

APELLIDOS:

NOMBRE:

DNI:

COMISIÓN:

CALIFICACIÓN:

PRUEBAS ESPECÍFICAS DE CERTIFICACIÓN DE NIVEL

INGLÉS AVANZADO C2 CONVOCATORIA ORDINARIA 2020

COMPRENSIÓN DE TEXTOS ESCRITOS

INSTRUCCIONES PARA LA REALIZACIÓN DE ESTA PARTE:

- **DURACIÓN:** 60 minutos.
- **PUNTUACIÓN:** Será necesario superar todas y cada una de las cinco actividades de lengua de las que constan las pruebas de certificación, con una puntuación mínima del 50% en cada una de ellas y una calificación global final igual o superior al 65%.
- Las respuestas erróneas no descontarán puntos.
- Esta parte consta de TRES tareas.
- Leer las instrucciones al principio de cada tarea y realizarla según se indica.
- Las respuestas escritas a lápiz no se calificarán.
- No está permitido el uso del diccionario.
- **NO ESCRIBIR NADA EN LAS ÁREAS GRISES.**

TAREA 1

Read the following text and choose the appropriate sentences or expressions (A-M) to complete it. Be careful! There are THREE additional sentences or expressions. When you have finished, transfer your answers to the answer box. Answer 0 is an example. (1 ítem = 0,8).

IS THE NHS A BUSINESS?

The purpose of this article is twofold, first to refute the above claim and secondly, to argue that the NHS, **(0) despite ideological pressure, and legislation to the contrary,** still remains a service. It is not a business in either the literal, or the popular sense of the word.

The dictionary definition of a business is, 'commercial activity, or a commercial organisation'. Commerce is described as, 'the activity of buying or selling, especially on a large scale' and commercial activity as, 'making, or intending to make a profit'. This set of definitions hardly describes the NHS.

(1) _____, so it is not a business in the actual sense of the word.

In 1948 when the NHS was established its founders had no problem with the title, it was to be what the name implied — a health service that would cover the nation. No one ever suggested calling it a business. A service is described as a, 'department of royal or public employ or of work done to meet some general need.' The army, navy, and air force are quoted as examples of services. The NHS is indeed very similar in certain respects to the armed forces, **(2)** _____. Unlike the NHS though, we never hear of the army, navy, or air force referred to as 'businesses'.

Neither is the NHS an insurance scheme. Insurance schemes cater for those who are at risk from some calamity or another, be it an injured pet, a fallen roof, or a lost mobile phone. The customer will pay in advance to offset any losses should the risk become a reality. All insurance companies when charging their premiums take into account the nature of the risk involved. A house in an area where there is a risk of high tides or that is subject to strong winds is more expensive to insure than one that is situated away from the sea or where winds are light. Private health insurance is no different to other forms of insurance. **(3)** _____.

The NHS covers everyone, and we all contribute according to our income. It is based on universal need. That is, everyone who pays income tax contributes towards the NHS, but some who contribute may seldom use the service, **(4)** _____. We all pay in but some may take out more than others.

If we take the popular, rather than the dictionary definition of a 'business', that is, an organisation that buys or sells, or distributes commodities; again, the NHS doesn't fit into this category. Businesses that trade on the stock market, the great majority, invite investors to buy shares in the particular company. Shareholders do this to either grow their capital or to seek a return on their investment in the form of a dividend. People do not invest in the NHS as such; it is paid for by all of us out of taxation. We do not expect a return on our investment, **(5)** _____. Neither do we expect our investment to grow.

From its inception until 1990 the NHS operated as a fairly integrated service, it was both a purchaser and a provider. It bought what was necessary to provide health care. It paid GPs, who are independent contractors, it purchased drugs, it developed its own real estate, paid for new hospitals, took care of training for its staff, and was responsible for a myriad of other expenses. **(6)** _____ that its budget would allow. Margaret Thatcher changed all that.

In 1990, a brainchild of the Thatcher era was introduced into the NHS: the purchaser-provider split. This major reorganisation did not turn the NHS into a business, but it did create a market in health care. A service that had been integrated for over 40 years was turned into competing parts. In future the NHS would be split up between a purchasing sector and a provider arm. **(7)** _____, this system has remained intact ever since, even surviving the 13 years of a Labour government.

In 2013, the NHS underwent yet another major reorganisation, the Health and Social Care Act 2012. This new legislation dramatically accelerated the pace at which the NHS was being turned into a full-scale market. **(8)** _____, and opened wide the door to private companies who could now provide services previously carried out by the NHS. Private companies by definition would seek to make a long-term profit from such transactions. The private sector, voluntary sector, social enterprises, and NHS organisations could all compete for tenders for various aspects of health provision.

Yet even with these internal changes the NHS still cannot be described as a business. It has been turned into a market, although at the moment even here there are certain restrictions. There is a set price, or tariff, for every conceivable NHS procedure, **(9)** _____. This tariff cannot be undercut. No one can bid for a tender by offering a lower price than the NHS tariff.

Given all these changes is it still correct to refer to the NHS as a service? In many respects yes, it is.

(Adapted from www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov)

CLAUSES AND SENTENCES

A. *A 12-year-old Staffordshire bull terrier will cost more to ensure than a 2-year-old Labrador*

B. *A fit 20-year-old male will pay lower premiums than a 76-year-old woman*

C. ~~*Despite ideological pressure and legislation to the contrary (0)*~~

D. *Despite major criticism from most health professionals*

E. *Indeed, the NHS is none of the above*

F. *In return, it provided the majority of the health care*

G. *From temperature-taking to hip replacement*

H. *Let alone substantial tax relief on your investment*

I. *Other than it keeps us well when we are sick*

J. *These new developments further fragmented a universal service*

K. *They are both paid out of taxation and both provide a service*

L. *While others may be dependent on it from the day they are born*

M. *While others may well regard it as a profitable investment*

ANSWER BOX

GAP	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
CLAUSES AND SENTENCES	C									

Puntuación 1: _____/7,2

TAREA 2

Read the text and choose the best option (A, B or C) to answer each question. Then, transfer your answers to the answer box. There is only ONE correct answer in each question. Answer 0 is an example. (1 ítem = 0,8).

THE APOSTLES OF ANTI-WOKENESS

There was a time when being right-wing meant being conservative in the truest sense; committed to order, civility and restraint. No longer.

The Reagan/Thatcher years began to change things, as neoliberal economics destabilised societies by slashing and burning the state. And in recent years, this lust for destruction has been accompanied by a gleeful lack of restraint in language and behaviour.

Donald Trump, of course, is responsible for the final triumph of right-wing incivility. His instinctual genius lies in recognising that so many of the defences against naked power and abuse are rooted in unspoken social norms. Trump stared out these defences and they melted away: he revels in being ignorant, abusive and cruel. Where Trump went, Boris Johnson, Jair Bolsonaro and other proudly vile politicians have followed.

Alongside the politicians in this vanguard, constantly probing the boundaries of acceptability, are the champions of “anti-wokeness”. Consider Brendan O’Neill, the editor of Spiked – a contrarian so consistent in his contrariness that he is totally predictable. Or consider Piers Morgan’s matey smugness, Laurence Fox’s pretentiousness and Rod Liddle’s sneeriness. Such figures delight in shrugging off the restraints of decency while self-righteously claiming to be victimised by the woke “establishment”. Toby Young’s new Free Speech Union embodies all the shamelessness of this movement: claiming to be oppressed from a position of power, and disguising abuse as self-defence against those who threaten liberty.

The state of the right today would have left George Orwell flabbergasted. In his essay *England Your England*, Orwell famously argued that **the goose-step is “far more terrifying than a dive-bomber”**, it is “an affirmation of naked power” expressing the taunt “Yes, I am ugly, and you daren’t laugh at me”. The reason why the goose-step is not used in England, Orwell believed, is because “the people in the street would laugh”.

Orwell was implying that the freedom to laugh necessarily acts as a corrective to the powerful and their defenders. He assumed that no one liked to be laughed at. Today, we can no longer make this assumption. One of the defining features of the ongoing backlash against “wokeness” – presidents and columnists alike – is that its champions are often truly laughable characters. And we laugh at them, we mock, we ridicule ... yet nothing happens. If anything, it works to their advantage. It helps them come across as ludicrous, concealing the ultimate seriousness of the situation.

Defiance in the face of laughter is, in fact, one aspect of this wider “liberation” offered by the right today. Its leaders are free, weightless, impervious to shame. To be a follower of this movement is to vicariously experience the pleasures of this joyousness. To live without restraint, without the complicated obligations of society, without the need to engage with the messy complexities of life: it is a powerful narcotic.

If ridicule doesn’t work when directed against such libidinous beings, what can? It is tempting to make a “counter-offer” of similarly ecstatic pleasures, directed in a righteous direction. Certainly that is the argument of those, like the political theorist Chantal Mouffe, who advocate a “left populism”. But for progressives to harness such forces requires containing them in some way, to prevent things turning abusive – in which case, why would those attracted to populism not choose the full-blooded version? The left has its fair share of laughable abusers claiming victimhood, but they aren’t as much fun as those on the right.

We need to take seriously the allure of the transgressive, the shameless, and the ways in which it might express a human need. The problem is that when those acting out this transgression do so from positions of power and influence, this has real consequences for real human beings. There should be no place for transgressiveness within those spaces where power resides. But if these desires can be harnessed outside those spaces, it might mean that the transgressiveness of the powerful would become less attractive.

So how can we revel in transgressive fantasies without causing harm to others? Today there are some shared, private spaces in which we can be bad, such as nightclubs and football grounds. However we also need common spaces, rather than contained and limited ones, in which we can be our bad selves. We need to come together then, as a bigger, diverse mass, for the purposes of celebrating our darker yearnings, rather than some tepid vision of harmony.

To be sure, such common spaces of transgression could be co-opted by politicians and those with dangerous agendas. Mass festivities feel small, peevish and parochial when they exclude and abuse; they feel powerful and life-affirming when they celebrate our common human bodylines.

Embracing our lust for play, debauchery and gluttony promises to do more than just unite us. It can reveal how limited the transgressions offered by the apostles of anti-wokeness really are.

(Adapted from <https://www.theguardian.com>)

0. **According to the writer,:**
A. Traditional conservative behaviour has taken a turn for the worse.
B. Traditional conservative behaviour is no longer what it used to be.
C. Traditional conservative behaviour is on the way out.
1. **What might have acted as a catalyst for this unprecedented shift was:**
A. The election of Donald Trump as the President of the US in recent years.
B. The fact that right-wing politicians have stopped harnessing their long-held beliefs.
C. The implementation of policies of restraint in public spending by neoliberal governments.
2. **Donald Trump has eventually got away with it:**
A. Because he has managed to grasp the true nature of power.
B. Because he has managed to identify a hidden weakness in social behaviour.
C. Because other influential heads of state have followed in his footsteps.
3. **Most followers of this trend have in common that:**
A. They are fully aware of social and political issues relating to race, gender or class.
B. They are indecent people who take pride in shamelessness.
C. They claim to be oppressed by a government who does not care for them.
4. **What does the comparison of the goose-step with a dive-bomber suggest?**
A. That nobody likes to be laughed at any longer.
B. That present assumptions are bound to change with time.
C. That something outwardly funny may conceal dark purposes.
5. **The leaders of this movement are popular because:**
A. They make their followers feel free to do and say what they want.
B. They make their followers laugh and enjoy life.
C. They free their followers from feelings of shame.
6. **What does the writer propose to counteract the transgressive “liberation” of the right?**
A. To encourage the same sort of attitude within progressives.
B. To negotiate and set up some boundaries.
C. To put transgressors in the spotlight.
7. **Why wouldn't a similar counteroffer from the left-wing be an appealing solution?**
A. Because there aren't enough transgressors on the left as on the right.
B. Because it probably wouldn't appeal to left-wing supporters.
C. Because it would be far less entertaining than the right-wing version.
8. **Why are transgressive leaders so pernicious to society?**
A. Because they are ordinary people and people copy them.
B. Because they belong to an elite which only cares for itself.
C. Because they have the means to affect people's lives.
9. **What does the writer finally suggest would put an end to harmful transgressiveness?**
A. People publicly indulging in transgressive acts.
B. People participating in controlled mass gatherings.
C. People enjoying the freedom of being transgressive at home

ANSWER BOX

QUESTION	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
ANSWER	B									

TAREA 3

Read the text and choose the best title for each of the following texts. Be careful! There are THREE extra titles. When you have finished, transfer your answers to the answer box at the end of the task. The first answer (title 0) is an example. (1 ítem = 0,8).

A DEVELOPER'S GUIDE TO PASSIVE HOUSE BUILDINGS

With more than 60,000 Passive House buildings around the world and 25 years of monitoring and verification of thousands of units, the performance of Passive House buildings is trusted by developers, lenders and governments. It started as an academic research project to determine an optimal level of efficiency of a building, and to this day the Passive House Institute in Germany remains a building science research institute, committed to advancing building performance and quality.

What are the benefits for developers and builders?

G. Build bigger and better more easily

0. As Passive House design focuses on the building envelope, and in a multifamily building there is less envelope per square foot of floor area than in a single family house, it is actually easier to achieve Passive House performance in multifamily buildings, with a lesser cost premium than in smaller projects.

1. Being able to offer seriously lower heating and cooling costs is obvious, but so is comfort — no drafts, no hot and cold spots. Those living on busy roads will appreciate the quiet provided by triple glazed windows and extra insulation. Higher quality can be marketed based on the obviously better windows, silent ventilation and the level of inspection.

2. Because of the lower operating costs and perceived higher quality. Hard construction costs are only slightly higher, and the higher cost for windows and insulation is often offset by a more efficient building form and lower costs for heating and cooling equipment.

3. Municipal governments know the important role buildings play in reducing emissions in their community. Many consider the benefits a Passive House building brings to the community when making density decisions during rezoning or development permitting, and some jurisdictions have explicit policies to encourage such development.

4. Passive House aligns with many local-government policies on energy and carbon reduction. Experience indicates neighbours and neighbourhood associations are often pleased to see high-quality and sustainable construction add value to their neighbourhoods.

5. A Passive House building requires detailed design and component specification well before a building permit is issued, resulting in more complete contract documents. This detailed work represents an incremental investment in design but avoids problems during construction.

6. The level of inspection and documentation during the construction phase is more rigorous than conventional construction and is likely to catch problems before it is too late to fix them.

7. It's not about adding "green bling" but about keeping it simple. If a net zero building is desired, fewer solar panels are required; instead you invest in building better to reduce demand. In the end this costs less and is easier to maintain and manage.

(Adapted from www.passivehousecanada.com)

HEADINGS

- A. *A focus on better building techniques and materials, not expensive green gizmos*
- B. *A higher sale price*
- C. *A marketing edge over conventional buildings*
- D. *An optimal level of energetic efficiency*
- E. *Approvals and permits may be faster*
- F. *A project which is not limited to residential buildings*
- G. ~~*Build bigger and better more easily*~~
- H. *Fewer callbacks and warranty claims*
- I. *Fewer change orders and construction delays*
- J. *Increased saleable floor area may be approved*
- K. *Science- based building designs*

ANSWER BOX

PARAGRAPH	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
TITLE	G							

Puntuación 3: ____/5,6

TAREA 1	TAREA 2	TAREA 3	PUNTUACIÓN TOTAL
			/ 20

TAREA 1

IS THE NHS A BUSINESS?

ANSWER BOX

GAP	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
CLAUSES AND SENTENCES	C	E	K	B	L	I	F	D	J	G

TEXT (*Is the NHS a business?*)

The purpose of this article is twofold, first to refute the above claim and secondly, to argue that the NHS, **despite ideological pressure, and legislation to the contrary (0)**, still remains a service. It is not a business in either the literal, or the popular sense of the word.

The dictionary definition of a business is, 'commercial activity, or a commercial organisation'. Commerce is described as, 'the activity of buying or selling, especially on a large scale' and commercial activity as, 'making, or intending to make a profit'. This set of definitions hardly describes the NHS.

Indeed, the NHS is none of the above (1), so it is not a business in the actual sense of the word.

In 1948 when the NHS was established its founders had no problem with the title, it was to be what the name implied — a health service that would cover the nation. No one ever suggested calling it a business. A service is described as a, 'department of royal or public employ or of work done to meet some general need.' The army, navy, and air force are quoted as examples of services. The NHS is indeed very similar in certain respects to the armed forces, **they are both paid for out of taxation and both provide a service (2)**. Unlike the NHS though, we never hear of the army, navy, or air force referred to as 'businesses'.

Neither is the NHS an insurance scheme. Insurance schemes cater for those who are at risk from some calamity or another, be it an injured pet, a fallen roof, or a lost mobile phone. The customer will pay in advance to offset any losses should the risk become a reality. All insurance companies when charging their premiums take into account the nature of the risk involved and the client will pay a premium according to the risk entailed. A house in an area where there is a risk of high tides or that is subject to strong winds is more expensive to insure than one that is situated away from the sea or where winds are light. Private health insurance is no different to other forms of insurance. **A fit 20-year-old male will pay lower premiums than a 76-year-old woman (3)**.

The NHS covers everyone and we all contribute according to our income. It is based on universal need. That is, everyone who pays income tax contributes towards the NHS, but some who contribute may seldom use the service, **while others may be dependent on it from the day they are born (4)**. We all pay in but some may take out more than others.

If we take the popular, rather than the dictionary definition of a 'business', that is, an organisation that buys or sells, or distributes commodities; again the NHS doesn't fit into this category. Businesses that trade on the stock market, the great majority, invite investors to buy shares in the particular company. Shareholders do this to either grow their capital or to seek a return on their investment in the form of a dividend. People do not invest in the NHS as such; it is paid for by all of us out of taxation. We do not expect a return on our investment, **other than it keeps us well when we are sick (5)**. Neither do we expect our investment to grow.

From its inception until 1990 the NHS operated as a fairly integrated service, it was both a purchaser and a provider. It bought what was necessary to provide health care. It paid GPs, who are independent contractors, it purchased drugs, it developed its own real estate, paid for new hospitals, took care of training for its staff, and was responsible for a myriad of other expenses. **In return it provided the great majority of the health care (6)** that its budget would allow Margaret Thatcher changed all that.

In 1990, a brainchild of the Thatcher era was introduced into the NHS: the purchaser–provider split. This major reorganisation did not turn the NHS into a business but it did create a market in health care. A service that had been integrated for over 40 years was turned into competing parts. In future the NHS would be split up between a purchasing sector and a provider arm. **Despite major criticism from most health professionals (7)** this system has remained intact ever since, even surviving the 13 years of a Labour government.

In 2013, the NHS underwent yet another major reorganisation, the Health and Social Care Act 2012. This new legislation dramatically accelerated the pace at which the NHS was being turned into a full-scale market. **These new developments further fragmented a universal service (8)** and opened wide the door to private companies who could now provide services previously carried out by the NHS. Private companies by definition would seek to make a long-term profit from such transactions. The private sector, voluntary sector, social enterprises, and NHS organisations could all compete for tenders for various aspects of health provision.

Yet even with these internal changes the NHS still cannot be described as a business. It has been turned into a market, although at the moment even here there are certain restrictions. There is a set price, or tariff, for every conceivable NHS procedure, **from temperature-taking to hip replacement (9)**. This tariff cannot be undercut. No one can bid for a tender by offering a lower price than the NHS tariff. Given all these changes is it still correct to refer to the NHS as a service? In many respects yes it is.

(Adapted from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4001159/>, 01/05/2014, 842 words)

TAREA 2

THE APOSTLES OF ANTI-WOKENESS

ANSWER BOX

QUESTION	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
ANSWER	B	C	B	C	C	A	A	C	C	A

TEXT (*The apostles of anti-wokeness*)

There was a time when being rightwing meant being conservative in the truest sense; committed to order, civility and restraint. **No longer (0)**.

The Reagan/Thatcher years began to change things, as neoliberal economics destabilised societies by slashing and burning the state (1). And in recent years, this lust for destruction has been accompanied by a gleeful lack of restraint in language and behaviour.

Donald Trump, of course, is responsible for the final triumph of rightwing incivility. **His instinctual genius lies in recognising that so many of the defences against naked power and abuse are rooted in unspoken social norms (2)**. Trump stared out these defences and they melted away: he revels in being ignorant, abusive and cruel. Where Trump went, Boris Johnson, Jair Bolsonaro and other proudly vile politicians have followed.

Alongside the politicians in this vanguard, constantly probing the boundaries of acceptability, are the champions of “anti-wokeness”. Consider Brendan O’Neill, the editor of Spiked – a contrarian so consistent in his contrariness that he is totally predictable. Or consider Piers Morgan’s matey smugness, Laurence Fox’s pretentiousness and Rod Liddle’s sneeriness. **Such figures delight in shrugging off the restraints of decency while self-righteously claiming to be victimised by the woke “establishment” (3)**. Toby Young’s new Free Speech Union embodies all the shamelessness of this movement: claiming to be oppressed from a position of power, and disguising abuse as self-defence against those who threaten liberty.

The state of the right today would have left George Orwell flabbergasted. In his essay *England Your England*, Orwell famously argued that the goose-step is “far more terrifying than a dive-bomber”, it is “an affirmation of naked power” expressing the taunt “Yes, I am ugly, and you aren’t laugh at me”. The reason why the goose-step is not used in England, Orwell believed, is because “the people in the street would laugh”.

Orwell was implying that the freedom to laugh necessarily acts as a corrective to the powerful and their defenders. He assumed that no one liked to be laughed at. Today, we can no longer make this assumption. One of the defining features of the ongoing backlash against “wokeness” – presidents and columnists alike – is that its champions are often truly laughable characters. And we laugh at them, we mock, we ridicule ... yet nothing happens. If anything, it works to their advantage. **It helps them come across as ludicrous, concealing the ultimate seriousness of the situation (4).**

Defiance in the face of laughter is, in fact, one aspect of this wider “liberation” offered by the right today. Its leaders are free, weightless, impervious to shame. **To be a follower of this movement is to vicariously experience the pleasures of this joyousness. To live without restraint, without the complicated obligations of society, without the need to engage with the messy complexities of life: it is a powerful narcotic (5).**

If ridicule doesn’t work when directed against such libidinous beings, what can? **It is tempting to make a “counter-offer” of similarly ecstatic pleasures, directed in a righteous direction. Certainly that is the argument of those, like the political theorist Chantal Mouffe, who advocate a “left populism” (6).** But for progressives to harness such forces requires containing them in some way, to prevent things turning abusive – in which case, **why would those attracted to populism not choose the full-blooded version? The left has its fair share of laughable abusers claiming victimhood, but they aren’t as much fun as those on the right (7).**

We need to take seriously the allure of the transgressive, the shameless, and the ways in which it might express a human need. **The problem is that when those acting out this transgression do so from positions of power and influence, this has real consequences for real human beings. (8).**

There should be no place for transgressiveness within those spaces where power resides. But if these desires can be harnessed outside those spaces, it might mean that the transgressiveness of the powerful would become less attractive

So how can we revel in transgressive fantasies without causing harm to others? Today there are some shared, private spaces in which we can be bad, such as nightclubs and football grounds. However we also need common spaces, rather than contained and limited ones, in which we can be our bad selves. We need to come together then, as a bigger, diverse mass, for the purposes of celebrating our darker yearnings, rather than some tepid vision of harmony.

To be sure, such common spaces of transgression could be co-opted by politicians and those with dangerous agendas. Mass festivities feel small, peevish and parochial when they exclude and abuse; they feel powerful and life-affirming when they celebrate our common human bodiliness.

Embracing our lust for play, debauchery and gluttony promises to do more than just unite us. It can reveal how limited the transgressions offered by the apostles of anti-wokeness really are (9).

(Adapted from: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/mar/02/anti-woke-right-liberals#maincontent>, 02/03/2020, 803 words)

TAREA 3

A DEVELOPER’S GUIDE TO PASSIVE HOUSE BUILDINGS

ANSWER BOX

PARAGRAPH	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
HEADING	G	C	B	J	E	I	H	A

TEXT (*A developer's guide to passive house buildings*)

With more than 60,000 Passive House buildings around the world and 25 years of monitoring and verification of thousands of units, the performance of Passive House buildings is trusted by developers, lenders and governments. It started as an academic research project to determine an optimal level of efficiency of a building, and to this day the Passive House Institute in Germany remains a building science research institute, committed to advancing building performance and quality.

What are the benefits for developers and builders?

0./G. Build bigger and better more easily.

As Passive House design focuses on the building envelope, and in a multifamily building there is less envelope per square foot of floor area than in a single family house, it is actually easier to achieve Passive House performance in multifamily buildings, with a lesser cost premium than in smaller projects.

1./C. A marketing edge over conventional buildings.

Being able to offer seriously lower heating and cooling costs is obvious, but so is comfort — no drafts, no hot and cold spots. Those living on busy roads will appreciate the quiet provided by triple glazed windows and extra insulation. Higher quality can be marketed based on the obviously better windows, silent ventilation and the level of inspection.

2./B. A higher sale price

Because of the lower operating costs and perceived higher quality. Hard construction costs are only slightly higher, and the higher cost for windows and insulation is often offset by a more efficient building form and lower costs for heating and cooling equipment.

3./J. Increased saleable floor area may be approved

Municipal governments know the important role buildings play in reducing emissions in their community. Many consider the benefits a Passive House building brings to the community when making density decisions during rezoning or development permitting, and some jurisdictions have explicit policies to encourage such development.

4./E. Approvals and permits may be faster

Passive House aligns with many local-government policies on energy and carbon reduction. Experience indicates neighbours and neighbourhood associations are often pleased to see high-quality and sustainable construction add value to their neighbourhoods.

5./I. Fewer change orders and construction delays

A Passive House building requires detailed design and component specification well before a building permit is issued, resulting in more complete contract documents. This detailed work represents an incremental investment in design but avoids problems during construction.

6./H. Fewer callbacks and warranty claims

The level of inspection and documentation during the construction phase is more rigorous than conventional construction, and is likely to catch problems before it is too late to fix them.

7./A. A focus on better building techniques and materials, not expensive green gizmos

It's not about adding "green bling" but about keeping it simple. If a net zero building is desired, fewer solar panels are required; instead you invest in building better to reduce demand. In the end this costs less and is easier to maintain and manage.

(Adapted from: <https://www.passivehousecanada.com/downloads/PHC-developers-guide.pdf>, 438 words)