North Current
LTD

WHITE PAPER

The State of the Digital Building

Connected, Contracted and Still Unclear

Why operational truth is still difficult to prove in modern building, energy and control environments

A white paper prepared by North Current Ltd

PREPARED BY	DOCUMENT TYPE	STATUS
North Current Ltd	**White paper**	**Branded template**

Operational clarity for complex systems. | northcurrentltd.co.uk | contact@ncltd.co.uk

DOCUMENT GUIDE

Contents

This white paper follows the evidence chain behind modern building, energy and control environments: what is connected, what is contracted and what can actually be trusted.

> **NORTH CURRENT POSITION:** Connected assets can be online and still be wrong. The useful question is not whether data exists, but whether the evidence chain behind it holds.

SECTION 01

Executive summary

Modern buildings, estates and energy systems are more connected than they have ever been. A typical commercial site can now have a BMS, an EMS, fiscal meters, sub-meters, solar PV, battery storage, EV charging, standby generation, gateways, dashboards, analytics tools and one or more support services watching the lot.

On paper, that should make basic questions easier to answer.

Is the building performing as designed? Is the energy data right? Why does the bureau report disagree with what the site team sees? Which supplier owns this fault? Should the business approve this spend?

In practice, many organisations still cannot answer those questions with confidence.

This is not always because the technology is missing. It is also not because the industry has no standards. It has plenty. CIBSE guidance covers commissioning, metering, operation and maintenance. Alarm-management standards cover prioritisation, alarm discipline and lifecycle management. Building-safety guidance has strengthened the need for reliable information. Energy-performance work from BBP, UKGBC, LBNL, DOE and others has been clear for years that design intent, data, analytics and operational action are different things [CIBSE Code M, 2022; CIBSE TM39, 2009 and 2026 revision; CIBSE Guide M, 2023; ANSI/ISA-18.2-2016; IEC 62682:2022; CLC Golden Thread Guidance, 2024; BBP Design for Performance; UKGBC performance-gap guidance; LBNL Smart Energy Analytics Campaign, 2020].

> **KEY POINT:** The weak point is usually the chain of evidence.

That chain starts at the physical asset. It then passes through installation quality, communications, data mapping, control logic, reporting, analytics, contracted support, operational action and, eventually, a commercial decision. A small fault near the beginning can end up looking like a confident report, a supplier dispute or a capital case later on.

A missing terminating resistor, wrong CT ratio, reversed polarity, stale BMS point, scaling error, bypassed sensor or badly configured alarm delay rarely looks dramatic. Most of these faults sit quietly. The asset may still be online. The trend may still move. The report may still issue on time.

> **ISSUE:** Connected systems can look healthy while the evidence behind them is already unreliable.

Connected assets can be online and still be wrong. Support services can manage an inaccurate picture very efficiently. Supplier boundaries can leave every party correct inside its own scope while the building, as a whole, is still not delivering what the client needs.

The result is wasted investigation time, spend aimed at the wrong problem, disputes with the wrong supplier, energy and carbon reporting built on uncertain metering, and senior decisions made from evidence that may not stand up when challenged.

A digital building is only useful if the evidence behind it holds. Before organisations approve more spend, accept supplier explanations or replace plant, they need to know which parts of the story can actually be trusted.

SECTION 02

The digital building promised clarity

Digitising buildings was meant to make them easier to run. Connect the plant, meter the loads, centralise the data and the building would start to explain itself. Faults would be seen earlier. Energy would be measured, not guessed. Decisions would be based on evidence.

Some of that promise has been delivered. It is now normal for a single site to include:

- A BMS controlling HVAC plant, AHUs, chillers, heat pumps and terminal units

- An EMS or energy data platform collecting fiscal meters, sub-meters and asset data
- PV inverters, battery storage and EV charging, each with its own controller and portal
- Standby generators and ATS equipment
- Gateways translating between BACnet, Modbus, M-Bus, MQTT, OPC-UA, REST APIs and other protocols
- FDD tools, dashboards and analytics layers
- Remote monitoring, bureau services, alarm handling and digital maintenance contracts

Each of these can be useful. A good BMS can control plant properly. A good metering system can expose waste. A battery controller can shift load and protect resilience. A bureau can spot patterns that a local team does not have time to watch. FDD can help maintenance teams focus on faults that matter.

> **IMPORTANT DISTINCTION:** Connectivity, monitoring and reporting do not prove that the building is understood.

A site can be connected, monitored, alarmed, dashboarded and reported on, while still being misread. The data exists, but nobody has proven whether it reflects what the building is physically doing. That gap, between having data and knowing what it means, is where a lot of the waste sits.

SECTION 03

Why more data has not solved the problem

More data does not automatically lead to better decisions. Sometimes it gives bad evidence a faster route into the business.

The first issue is inheritance. A trend chart inherits the quality of the sensor, CT, wiring, communications link, point mapping, scaling, units, timestamps and control context underneath it. If one of those is wrong, the chart can still look believable. Plausible but wrong data is often the most dangerous kind because people use it.

The second issue is interfaces. Every extra system creates another place where ownership can soften. A PV inverter talking through a gateway into an EMS, then into a bureau report and then into a carbon disclosure, has passed through several technical and contractual boundaries. Each boundary can introduce an error. Each one also gives people a reason to assume somebody else checked it.

The third issue is volume. Ten thousand points and hundreds of daily alarms do not make a building easier to understand. They can make it easier to stop looking. Operators learn which alarms are noise, which trends are not worth trusting and which dashboards are mainly for meetings. Once that happens, good data and bad data get discounted together.

LBNL's Smart Energy Analytics Campaign is useful here because it does not treat EMIS and FDD as a cure by themselves. The 2020 final report, Proving the Business Case for Building Analytics, shows that EMIS and FDD can deliver energy and cost savings, but it describes a working process: data has to be stored, organised, analysed, prioritised and acted on. The related Energy Efficiency journal paper makes the same practical point. Large amounts of building data do not normally lead to corrective action unless they are organised and prioritised in a way that supports operations [LBNL, Proving the Business Case for Building Analytics, 2020, Executive Summary and Sections 3 to 4; Kramer et al., Building Analytics and Monitoring-Based Commissioning, Energy Efficiency, 2020].

> **DIAGNOSTIC IMPLICATION:** More data has raised the standard of judgement required.

SECTION 04

Standards exist, but operational reality still drifts

The industry does not lack guidance. That needs saying clearly.

CIBSE Commissioning Code M sets out commissioning management across project stages, including planning, responsibility, verification and handover [CIBSE Code M, 2022]. CIBSE TM39 deals with building energy metering and, in its 2026 revision, puts stronger emphasis on metering and monitoring that can support energy management, benchmarking and correlation between design and in-use performance [CIBSE TM39, 2009; CIBSE TM39 2026 revision].

CIBSE Guide M brings maintenance, operation, controls, documentation, condition evidence and competency into focus for designers, maintainers, owners and operators [CIBSE Guide M, 2023].

Alarm management is not a new subject either. ANSI/ISA-18.2-2016 and IEC 62682:2022 set out lifecycle principles for alarm systems, including philosophy, rationalisation, prioritisation, implementation, monitoring, maintenance and change management. They come from process industries, but the failure mode is familiar in buildings: too many poorly designed alarms, and not enough useful response [ANSI/ISA-18.2-2016; IEC 62682:2022, Scope and alarm lifecycle principles].

Building information is also moving in the right direction. Golden-thread guidance for higher-risk buildings is safety-led, but the principle matters more widely. Information needs to be accurate, up to date, accessible and maintained through design, construction, handover, operation and change [Building Safety Regulator guidance; CLC, Delivering the Golden Thread, 2024, Sections 1 and 2].

Performance-gap work says something similar from another angle. BBP's Design for Performance work was built to address the difference between design intent and measured operational performance in offices. UKGBC's performance-gap work describes the common difference between expected energy performance at design stage and actual performance in use [BBP Design for Performance; UKGBC Tackling the Performance Gap].

So the problem is not that nobody has written down what good looks like. The problem is that those principles are often applied in pieces, not across the whole operational chain.

A project may commission mechanical plant properly but never validate the point mapping that the analytics platform later depends on. Metering may be installed to a specification but never checked against load direction, CT ratio, voltage reference and downstream reporting. Alarm-management thinking may exist in a document, while the BMS front end still floods the operator with nuisance alarms. Golden-thread discipline may cover safety-critical information, while controls logic, meter registers, gateway mappings and support processes sit in disconnected files.

Standards describe good practice. They do not prove that a particular building was delivered that way. They also do not prove it still works after controller replacements, platform migrations, contractor changes, local overrides and undocumented site fixes.

> Why buildings drift from design intent

Buildings drift because real projects are full of pressure.

Design can be aimed at compliance rather than in-use performance. The model satisfies the requirement, but the site never gets the commissioning time, metering resolution or operational follow-through needed to perform as intended. That is the gap BBP and UKGBC have been trying to close through measured performance work [BBP Design for Performance; UKGBC performance-gap guidance].

Commissioning is often squeezed at the end. Sign-off can mean a point was witnessed under test conditions on one day, not that the system was proven across seasons, occupancy patterns, tariff changes, failure modes and support handovers. CIBSE Code M gives commissioning management a proper structure, but in the field, time, access and commercial pressure still win too often [CIBSE Code M, 2022].

Handover is another weak point. O&M manuals, points schedules, controls descriptions, meter registers and network diagrams are often incomplete, out of date or written for a version of the system that has already changed. CIBSE Guide M gives maintenance and documentation a proper role, but documents still get treated as the close-out pack rather than the working memory of the building [CIBSE Guide M, 2023].

Point validation is usually too thin. Few projects independently prove that every important point reads the right sensor, in the right units, at the right scale, in the right direction, with the right timestamp and the right control meaning. That may sound detailed, but it matters because every analytics rule, bureau report and operational decision downstream depends on it.

Supplier scopes make the problem harder. Controls, metering, PV, batteries, EV charging, networks, gateways, analytics and maintenance are often procured separately. The interfaces between them are where the building actually works or fails. They are also where ownership is least clear.

Site teams solve problems pragmatically. Many of those fixes are sensible. Some quietly change how the system behaves. A local override, bypassed sensor, changed inverter mode or swapped meter channel can keep a site moving on the day and create years of confusion later.

This is where projects start to drift. Not because everyone is careless, but because joined-up evidence is rarely anyone's daily job.

SECTION 05

The evidence chain that nobody checks end to end

The most useful way to read a digital building is as a chain of evidence:

> **EVIDENCE CHAIN:** physical asset -> installation quality -> communications -> data mapping -> control logic -> reporting and analytics -> contracted support -> operational action -> commercial outcome

Each link depends on the one before it.

A good analytics platform sitting on a badly mapped point set produces confident nonsense. A diligent bureau reporting on unvalidated meters produces well-formatted uncertainty. A capital decision based on either is a gamble with a chart attached.

Most organisations have suppliers responsible for individual links. Very few have anyone responsible for proving the chain as a whole.

The mechanical contractor stops at the plant. The controls contractor stops at the controller. The network integrator stops at the gateway. The platform provider stops at the dashboard. The bureau stops at the report. The FM provider stops at the task list. Each scope can be reasonable. The joints between them are where buildings go wrong.

That is why some building problems live for years with several competent parties involved. Nobody has to be wrong inside their own boundary for the overall outcome to fail. The fault often sits between the boundaries.

SECTION 06

The small faults that distort the whole picture

The faults that undermine digital buildings are rarely impressive. They are usually small, technical and cheap to fix once found. They become expensive while hidden because they gain authority downstream.

> Three common fault patterns

A common version of the metering problem starts with a CT that is the wrong ratio, reversed, matched to the wrong voltage reference or installed on a load that rarely reaches the CT's accurate range. The meter still reports. The trend has a shape. The dashboard looks alive.

That misread CT then becomes a monthly energy report, then a supplier challenge, then a business case for plant replacement or optimisation spend. By the time anyone questions it, the number has appeared in enough reports to feel true. Janitza and Accuenergy guidance covers polarity, sizing, conductor matching and burden [Janitza CT installation guidance, Terminals S1/S2; Accuenergy, How to Install Current Transformers?, 2022].

A common version of the communications fault is an RS-485 or Modbus trunk that mostly works. The cable is not quite right. The topology has grown arms and legs. Termination is missing, or the stubs are too long. The site sees random dropouts, spikes and gaps when large loads switch or plant starts.

Because the devices come back, the issue is treated as nuisance rather than evidence failure. The report still runs. The platform fills gaps. The wrong lesson is learnt: the system is temperamental. The more useful lesson is that the data path has never been properly proven. TI and Analog Devices guidance covers termination, cable practice and reflections [Texas Instruments, The RS-485 Design Guide, SLLA272D, Section 6; Analog Devices, AN-960].

A common version of the control fault is a point that looks live and sensible but no longer represents the physical plant. A pressure switch has been bypassed. A hand/off/auto switch is not in auto. A third-party demand input is permanently asserted. An inverter is following a local mode the central system cannot see.

The front end shows intent. The asset does something else.

The issue then moves from engineering into management. Maintenance tasks are closed, energy exceptions are explained away, and support teams argue from the digital record rather than the plant. The system has not failed loudly. It has quietly parted company with reality.

> Other compact examples seen in practice

- Wrong cable used externally or in noisy plant areas, then the device gets blamed when comms degrade.
- Comms cable run alongside power, creating intermittent data corruption during switching events.
- CT secondary cable too long or too small, increasing burden and reducing measurement accuracy.
- A missing zero in a scaling object, so a value reads 10% of reality everywhere downstream.
- Extract temperature mapped as supply temperature, so analytics and control logic reason about the wrong air stream.
- Units confused between W and kW, kVA and kvar, percentage and absolute value.
- A frozen point shown with a healthy status icon, then treated as live data for months.
- AHU schedules defeated by third-party demand, local overrides or temporary commissioning links left in place.
- Alarm points configured with no deadband, delay or priority, creating alarm floods that train operators to ignore the list.
- Filters recorded as serviced without airflow evidence.
- Maintenance jobs closed without proof that the plant condition or performance changed.

Individually, these faults look small. Collectively, they corrupt the evidence behind the building. They waste investigation time, create false confidence, send suppliers in the wrong direction, damage reporting and support commercial decisions that cannot later be defended.

The risk is simple: the original fault stays cheap, but the decisions built on top of it do not.

SECTION 07

Connected assets are not just data sources

Connected assets are often treated as neutral witnesses. The inverter reports. The meter reports. The BMS reports. The data layer just collects the statements.

That is not how buildings work.

Connected assets are active parts of the fault chain. They can be online, communicating and wrong with complete confidence. This applies across BMS controllers, EMS platforms, PV inverters, BESS, EV chargers, generators, ATS equipment, heat pumps, chillers, AHUs, meters, gateways, export-limitation systems, grid interties and data platforms.

PV can be visible but curtailed because an export-limitation system is acting on bad site metering. The portal shows the array online. The real question is why yield is consistently below expectation.

A battery can be healthy while following the wrong commercial objective. It may cycle against an old tariff, protect a peak that no longer matters or hold reserve because a previous resilience decision was never revisited.

A generator can show status while the ATS sequence tells a different story. The digital record of resilience may not match what would happen on mains failure.

EV load balancing can throttle charging unnecessarily because site load is overstated, or fail to throttle because site load is understated. Both errors have operational and commercial consequences.

A BMS can show an asset as healthy while the sensor is bypassed. Meter data can be present while import and export are reversed. A gateway can pass every value faithfully and still pass the wrong meaning.

In each case the asset is connected, the data is flowing and the picture is wrong.

Connectivity proves a path exists. It does not prove the value is right, the configuration matches the intent, or the asset is doing what the organisation is paying it to do.

SECTION 08

Contracted support services can add value and add uncertainty

Most estates now buy some form of digital support: FDD platforms, energy bureaux, digital maintenance services, alarm management providers, remote monitoring centres, PV performance monitoring, EMS monitoring, analytics providers, managed service desks, FM helpdesks and internal support centres.

These services deserve a fair assessment. When the asset condition, point mapping, metering, control intent and escalation route are sound, they can be genuinely useful. Faults are seen earlier. Energy anomalies are flagged. Maintenance is directed by evidence rather than by the calendar. Local teams get help with the monitoring burden.

LBNL's Smart Energy Analytics Campaign supports that positive case. EMIS and FDD can create measurable savings when they are part of an operating process that reviews, prioritises and acts on findings [LBNL, Proving the Business Case for Building Analytics, 2020, Executive Summary and Section 4].

The difficulty starts when a support service works only inside its contract scope, using inputs it has not been asked or paid to validate.

> **CONTRACT RISK:** A support service can become very efficient at managing the wrong picture.

FDD can raise faults from badly mapped points. The logic may be internally consistent but externally meaningless. Site teams investigate, find nothing and learn to distrust the tool.

A bureau can report diligently on unvalidated meter data. The report is punctual, tidy and built on numbers nobody has proved.

A PV performance platform can flag underperformance without enough evidence to separate curtailment, metering error, shading, soiling, inverter settings or local control behaviour. That separation usually needs data outside the platform's scope.

A maintenance provider can close tasks without proving performance changed. The contract may measure completion. The building needs improvement. Those are not the same thing.

A helpdesk can close alarms as tickets without recognising that the same alarm has closed hundreds of times this year. That repetition is not admin noise. It is part of the fault.

None of this makes these services bad. It makes them dependent. They process the evidence they receive. In most contracts, they do not verify it from asset to outcome.

> **ASSURANCE TEST:** Monitoring without validation creates confidence, not assurance.

SECTION 09

Why ownership breaks down between suppliers

Put the previous sections together and the ownership problem becomes fairly obvious.

The BMS contractor confirms the controller is healthy. The inverter supplier confirms the inverter is reporting. The meter provider confirms the meter is online. The bureau confirms the report was issued. The maintenance provider confirms the task is complete.

Every one of those statements can be true.

The client can still have no clear answer on whether the system as a whole is delivering the operational or commercial outcome it was bought to deliver. The question, “is the whole chain right?”, sits in nobody’s contract.

This is not usually bad faith. It is what happens when fragmented procurement meets an integrated problem. Two consequences matter.

First, interface problems default to the client. If the fault sits between scopes, such as a mapping error between meter and platform, a wiring issue between asset and controller, or a control assumption between BMS and battery controller, each supplier can reasonably point elsewhere. The cost of disagreement lands on the building owner.

Second, supplier advice is not the same as an independent view when the supplier is part of the delivery chain. A supplier asked to assess a problem that may sit inside its own installation, configuration or service has an unavoidable position to manage, even when acting properly. Their explanation may be right. The client simply has no separate evidence to test it against.

> **OWNERSHIP NOTE:** The problem is usually structural: fragmented procurement meets an integrated fault chain.

SECTION 10

The commercial impact of bad operational evidence

Weak evidence first shows up as operational noise: higher energy use, poor comfort, recurring complaints, repeated faults, alarm overload, nuisance call-outs, underperforming PV and BESS, schedules that cannot be relied on, contractor disputes and site visits that never quite close the issue.

The commercial damage is usually wider.

Decision quality. Bad data leads to bad decisions at every level, from setpoint changes to board-level capital cases. A dashboard can make a weak number look authoritative. Plant can be replaced because the data made it look faulty. Failing plant can be left in place because the data made it look healthy. Optimisation can be tuned against a false baseline and then report savings that never happened, or miss savings that were available. A small technical fault becomes a spending decision.

Supplier relationships. Poor evidence sends challenge in the wrong direction. The wrong supplier is blamed, or the right supplier is challenged with the wrong evidence. Both damage trust. Neither fixes the building. Support contracts can then be judged on weak data, so renewal and re-procurement decisions reward presentation, response speed or ticket closure rather than real performance.

Reporting and disclosure. Energy and carbon reporting depend on metering that can be defended. If CT ratios, voltage references, flow direction, scaling, data gaps and estimated values are not understood, the disclosure risk rises. As reporting expectations tighten, a tidy monthly pack is not enough. The question is whether the numbers would hold up under audit, dispute or investor review.

Organisational trust. Once site teams stop believing the BMS, the meter report or the analytics platform, even good data gets discounted. Decisions move back to anecdote, manual checks and whoever sounds most confident. Alarm floods and stale data become normal. Senior leaders then face a difficult position: they have paid for digital systems, but when the evidence is challenged by a board, auditor, customer, landlord, tenant or counterparty, nobody can prove the chain behind it.

> **COMMERCIAL RISK:** The cost of the original fault is small. The cost of the decisions made on top of it is not.

SECTION 11

What good diagnostic review needs to prove

The answer is not automatically another platform, another dashboard or a replacement programme. Often the first requirement is a diagnostic review that tests the chain without having to defend the original design, installation, platform, maintenance contract or previous decision.

Stated plainly, the review needs to prove:

- What is physically happening, not just what is digitally reported
- Which meters, points, alarms, reports and control outputs can be trusted
- Which values cannot be trusted, and why
- Where the evidence breaks: asset, installation, communications, mapping, control logic, reporting, support process or escalation route
- Which issues are symptoms and which are likely causes
- Which supplier owns which part of the problem, based on actual scope rather than assumption
- What should happen next, in a practical order
- What should not be approved until better evidence exists

That last point matters. One of the most valuable findings is often "do not spend yet".

Do not replace the chiller until the valve position, flow, temperature, demand and control sequence have been checked. Do not accuse the PV supplier until the export-limitation meter and curtailment logic have been proven. Do not accept the battery performance report until the operating objective, tariff logic, SOC limits and site-load measurement have been tested. Do not re-procure a bureau because reports are untrusted if the meters underneath those reports have never been validated.

This discipline is consistent with the sources used in this paper, even though they use different language. Code M points toward commissioning that is managed and verified. TM39 points toward metering that is designed, installed, checked and used for actual energy management. Guide M points toward operation and maintenance grounded in documentation, audit, controls understanding and condition evidence. Golden-thread guidance points toward information that is accurate, current and usable through the building lifecycle. EMIS and FDD work points toward analytics that lead to prioritised operational action, not passive reporting [CIBSE Code M, 2022; CIBSE TM39, 2009 and 2026 revision; CIBSE Guide M, 2023; CLC Golden Thread Guidance, 2024; LBNL Smart Energy Analytics Campaign, 2020].

The independent part matters because the chain crosses supplier boundaries. No single contractor can always see the whole picture. No platform can prove the physical installation by itself. No bureau can validate every meter unless that is part of its scope. No maintenance report proves performance unless the right evidence is collected before and after.

Where this paper describes specific field faults such as terminating resistors, CT selection, mapping errors, bypassed sensors and hidden overrides, those examples are professional field inference from recurring practical patterns. The principles behind them are supported by the cited guidance. The exact downstream consequences described here are not presented as a single published dataset.

SECTION 12

Conclusion: operational truth before operational spend

> **CONCLUSION:** The digital building has not failed. What is missing on many sites is proof.

The technology works when it is designed, installed, commissioned and operated properly. Standards and guidance exist. Support services can add real value. Analytics can help. Bureaux can help. FDD can help. Remote monitoring can help.

What is missing on many sites is proof.

Before a building owner can rely on a dashboard, report, alarm list or supplier explanation, the chain behind it needs to hold: physical asset, installation quality, communications, data mapping, control logic, reporting and analytics, contracted support, operational action and commercial outcome.

Until that chain is tested, connectivity is a claim. Dashboards are assertions. Reports are formatted uncertainty.

Organisations facing supplier disputes, re-procurement, capital cases, energy reporting risk or persistent underperformance do not mainly need more data. They need to know which parts of the data they already have can be believed.

> **CLOSING POSITION:** Modern buildings do not need more assumptions. They need better evidence.

SECTION 13

Selected sources

1. CIBSE, CCM Commissioning Code M: Commissioning Management, July 2022. Publisher: Chartered Institution of Building Services Engineers. Used here for commissioning as a managed process involving planning, responsibility, verification and handover.

2. CIBSE, TM39: Building Energy Metering, 2009, and TM39: Building Metering and Monitoring, 2026 revision. Publisher: Chartered Institution of Building Services Engineers. Used here for the treatment of metering as something that must be designed, installed, checked and then used properly for energy management, benchmarking and in-use performance review. The 2026 title and revision are used only at the level confirmed by CIBSE public information.

3. CIBSE, Guide M: Maintenance Engineering and Management, 2023. Publisher: Chartered Institution of Building Services Engineers. Used here for operation, maintenance, controls, documentation, condition evidence, competency and full-life performance.

4. ANSI/ISA-18.2-2016, Management of Alarm Systems for the Process Industries. Publisher: International Society of Automation. Used here for alarm philosophy, lifecycle management, rationalisation, prioritisation, implementation, monitoring, maintenance and management of change.

5. IEC 62682:2022, Management of Alarm Systems for the Process Industries. Publisher: International Electrotechnical Commission. Used here for the same alarm-management principles at international standard level, especially general principles and lifecycle processes for alarm systems based on control systems and HMI.

6. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Kramer, H., Lin, G., Curtin, C., Crowe, E. and Granderson, J., Proving the Business Case for Building Analytics, October 2020. Used here for the position that EMIS and FDD can deliver savings when data is organised, analysed, prioritised and acted on through operating practice.

7. Kramer, H., Lin, G., Curtin, C., Crowe, E. and Granderson, J., Building Analytics and Monitoring-Based Commissioning: Industry Practice, Costs, and Savings, Energy Efficiency, 2020. Used here for the point that large quantities of building data do not normally lead to insight, corrective action or savings unless they are organised and prioritised.

8. IEA EBC Annex 81, A Guide on Data Platforms for Data-Driven Smart Buildings, Final Report, June 2025. Publisher: International Energy Agency Energy in Buildings and Communities Technology Collaboration Programme. Used here for the smart-building data layer, digital readiness, interoperability, metadata and data-management issues.

9. NIST, Building Digitization and Semantic Interoperability, programme page, 2021. Publisher: National Institute of Standards and Technology. Used here for the point that machine-readable metadata, semantic interoperability and lifecycle data are needed if building systems are to be integrated reliably across estates and systems.

10. Better Buildings Partnership, Design for Performance initiative and related publications. Publisher: Better Buildings Partnership. Used here for the distinction between design intent, compliance-led design and measured operational performance, especially for offices and NABERS UK-related performance outcomes.

11. UK Green Building Council, Tackling the Performance Gap. Publisher: UKGBC. Used here for the point that building energy performance in use often differs from what was anticipated at design stage. No edition year is asserted here beyond what is clear from the publicly available UKGBC resource.

12. Building Safety Regulator, Understanding the Golden Thread, and Construction Leadership Council, Delivering the Golden Thread: Practical Guidance, August 2024. Used here for golden-thread principles: accurate, reliable, accessible and up-to-date information maintained through design, construction, handover, occupation and change. This paper applies that as an information-management principle, while recognising the formal golden-thread regime is safety-led and focused on higher-risk buildings.

13. Texas Instruments, The RS-485 Design Guide, SLLA272D, February 2008, revised May 2021, especially Section 6, Bus Termination and Stub Length. Used here for RS-485 points on termination, cable impedance, reflections and stub length.

14. Analog Devices, AN-960: RS-485/RS-422 Circuit Implementation Guide. Used here for the treatment of RS-485/RS-422 as an industrial and building-automation physical layer where cabling, termination and implementation affect communications reliability.

15. Janitza, Installing Current Transformers, installation guidance, especially the S1/S2 and K/L polarity section. Used here for CT polarity and measurement-direction points.

16. Accuenergy, How to Install Current Transformers?, 28 June 2022. Used here for CT installation points on sizing, polarity, phase matching, conductor selection and lead extension.

> Note on evidence and field inference

The cited sources support the principles used in this paper: commissioning discipline, metering validation, maintenance evidence, alarm management, reliable building information, data interoperability, measured performance and the technical requirements of RS-485 and CT installations.

The practical fault patterns described in the paper, such as misread CTs escalating into disputes, intermittent Modbus faults being normalised, bypassed sensors creating false confidence and supplier-boundary issues delaying resolution, are professional field inferences from recurring real-world building, energy, controls and support environments. They are not presented as named case studies, client claims or statistically quantified findings.