorofluorocarbons make them environmentally friendly and appealing. But, applying thermoelectric systems for space heating and cooling remains much more challenging and has not been explored beyond small scale applications and in theoretical proposals (Zhao and Tan, 2014). Two possible reasons might be relatively low efficiency of TEMs compared to high-efficiency HVAC systems, and relatively high costs. However, recent developments show promise in new classes of TEs that improve energy output and reduce manufacturing costs (Schonecker et al., 2015). The conversion efficiency of TEs has also been steadily rising as a consequence of the intensified research into abundant, naturally-occurring, and efficient TE materials. Furthermore, economies of scale have been steadily exerting downward pressure on the prices of TEMs as they reach market penetration; currently, TEMs are commercially available with costs below the $1/W mark. The key driver of the cost remains the overall assembly and installation, including heat exchangers, power supplies, and control systems.

Few applications of TEM’s in facade assemblies have been researched, proposed, or constructed. This has created a significant gap in knowledge in the potential architectural applications of TEM’s. Some researchers, however, have proposed architectural applications with promising preliminary results. Liu et al. proposed a facade assembly that integrates TEM with a heat sink for heating and cooling needs. Results indicate that the total input power required to operate a TEM decreases as the distribution density of the TEMs increase. The thermal resistance of the heat sink plays an important role in determining the number of TE coolers optimizing all potential design configurations (Liu et al., 2015). This study proposed a window composed of four parts: a passive window, a PV module, thermoelectric cooling units, and heat sinks. A semi-transparent PV module is integrated into the front pane of a passive double-pane window and it is used to power TEMs integrated into the window frame. Finned heat sinks are placed in contact with the TE units to control the heat transfer between the TEMs and the ambient environment. The PV unit converts solar radiation into electrical energy, while the TEMs change this electrical energy into thermal energy. The TEMs can heat or cool, depending on the direction of the current supplied by the PV unit. This would allow the building envelope to be used in both heating and cooling applications (Liu et al., 2015).

While the scientific principles and properties that govern TEs were discovered over one hundred years ago, the applications in facade systems have not been widely explored. This research addresses this gap in knowledge by investigating integration of TEMs into building facades for heating and cooling.

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHODS**

The research questions that were addressed include:
- How can TEMs be integrated into architectural facade assemblies to provide localized heating and cooling?
- How do TEMs behave in typical climate thermal conditions?
- How is TEM’s thermal performance affected by varying voltages, climatic conditions and assembly construction?
- How is TEM performance affected by different configuration of heat sinks?
Two low fidelity TEM facade prototypes were assembled for the purposes of this study. These were tested in ambient and thermally controlled conditions to measure temperature gradients, heating and cooling potential. Materials for these assemblies were selected for their commercial availability, low cost, as well as their specifications. Two heat sink types were chosen to provide a comparison in heat transfer performance values.

The dimensions of TEM modules are 40mm x 40mm, drawing up to 12V, with operating conditions from -30°C to 83°C. Small heat sinks of 40mm x 40mm x 11mm, composed of aluminum cooling fins, were used to provide direct heat sinks for a flat heat sink assembly. These were fixed to the TEMs using 0.5mm silicone based thermal pads. The second prototype included larger heat sinks. Two 120mm heat sinks were used, with four direct heat copper pipes for heat dissipation to an array of fins. Thermal paste provided a thermal connection to the TEM module.

Five configurations were considered when constructing prototypes for testing (Fig. 3). A direct contact TEM facade module would provide the simplest assembly, applying heat sinks directly to the TEM. This assembly, however, poses the greatest potential for thermal bridging and gaps in the facade assembly. A sink transfer assembly expands upon the direct contact assembly, but relies on conductors to transfer heat from the TEM to heat sinks. Location shift assemblies are similar to sink transfer assemblies, but allow flexibility for heat sink location in relation to the TEM. Stacked TEMs provide the opportunity to increase the temperature differences between the hot and cold sides beyond what is possible with a single TEM across multiple modules. Floor mounted assemblies consider integrating TEMs, conductors, and heat sinks into the floor plate and facade. This assembly is the most complicated application, but provides benefits that include natural convection and heat sink concealment.

![Figure 3](image_url) Schematic representation of possible configuration and placement of TEMs in facades.

For the purposes of this research, direct contact and sink transfer TEM facade assemblies were selected, for their simplicity and broad applicability. Each assembly was constructed using two 1” foam insulation panels with an R-value of 5, providing each assembly with an R-value of 10. Thin board (1/8”) was glued to the face of foam insulation and provided a housing within the assembly for the TEM modules and heat sinks. Heat sinks were inserted into the assembly and connected to the TEM using thermal paste or thermal pads. The flat assembly did not rely on any fasteners to connect the TEMs to the heat sinks, instead thermal pads provided the adhesion. The large heat sink assembly required an assembly composed of nuts, bolts, and washers to sandwich the TEM, foam, and board assembly together. Spray foam insulation was applied to the larger heat sink assembly to prevent any thermal breaks that may have developed through use of metal hardware and fasteners. These assemblies can be seen in Figures 4 and 5.
To understand how facade-integrated TEMs behave, these prototypes were first tested in ambient room conditions (temperature of 72°F). An independent module without a heat sink, a module with a flat heat sink, as well as the assembly mockups were tested with applied voltage of 1V increments. Results were measured using thermal imaging camera and a power supply. Thermal images were taken at one volt increments up to 8V, and temperatures were recorded using a thermal camera with numerical temperature read-out with resolution of 0.1 degree.

Further testing involved the use of a temperature controlled thermal chamber, model Tenney Jr. The thermal chamber’s 16.5” x 16.5” opening was sealed using 1” of insulating foam with tape applied to provide a relatively air tight seal for the testing. Assemblies were inserted into a 10”x10” void and were taped again (Fig. 6). The 10”x10” void allowed for easy insertion and removal of the prototypes. The chamber was set to 0°F, 30°F, 60°F, and 90°F to represent different exterior temperatures (winter, summer and intermediate seasons). This method of testing simulated typical exterior temperatures found in most climates while allowing for temperature data to be collected in a controlled setting. The thermal chamber was allowed time to stabilize (1 hr) before each testing session, and 20 minute breaks were taken in between each measurement. The ambient temperature of the room was kept relatively stable at 73°F. Voltage was applied in 1 V increments in both heating and cooling modes. Temperature measurements on the exterior surface of the prototypes were recorded using a thermal camera.
RESULTS

Ambient Testing Results

Results were collected, tabulated, and graphed for analysis. The temperatures observed in ambient testing ranged from 48.8°F to 258.3°F in both cooling and heating modes. The maximum temperature observed occurred on the hot side of the flat heat sink at 8V. The independent TEM approached this value, reaching 238.2°F at 6V before module failure. Heating side maximums exceeded 200°F in all ambient assembly tests, except for the large heat sink (measured temperature for of this assembly was 98.3°F at 8V). All heating side temperatures show positive temperature trends (Fig. 7).

Cooling temperatures displayed inconsistent data. Temperatures ranged from 48.8°F to 181.1°F. Cold side temperatures elevate significantly on the independent TEM, flat heat sink, and flat heat sink assembly above 4V. The cold side temperatures of these testing modules exceed 100°F at or around 4V. The large heat sink shows temperatures ranging from 59.5°F to 48.8°F. The temperature difference and average temperature values were the lowest for this assembly. Modules without heat sinks were stressed by high temperature difference values, often times exceeding those suggested by the manufacturer. Average temperatures show similar stresses, and can reach or exceed 200°F. TEM failures occurred on several occasions, most notably when TEMs were not paired with heat sinks, or if voltages exceeded 8V. This is caused by poor thermal coupling to the environment: when the heat removal from the TEM to the environment is inefficient, the TEM overheats and fails. Only the large heat sink maintained a stable average temperature, stressing the importance of incorporating a properly-sized heat sink with minimal thermal resistance for the proper functioning and reliability of facade-integrated TEMs.
Figure 7: Temperature difference and average temperature results in ambient conditions.

Temperature difference data indicates that a threshold of failure exists within the TEM module, occurring around 80°F, 15°F above the manufacturer's stated value. When plotted against power, the data show performance in line with observations, indicating that the temperature differentials were directly influenced by the presence of a heat sink. Data also shows that heat sinks allow a higher power input without leading to extreme temperature differentials.

Thermal Chamber Testing Results: Heating

Results of the thermal chamber testing indicate that the temperature values increase as higher voltages are applied, regardless of the assembly type or tested temperature (Fig. 8). The results for the prototype with a large heat sink show that temperatures range from 56.4°F to 97.1°F when applied in 1V increments. Tested temperature of 0°F yields a heating temperature range of 66.9°F to 80.1°F. Observed values start at 66.9°F due to the ambient temperatures of the testing room. Values always remained above 0°F temperature. 30°F ambient temperature data show values rising from 56.4°F to 81.6°F from 1V to 5V respectively. At 6V, a decline in temperature to 75.8°F was observed. At 60°F ambient temperature, heat sink values ranged from 73.8°F to 97.1°F. Temperatures rose relatively consistently at this tested temperature.

Figure 8: Assembly heating at 0, 30, 60°F with 3V applied.
Heating performance of the assembly with flat heat sink shows temperatures ranging from 28.8°F to 177°F. The heating from this assembly always exhibits a positive trend with increasing voltage. At 0°F temperature, heating temperatures range between 28.8°F to 80.6°F. Observed values without applied voltage start at 26.6°F. At 30°F temperature, results show values rising from 49.6°F to 159.8°F from 1V to 6V respectively. At 60°F temperature, values ranged from 70.5°F to 177°F. Heat sink temperatures at this temperature exceeded 100°F when 3V is applied.

![Figure 9](image)

**Figure 9** ΔT vs Watts and average temperature vs Watts in heating mode.

Temperature difference data in the heating mode indicates that heating performance behaves consistently despite thermal chamber temperatures (Fig. 9). Detailed data is shown in Table 1. Higher thermal chamber temperatures lead to higher temperature differences with increasing power being applied. This was observed in both assemblies; however, the flat heat sink showed positive trends, while the large heat sink showed relatively constant temperature differences with increasing power. The temperature differences observed in the flat heat sink greatly exceeded the manufacturer stated maximum of 65°F, leading to failure at 7W. The large heat sink assembly displayed a relatively constant difference of 65-70°F, even as power input increases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chamber Temp (°F)</th>
<th>Voltage (Volts)</th>
<th>Current (Amps)</th>
<th>Power (Watts)</th>
<th>Exposed TEM Temp (°F)</th>
<th>Average Temp (°F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>33.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>35.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>37.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>40.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>26.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Thermal Chamber Testing Results: Cooling**

TEM cooling data shows temperature values that are dependent on TEM assembly. The large heat sink data show that at a 60°F ambient temperature, cooling ranges from 71.6°F to 46.1°F when voltage is applied in 1V increments. However, cooling does not occur linearly. The minimum temperature was observed when 4V was applied to the large heat sink, while 5V and 6V values were slightly higher, at 53.7°F and 49.5°F respectively. Cooling performance was more effective at 60°F. Temperatures observed at 1-3V were higher than 60°F temperature (due to testing room temperature), but lowered significantly when higher voltages were applied. At 90°F temperature, TEM performance is relatively uniform. Measured temperatures ranged from 57.2°F to 66.8°F.

The flat heat sink assembly showed results ranging from 43.3°F to 93.9°F. Observed temperatures were lower when operated at a 60°F temperature, and remained below the ambient temperature through 4V. Temperatures observed at 90°F ranged from 72.8°F to 93.9°F. Temperatures remained below the ambient temperature up to 5V, but temperatures observed would not provide adequate cooling for occupant thermal comfort.

![Figure 10 ΔT vs Watts in cooling mode.](image-url)

Results for the cooling mode indicates that higher temperature differences arise as power inputs increases within the assemblies (Fig. 10). This was observed in both assemblies; however, the flat heat sink showed positive trends, while the large sink showed a slightly negative trend or constant temperature difference trend. Table 2 shows detailed results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th>0.62</th>
<th>1.86</th>
<th>72.1</th>
<th>36.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>34.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>48.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Detailed Results
PERFORMANCE

The overall efficiency of a TEM assembly in heating or cooling mode is captured by its coefficient of performance (COP). The COP is the ratio of the heat flux caused by the TEM over the electrical input power. Hence the COP represents the output (heat) and the input (electrical power). The input power is the product of voltage and current recorded from the power supply, while the heat flux $Q$ was calculated from the difference between heatsink and environment temperature, multiplied by the thermal resistance $R$ of the heatsink. The $R$ was calculated to be 0.2 W/F based on the area, thickness, and total number of cooling fins on the heatsink. Thus, the complete formula for the COP is $\text{COP} = \frac{Q}{P} = \frac{R(T_{\text{heatsink}} - T_{\text{room}})}{IV}$. The COP values were calculated assuming $T_{\text{room}} = 72^\circ$F. The results are shown in Figure 11. The COP values can be negative when $\Delta T$ is large. This is because heat naturally diffuses from hot to cold, sometimes termed the “passive” flux, while the TEM is trying to push a heat flux in the opposite direction, from cold to hot, termed “active” flux. The heat flux produced by the TEM is proportional to the input power, while the opposing natural diffusion is proportional to $\Delta T$. When input power is low and $\Delta T$ is high, the active flux is smaller than the passive component, and the total in the numerator of the COP formula is negative. As input power increases, the active flux overtakes the passive and a net COP ranging from 1 to 3 is observed, meaning that the TEM pushes 1-3 Watts of heat for every Watt of input. Under smaller $\Delta T$ values, the COP can exceed 5; however, practical applications require as much heat flux as possible and at the largest input powers tested (8-10 Watts), the COP is only slightly higher, reaching values of 5-6. These COPs are reasonably high and comparable to smaller conventional HVAC systems, but here we have the added advantage of size, noise, and reliability. Furthermore, despite the TEM having relatively low efficiency in power generation mode (when extracting electricity from a temperature difference) of about 5-10%, the COP in heating and cooling modes can easily exceed 1.
CONCLUSION

The results show that TEMs operate at effective heating and cooling temperatures even when exposed to variable exterior temperatures, represented by the thermal chamber. They are most effective when paired with a larger heat sink, especially for cooling. Results also show that TEMs, when integrated into facade prototypes, operate effectively in heating and cooling modes.

TEM modules operating without a heat sink or with a small heat sink are inefficient or ineffective. Without a means to transport and dissipate heat, TEM modules overheat due to the thermal transport involved at the molecular level. Thermal bridging may also contribute to high cold side temperatures.

Results of this study show promising opportunities for integrating TEMs in facade systems, since these materials can be used for localized heating and cooling of interior spaces.

Integrated TEM facades offer many potential benefits. The mechanical equipment required for HVAC can be reduced, leading to lower maintenance requirements and operational cost reductions. TEMs can be integrated and paired with radiant panels to cause less disruption to interior spaces than traditional HVAC equipment.

Next steps for this research will include investigation of thermal transport in several different exterior wall types (computational and experimental), used for commercial and residential applications.
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