

Nomad Coffee: Using an Energy Audit to Prioritise Improvements

Canonical: <https://northmoregordon.com/case-studies/energy-audit-takes-nomad-coffee-to-next-level/>

Details:

On this page: A closer look at energy use in coffee production · What the Type 2 audit examined · What the published opportunity assessment reported · The challenge: limited sub-metering · Using the example at another food or beverage site

A closer look at energy use in coffee production

Nomad Coffee Group is a collective of coffee brands, including Veneziano Coffee Roasters, Coffee Hit and the private-label business Black Bag Roasters. Northmore Gordon's October 2023 case study describes an energy audit at the group's Richmond café and roastery in Victoria.

The business wanted to understand consumption and emissions in more detail and identify opportunities to improve performance. The case study describes sustainability as an established priority, reporting Climate Active and B Corporation certification at the time. The audit was intended to help turn that commitment into a more informed programme of site improvements.

What the Type 2 audit examined

Northmore Gordon completed an AS/NZS 3598 Type 2 energy audit covering the site's baseline energy use, consumption breakdown, operating patterns and tariffs. The work included short-term electrical metering, recommendations for metering, and examination of individual coffee roasters' energy use per unit of production.

The opportunity assessment considered potential savings, costs and funding availability. The source reports that the audit itself received support through the Australian Government's Energy Efficient Communities programme. That is historical support for this project, rather than evidence that the same funding is available for a new audit.

What the published opportunity assessment reported

The source distinguishes the wider opportunity set from selected priority and secondary opportunities. Its figures should be read as identified or projected benefits, not as independently verified post-installation savings.

| Reported measure | Published figure | Status in this case study | | --- | --- | --- | | Wider energy-saving opportunities | 37% | Identified by the audit. | | Wider emissions-saving opportunities | 32% | Identified by the audit. | | Priority and secondary energy opportunities | 871 GJ per year, reported as 9% | Projected on implementation. | | Associated energy-cost opportunities | Up to \$19,419 per year, reported as 8% | Projected using the source's assumptions. | | Opportunity payback periods | 0.9 to 4.6 years | Reported assessment estimates. |

These figures describe different measures and opportunity groups. They should not be added together or transferred to another facility as an expected outcome.

Emissions-accounting qualification: The original account attributes an emissions reduction to Scope 2 while linking it to natural-gas use. That scope attribution is unresolved. We are withholding the disputed emissions figure as a verified outcome until the underlying audit clarifies the fuel, boundary and calculation.

The challenge: limited sub-metering

The source identifies a lack of sub-metering as a constraint. Energy and emissions attributed to individual areas or major equipment therefore required estimation, supported by the investigation and temporary measurements.

This matters in a production business because whole-site bills do not explain how consumption changes with throughput or how individual machines perform. The audit's equipment-level and production-related analysis helped identify where further attention would be useful.

Northmore Gordon reported improved awareness of reduction priorities and identified operational measures involving equipment running hours and duty. The published account does not provide a complete post-installation measurement record for the opportunity set.

Using the example at another food or beverage site

The transferable lesson is the assessment process. Define the measurement boundary, relate energy use to production, and state which periods temporary readings represent. Record the basis and uncertainty of each opportunity estimate, then identify the next evidence needed before implementation.

For a new enquiry, gather energy bills, interval data if available, production records and an equipment list. Explain any planned production changes. Ask for an opportunity register that distinguishes operational adjustments from capital projects and gives each selected measure an owner and a verification plan.

Explore Northmore Gordon's energy-audit services or discuss your site's requirements .

Related services and guidance

Plan an energy audit

Move from findings to implementation

Plan measurement and verification

Connect energy and emissions planning

What was included in Nomad Coffee's audit?

The Type 2 audit examined site energy use, baselines, operating patterns, tariffs and coffee-roaster performance per unit of production. It included short-term electrical metering, metering recommendations and an assessment of opportunities, costs and funding availability.

Were the reported 37% energy and 32% emissions savings achieved?

The case study reports those figures as opportunities identified by the audit. It does not establish that the entire opportunity set was implemented or that those percentages were measured as realised savings.

Why are the 871 GJ and \$19,419 figures different from the larger percentages?

The source associates those annual figures with priority and secondary opportunities, while the larger percentages describe the wider identified opportunity set. They represent different reported measures and should not be combined as one achieved result.

Why was sub-metering important in this case?

Without sub-metering, energy use by individual areas and major equipment could only be estimated. Temporary measurements and production-related analysis helped investigate performance beyond the

totals shown on whole-site bills.

Can another business obtain the same savings or grant?

The figures and funding relate to this historical project. A new site's opportunities depend on its equipment, operations and evidence, while any funding must be checked against the programme and timing applicable to that new project.