HAL
open science

Optimal design of energy production and storage systems in buildings

Aurélie Chabaud, Julien Eynard, Stéphane Grieu

To cite this version:

Aurélie Chabaud, Julien Eynard, Stéphane Grieu. Optimal design of energy production and storage systems in buildings. 4th Inverse Problems, Design and Optimization Symposium (IPDO-2013), Jun 2013, Albi, France. Thematic 5 - Optimal design and Global Optimization - n°05052. hal-00840708

HAL Id: hal-00840708

https://hal.science/hal-00840708

Submitted on 4 Jul 2013

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

4th Inverse Problems, Design and Optimization Symposium (IPDO-2013)
Albi, France, June 26-28, 2013

OPTIMAL DESIGN OF ENERGY PRODUCTION AND STORAGE SYSTEMS IN BUILDINGS

Aurélie Chabaud[a,b], Julien Eynard[a,b], Stéphane Grieu[a,b]
[a]*PROMES-CNRS, Rambla de la Thermodynamique, Tecnosud, 66100 Perpignan, France*
[b]*University of Perpignan Via Domitia, 52 Avenue Paul Alduy, 66860 Perpignan, France*
aurelie.chabaud@promes.cnrs.fr, julien.eynard@promes.cnrs.fr, stephane.grieu@promes.cnrs.fr

Abstract

This paper presents a comprehensive approach to manage energy resources in buildings connected to the electricity grid and equipped with energy production and storage systems. The aim of the work is to find interesting configurations that favour energy self-consumption while minimizing the negative impact of the local production on the grid. Energy and economic criteria are proposed to evaluate the strategy. A parametric study allowed the local systems to be optimally designed. So, we used first the TRNSYS software to model the thermal behaviour of a single-storey house, inhabited by four persons and equipped with photovoltaic solar panels, a vertical-axis windmill and batteries for electricity storage. The results we obtained in simulation prove that one can design in an optimal way the just-mentioned systems and find interesting configurations offering a good compromise between energy self-consumption and renewable energy coverage rate while avoiding the impact of the building on the grid to be clearly negative.

Introduction

Changes in climate due to greenhouse gas emissions, the rarefaction of fossil energy resources and an increasing energy demand, mainly caused by population growth and economic development, are worldwide concerns. In addition, power breakdowns caused by overloading are important issues impacting electricity networks safety. As a result, the energy market is being deregulated and decentralized energy production systems become more and more popular. That is why one needs to develop tools to improve safety and that ensure a good balance between electricity supply and demand. Spikes in electricity demand are forcing power companies to invest money in "peaking facilities" that are rarely used. Smart building automation approaches capable of trimming demand for electricity in response to real-time variations in prices could shave many peaks and help to improve generation and distribution networks reliability, in particular if penetration of intermittent energy resources in the power system is high, as well as cost effectiveness.

Electricity networks were initially designed in a radial and unidirectional way to carry out electricity from centralized power plants to consumers [1,2]. Actually, distribution networks are no more passive networks and adapt to a massive penetration of renewable energy. This penetration requires dramatic changes in planning and operation practices because it affects the physical operation of the grid. In particular, it affects short circuit, transient and voltage stability, electromagnetic transients, protection, power levelling and energy balancing as well as power quality. As a result, load forecasting becomes highly valuable while efficiently managing reactive power consumption is critical to grid stability. This also includes dynamic reactive power requirements of intermittent resources [3-6]. In this sense, new and "intelligent" tools allowing to manage decentralized energy production systems while taking into account the status of the grid are needed to minimize the impact of such production.

In France, the residential sector is the largest sector of energy consumption. It accounts for 28.7% of the final energy consumed. Besides, more than 60% of this energy is used with heating systems [7]. That is why we propose in this paper a multi-criteria approach for energy resources management in buildings equipped with energy production and storage systems [8,9]. The impact of local energy production on the electricity grid as well as the way multi-energy buildings and the grid interact are taken into account. Dynamic pricing is also considered. The first part of the paper describes the management strategy we propose for a grid-connected house equipped with energy production and storage systems. The second part of the paper is dedicated to the modeling of a single-storey house inhabited by four persons and equipped with photovoltaic solar panels, a vertical-axis windmill and batteries for electricity storage. The

end part focuses on the optimal design of the just-mentioned systems and the results we obtained in simulation with the proposed strategy.

Energy management strategy

This section of the paper is about the management strategy we propose for buildings equipped with energy production and storage systems. In addition, performance criteria dealing with energy use and the interaction between a building and the electricity grid are defined and used as evaluation tools.

1. Systems and objectives

We address a single-storey house, located in Perpignan (south of France) and connected to the grid. This house is equipped with photovoltaic solar panels, a vertical-axis windmill and batteries for electricity storage. Batteries favour energy self-consumption (because of a better balance between supply and demand) and allow the impact on the electricity grid of a local production of energy to be minimized.

The climate in the Languedoc-Roussillon region is Mediterranean. It is the hottest region in France after Corsica. Perpignan is on the coast and sheltered by mountains so it is dry and hot during the summer months of July and August when it can average between 25º and 30ºC during the day and 20 to 23ºC at night. September is warm but can feel humid and warm. Spring and Autumn weather tend to be more changeable as this region has some of the most extreme in the country as it has not only the hottest summers but the highest winds. It gets cooler in November and December but there is a still lot of sunshine. The winter months of January and February experience lots of rain. Temperatures average 10ºC during the day but can drop to -2ºC at night. The air is dry. March and April can be unpredictable with sunny days interspersed with cooler, cloudy and rainy periods.

2. Performance criteria

2.1. Renewable energy coverage rate

$\%_{EnR_c}$ is the ratio of the renewable energy produced and consumed *in situ* to the total energy consumed (1). The total energy consumed is the sum of the amount of energy produced and consumed *in situ* (EnR_c) and the amount of energy extracted from the electricity grid (E_{EDF}). This criterion has to be maximized to decrease the dependency on the electricity grid of a building:

$$\%_{EnR_c} = 100 \times \frac{EnR_c}{EnR_c + E_{EDF}} \quad (1)$$

2.2. Energy self-consumption

$\%_{SC}$ is the ratio of the renewable energy consumed *in situ* (EnR_c) to the renewable energy produced (EnR_p) (2). EnR_c and EnR_p are expressed in kWp (kiloWatt-peak). This criterion has to be maximized to promote energy self-consumption:

$$\%_{SC} = 100 \times \frac{EnR_c}{EnR_p} \quad (2)$$

2.3. Use of renewable energy

In order to find a reasonable compromise between the renewable energy coverage rate ($\%_{EnR_c}$) and the energy self-consumption criterion ($\%_{SC}$) and, as a result, to avoid the optimization process to lead to non-realistic configurations (highly undersized or oversized systems), both criteria are combined in a single criterion (J_{EnR}) (3):

$$J_{EnR} = \frac{\%_{EnR_c} \times \%_{SC}}{100} \quad (3)$$

2.4. Dynamic princing and economic cost

A criterion about economic cost J_{cost} (€) is defined, not according to the purchase and sale prices currently charged by EDF (Electricité de France) but based on a future application of dynamic pricing in the coming years. Dynamic pricing, already in use in the energy market, consists in adjusting energy

prices dynamically, with a short time step. This reflects variations in electricity production costs as well as daily and seasonally variations in the grid load. So, a polynomial model about energy price (P_{En}) was identified from both the grid load (L_g) and outdoor temperature (T_{out}) ((4), with $i, j \in [\![1,5]\!]$). The Mean Square Error (MSE) is about 16%:

$$P_{En}(t) = \sum_{i,j} a_{ij} \times L_g^i(t) \times T_{out}^j(t) \quad (4)$$

Table 1. Coefficients of the energy price model

$j \setminus i$	0	1	2	3	4	5
0	6.58×10^{1}	-0.38×10^{1}	7.67×10^{-2}	-5.12×10^{-4}	3.48×10^{-7}	6.37×10^{-9}
1	-1.77×10^{1}	9.27×10^{-1}	-1.64×10^{-2}	1.30×10^{-4}	-4.04×10^{-7}	-
2	6.04×10^{-2}	-3.12×10^{-3}	4.41×10^{-5}	2.29×10^{-7}	-	-
3	-5.16×10^{-4}	-1.96×10^{-4}	2.38×10^{-6}	-	-	-
4	4.11×10^{-4}	1.19×10^{-5}	-	-	-	-
5	2.01×10^{-5}	-	-	-	-	-

Economic cost criterion J_{cost} is then calculated as the difference between the cost related to the purchase of energy (E_{EDF}) and the gain resulting from the sale of energy (E_{inj}). E_{inj} is the amount of energy injected to the grid and P_{En} is the electricity price (5):

$$J_{cost} = \sum_t \left(E_{inj}(t) P_{En}(k) - E_{EDF}(t) P_{En}(t) \right) \quad (5)$$

2.5. Impact of a building on the electricity grid

The grid load (L_g) varies in daily (several peaks of consumption) and seasonal (demand is higher in winter than in summer) cycles. To define the status of the electricity grid, taking into account the daily and seasonal variations in its load, a daily load normalization $\widetilde{L_g}$ is firstly done. Then a daily threshold is defined to highlight a limit beyond which injecting energy to the considered grid is not appropriate. The difference between this threshold and the status of the grid (its load) allows quantifying if injecting energy is more or less favourable. This difference is normalized between 0 and 1 when the load is higher than the threshold and from -1 and 0 when the threshold is higher than the load. The impact of local production on the electricity grid I_{inj} is defined from E_{inj} and the normalized deviation between the fixed threshold and the status of the grid (ΔE_{thres}) (6):

$$I_{inj} = \frac{1}{1000} \times \sum_t \left(E_{inj}(t) \times \Delta E_{thres}(t) \right) \quad (6)$$

The impact on the grid related to energy extraction I_{ext} is defined in the same way as for I_{inj}, with E_{EDF} the amount of energy extracted from the electricity grid (7):

$$I_{ext} = -\frac{1}{1000} \times \sum_t \left(E_{EDF}(t) \times \Delta E_{thres}(t) \right) \quad (7)$$

Finally, an overall impact criterion I_{over} is defined as the sum of I_{inj} and I_{ext} (8). With a positive criterion, electricity is injected to the grid when demand is high while electricity is extracted from the grid when demand is low:

$$I_{over} = I_{inj} + I_{ext} \quad (8)$$

3. Management of energy resources

Figure 1 describes the strategy we propose to manage energy resources in multi-energy buildings connected to the grid and equipped with energy production and storage systems. The status of the grid is taken into account. One can highlight three main cases.

① **The local systems overproduce**. Energy production is higher than instantaneous consumption. Thus, renewable energy production covers 100% of instantaneous consumption and, as result, no energy is extracted from the grid. The surplus of energy is managed, taking into account the status of the grid. If energy demand is high ($\widetilde{L_g}$ close to 1), the surplus of energy is injected to the grid. Otherwise, if the batteries are not already fully charged, the surplus is stored in whole or in part.

② **Energy production and local energy demand are balanced**. All the energy produced is so consumed locally and there is no interaction with the grid and the batteries.

③ **The local systems under-produce**. So, energy consumption is higher than the renewable energy production. As a consequence, this production is completely auto-consumed and energy is destocked from the batteries, if they are charged. Otherwise, the missing amount of energy is supplied by the grid.



Fig.1. Energy management algorithm (see sections "Performance criteria" and "Batteries modelling"

Building and systems modeling

This section of the paper presents the model of the building equipped with energy production and storage systems we considered to test the proposed management strategy. Occupancy scenarios are also defined and presented.

1. Building model

The TRNSYS software [10] has been used to model the thermal behaviour of a 150 m^2 single-storey house located in Perpignan (south of France), facing south and inhabited by four persons (two adults and two children). The building can be equipped with photovoltaic solar panels, a vertical-axis windmill and batteries for electricity storage. Perpignan experiences a warm and windy Mediterranean climate, similar to much of southern France. Figure 2 presents the plan of the house (composed of a living room, a kitchen, three bedrooms, a bathroom, a corridor and a garage) and the volume of the rooms.

Table 2 depicts the materials used in the house as well as their characteristics. Common materials were considered and the overall thermal insulation of the structure agrees with relatively new French standards. In table 2, U is the heat transfer coefficient of the materials used while U_{RT2005} is the RT2005 (French thermal regulation 2005) value [11].

Fig.2. Plan of the 150 m^2 single-storey house. The house features a living room, a kitchen, three bedrooms, a bathroom, a corridor and a garage. Windows are represented in blue

Table 2. Characteristics of the materials used in the considered single-storey house

Element	Material	Thickness [m]	U [$W.m^{-2}.K^{-1}$]	U_{RT2005} [$W.m^{-2}.K^{-1}$]
External wall	BA13	0.013	0.602	0.45
	Rockwool	0.06		
	Cinderblock	0.2		
	Surface coating	0.02		
Internal wall	BA13	0.013	0.845	/
	Glass wool	0.04		
	BA13	0.013		
Floor	Tiles	0.022	0.415	0.4
	Mortar	0.05		
	Heavy concrete	0.16		
	Expanded polystyrene	0.08		
Ceiling	BA13	0.013	0.196	0.34
	Glass wool	0.1		
	Air knife	0.5		
	Terracotta	0.01		
Garage ceiling	BA13	0.013	2.37	0.34
	Terracotta	0.2		
Window	Double glazed	0.2	1.43	2.6

The photovoltaic solar panels installed (TRNSYS model 194) and the vertical-axis windmill (TRNSYS model 90) have also been modelled. Load curves have been studied to understand the way energy is consumed in the house. Because of its impact on energy consumption, inhabitants' lifestyle and behaviour has been also taken into account via occupancy scenarios fixed by the French thermal regulation [12]. The zoned HVAC system (its maximum power is 1kW) as well as electrical and electronic appliances are properly managed thanks to local regulators (TRNSYS model 56). Indoor temperature regulation is based on set-point temperature profiles and the just-mentioned occupancy scenarios. Inhabitants are at home during working days from 0 a.m. to 10 a.m. and from 6 p.m. to 12 p.m. During weekends, they are present from 0 a.m. to 12 p.m. So, the indoor temperature set-point is defined as follows: 19°C for heating and 28°C for cooling during occupancy periods and 16°C for heating and 30°C for cooling if people are out the house (non-occupancy periods). Figure 3 (left) is an example of daily load curve about specific energy (January 28, 2006). One can clearly observe on this load curve three peaks of energy consumption. Figure 3 (right) depicts the annual energy consumption of the single-storey house for heating. When consumption is negative (respectively positive), heating (respectively cooling) mode is on. We validated the proposed models using real data collected on site. As a key point, one can note that energy production and consumption are impacted by geographical, climatic and

physical conditions. Such conditions are part of the models we developed, via both the location and orientation of the house, its insulation level as well as the characteristics of the energy production systems. The Meteonorm software provided meteorological data [13].



Fig.3. Left: Daily consumption of specific energy (January 28, 2006). Right: Annual consumption of energy for heating and cooling (year 2006)

2. Batteries modeling

The model describes the functioning of the batteries, i.e. the load and discharge processes. At time *t*, the status of the batteries is related to the status at time *t-1* and the production/consumption of energy at time *t*. Equations (9) and (10) are about charging mode and discharging mode, respectively:

$$E_{bat}(t) = (1-\tau)\cdot E_{bat}(t-1) + \left(E_{EnR}(t) - \frac{E_{ch}(t)}{\eta_{inv}}\right)\cdot \eta_{bat} \quad (9)$$

$$E_{bat}(t) = (1-\tau)\cdot E_{bat}(t-1) + \left(\frac{E_{ch}(t)}{\eta_{inv}} - E_{EnR}(t)\right) \quad (10)$$

with η_{inv} the inverter performance, η_{bat} the batteries charge performance, E_{ch} the amount of energy available to charge the batteries, E_{bat} the amount of energy stored, E_{EnR} the amount of energy produced by the decentralized production systems after taking into account the energy losses due to the controller and τ the hourly self discharge rate (equal to 10^{-4}). Performance is supposed to be constant and equal to 85% in charging mode while it is equal to 1 in discharging mode. The amount of energy stored in the batteries is used when the local production is not sufficient to meet demand. In opposition, energy is stored when the power supplied by the renewable energy systems exceed the house demand. However, it should be noticed that the amount of energy one can store in the batteries is related to $E_{bat_{min}}$ and $E_{bat_{max}}$ (11):

$$E_{bat_{min}} \leq E_{bat}(t) \leq E_{bat_{max}} \quad (11)$$

Here, the maximum batteries capacity, $E_{bat_{max}}$, is equal to the rated capacity. The minimum capacity, $E_{bat_{min}}$, is determined from the Depth of Discharge (DoD), as shown in (12). DoD is used to describe how deeply the batteries are discharged:

$$E_{bat_{min}} = (1 - DoD) \times E_{bat_{max}} \quad (12)$$

According to the various specifications given by the manufacturer, the life of the batteries can be extended if the depth of discharge is between 30% and 50% [14]. So, we considered in this study a conservative DoD of 50%.

Energy resources management and design of energy production and storage systems

This section is about the design of the energy production and storage systems. We also discuss the results we obtained about energy resources management and highlight various interesting configurations.

1. Parametric study and optimal design

The management strategy presented in the first part of the paper has been applied to the single-storey house whose modelling is presented in part two. Using the developed models, a parametric study has been carried out to optimize the power of both the photovoltaic solar panels (power is related to the available surface on the roof and its orientation; maximum power is so 8 kWp) and the vertical-axis windmill (maximum power is 25 kWp) as well as the capacity of the batteries (capacity is related to size; maximum capacity is so 200 kWh what is equivalent to batteries of 2 m^3). The optimization process aims at maximizing an objective function, according to different values of the grid threshold. We choose J_{EnR} as function to be maximized. Let us remember that J_{EnR} is a compromise between the renewable energy coverage rate and the energy self-consumption criterion. We highlight in the following section the most interesting configurations we obtained, with or without energy storage. Let us remember that we want energy self-consumption to be promoted and the impact of the local production on the grid to be limited.

2. Results analysis

First, we highlight three configurations as well as the results we obtained in simulation (one year) (Table 3). Configuration 1 is based on standard photovoltaic solar panels of 3 kWp only (no vertical-axis windmill and no energy storage). Configurations 2 and 3 are based on optimally designed systems: photovoltaic solar panels of 6.9 kWp for configuration 1 and PV panels of 3.8 kWp as well as a vertical-axis windmill of 11 kWp for configuration 2. At this time, no energy storage is considered. With such a design, the J_{EnR} criterion is maximized. Taking configuration 1 (standard PV panels) as a reference, configuration 2 (optimally designed PV panels) allows energy self-consumption to be increased by 61.7% and energy extraction to be reduced of 7.8%. Energy costs are reduced of about 25% (310 €). With configuration 3 (optimally designed PV panels and vertical-axis windmill), energy self-consumption is increased by 50% while energy extraction is reduced of about 11% (in comparison to configuration 2). Energy costs are reduced of about 52% (509 €).

Table 3. Configurations 1, 2 and 3 (no energy storage) and results

System / Criterion	Configuration 1	Configuration 2	Configuration 3
PV panels (kWp)	3	6.9	3.8
Vertical axis windmill (kWp)	-	-	11
EnR_c (kWh)	3305	5345	10994
EnR_{inj} (kWh)	1132	4860	9124
E_{EDF} (kWh)	26078	24038	18390
$\%_{SC}$ (%)	74.49	52.38	54.65
$\%_{EnR_c}$ (%)	11.25	18.19	37.41
J_{EnR} (%)	8.38	9.53	20.45
J_{cost} (€)	-1281.30	-977.20	-468.52

Tables 4 to 7 present new configurations as well as the results we obtained in simulation (one year). Configurations 4, 4', 5, 5', 6 and 6' (Tables 4 and 5) are based on optimally designed photovoltaic solar panels and batteries. With this design, the criterion J_{EnR} is maximized. Results are given for three thresholds allowing the status of the electricity grid to be taken into account: 30%, 50% and 70%. A threshold of 30% is representative of a grid able to accept most of the time the decentralized production (configurations 4 and 4'). In opposition, a threshold of 70% is typical of a grid having a preference for injection of energy during peaks of demand (configurations 6 and 6'). Finally, a threshold of 50% is for a balanced grid (configurations 5 and 5'). Whatever the threshold, the first configuration proposed (i.e. 4, 5 or 6) is based on photovoltaic solar panels of 6.9 kWp (design is from configuration 2) (Table 3) and optimized batteries. The second configuration (4', 5' or 6') is based on optimally designed PV panels and batteries. Configurations 7, 7', 8, 8', 9 and 9' (Table 6 and 7) are based on optimally designed photovoltaic solar panels, vertical-axis windmill and batteries. Configurations 7, 8 and 9 derive from configuration 3

(PV panels of 3.8 kWp and a windmill of 11 kWp). Figure 4 depicts, as an example, the maximization of J_{EnR}, when considering a threshold of 70% (with or without vertical-axis windmill installed).



Fig.4. Maximisation of J_{EnR}. Left: only PV panels and batteries are considered. Right: PV panels, a vertical-axis windmill and batteries (capacity is 200 kWh) are considered. Threshold is 70%

Table 4. Configurations 4, 4', 5 and 5' with or without (in brackets) energy storage

Grid threshold (%)	70		50	
Configuration (-)	Configuration 4	Configuration 4'	Configuration 5	Configuration 5'
PV panels (kWp)	6.9	8	6.9	8
Batteries (kWh)	40 (-)	50 (-)	20 (-)	50 (-)
EnR_c (kWh)	7117 (5345)	7959 (5746)	5626 (5345)	6199 (5746)
EnR_{inj} (kWh)	2695 (4860)	3370 (6087)	4191 (4860)	5476 (6087)
E_{EDF} (kWh)	22266 (24038)	21425 (23638)	23757 (24038)	23184 (23638)
E_{stock} (kWh)	2166 (-)	2717 (-)	452 (-)	611 (-)
$\%_{SC}$ (%)	69.74 (52.38)	67.26 (48.56)	56.08 (52.38)	52.39 (48.56)
$\%_{EnR_c}$ (%)	24.22 (18.19)	27.09 (19,55)	19.48 (18.19)	21.10 (19.55)
J_{EnR} (%)	16.89 (9.53)	18.22 (9.49)	10.92 (9.53)	11.05 (9.49)
J_{cost} (€)	-997.27 (-977.20)	-927.33 (-901.44)	-982.12 (-977.20)	-909.55 (-901.44)
I_{inj} (-)	1034 (616)	1292 (762)	2100 (1979)	2625 (2468)
I_{ext} (-)	6383 (6645)	6238 (6634)	2124 (2048)	2217 (2144)
I_{over} (-)	7417 (7261)	7529 (7396)	4224 (4027)	4842 (4612)

Table 5. Configurations 6 and 6' with or without (in brackets) energy storage

Grid threshold (%)	30	
Configuration (-)	Configuration 6	Configuration 6'
PV panels (kWp)	6.9	7.9
Batteries (kWh)	10 (-)	50 (-)
EnR_c (kWh)	5326 (5345)	5748 (5711)
EnR_{inj} (kWh)	4561 (4860)	5861 (5974)
E_{EDF} (kWh)	24058 (24038)	23635 (23672)
E_{stock} (kWh)	82 (-)	112 (-)
$\%_{SC}$ (%)	52.99 (52.38)	49.19 (48.88)
$\%_{EnR_c}$ (%)	18.41 (18.19)	19.56 (19.44)
J_{EnR} (%)	9.75 (9.53)	9.62 (9.50)
J_{cost} (€)	-978.44 (-977.20)	-905.67 (-901.83)
I_{inj} (-)	2815 (2785)	3454 (3415)
I_{ext} (-)	-2518 (-2538)	-2382 (-2384)
I_{over} (-)	298 (247)	1072 (1031)

In a general way, optimally designed batteries favour energy self-consumption (approximately +25% for a threshold of 70%, with or without vertical-axis windmill) and allow injection to the grid to be reduced (for example, with a threshold of 50%, energy injection is reduced of about 35% in case of windmill and about 15% without windmill). In addition, with optimally designed batteries, the amount of energy supplied by the electricity grid is also generally reduced (considering PV panels as well as a vertical-axis windmill, this amount is reduced of about 10% for a threshold of 70% and 2% for a threshold of 50%; amount is almost the same for a threshold of 30%). Clearly, optimally designed batteries allow interactions between the single-storey house and the grid to be minimized. However, batteries increase I_{inj} and reduce I_{ext}. In some cases, for example when for a threshold of 70%, the overall impact of the house on the grid is increased. Periods of interaction seem to be less favourable for the grid when considering a storage system. Furthermore, batteries do not reduce economic costs. Depending on both the configuration and the threshold, one can observe a slight increase in costs (between 10 and 100 € per year). As a key point, the lowest the threshold, the lowest the impact of the batteries on the management of the available energy resources. As highlighted by the results we obtained, energy storage is of course one of the best ways to overcome intermittency in renewable energy production and allows a better match between production and demand.

Table 6. Configurations 7, 7', 8 and 8' with or without (in brackets) energy storage

Grid threshold (%)	70		50	
Configuration (-)	Configuration 7	Configuration 7'	Configuration 8	Configuration 8'
PV panels (kWp)	3.8	5.8	3.8	4.2
V.-a. windmill (kWp)	11	15	11	18
Batteries (kWh)	200 (-)	200 (-)	190 (-)	200 (-)
EnR_c (kWh)	14251 (10994)	17313 (12917)	12659 (10994)	16000 (13162)
EnR_{inj} (kWh)	4621 (9124)	9373 (15431)	6645 (9124)	12669 (16774)
E_{EDF} (kWh)	15132 (18390)	12070 (16466)	16725 (18390)	13383 (16222)
E_{stock} (kWh)	4504 (-)	6058 (-)	2479 (-)	4105 (-)
$\%_{SC}$ (%)	70.84 (54.65)	61.07 (45.57)	62.92 (54.65)	53.45 (43.97)
$\%_{EnR_c}$ (%)	48.50 (37.41)	58.92 (43.96)	43.08 (37.41)	54.45 (44.79)
J_{EnR} (%)	34.36 (20.45)	35.99 (20.03)	27.11 (20.45)	29.10 (19.69)
J_{cost} (€)	-531.54 (-468.52)	-136.38 (-52.35)	-509.71 (-468.52)	-34.81 (26.89)
I_{inj} (-)	942 (-662)	911 (-1166)	2755 (1551)	3920 (3574)
I_{ext} (-)	3790 (4634)	3036 (4326)	844 (1024)	677 (-583)
I_{over} (-)	4732 (3972)	3947 (3160)	3599 (2575)	4598 (2991)

Table 7. Configurations 9 and 9' with or without (in brackets) energy storage

Grid threshold (%)	30	
Configuration (-)	Configuration 9	Configuration 9'
PV panels (kWp)	3.8	3.5
V.-a. windmill (kWp)	11	20
Batteries (kWh)	100 (-)	200 (-)
EnR_c (kWh)	11868 (10994)	15305 (13688)
EnR_{inj} (kWh)	7848 (9124)	15190 (19327)
E_{EDF} (kWh)	17515 (18390)	14079 (15696)
E_{stock} (kWh)	1276 (-)	2997 (-)
$\%_{SC}$ (%)	59.00 (54.65)	48.53 (41.46)
$\%_{EnR_c}$ (%)	40.39 (37.41)	52.09 (46.58)
J_{EnR} (%)	23.83 (20.45)	25.28 (19.31)
J_{cost} (€)	-488.84 (-468.52)	55.02 (106.62)
I_{inj} (-)	3978 (3208)	6901 (4013)
I_{ext} (-)	-2413 (-2459)	-1995 (-525)
I_{over} (-)	1565 (749)	4906 (3488)

Conclusion

The paper focuses on a multi-criteria approach for energy resources management in buildings equipped with energy production and storage systems. This approach takes into account the way the building and the electricity grid interact. The aim of the strategy is to favour energy self-consumption while minimizing the negative impact of the local production on the electricity grid. Energy and economic criteria are proposed to evaluate the strategy. We applied this strategy in simulation to a 150 m^2 single-storey house, located in Perpignan (south of France) and inhabited by four persons. It can be equipped with photovoltaic solar panels, a vertical-axis windmill and batteries. We used the TRNSYS software to model the thermal behaviour of the building. As a key point, a parametric study allowed the design of the just-mentioned systems to be optimized. We obtained several configurations allowing energy self-consumption to be promoted while avoiding the impact of the considered house on the electricity grid to be negative. With the proposed management strategy, a good equilibrium between decentralized energy production, energy needs and integration into the grid can be found. Future work will now focus on improving the strategy using a predictive approach. We want the availability of the renewable resources, variations in energy demand and the status of the grid to be anticipated and the storage system management to be refined. We will also consider the impact of the geographical situation, insulation and lifestyle habits on energy resources management.

References

1. P. Carrive, *Réseaux de distribution - Structure et planification*, Techniques de l'Ingénieur, n°D4210, 1991.
2. C. Puret, *Les réseaux de distribution publique MT dans le monde*, Schneider Electric, Cahier Technique n°155, 1991.
3. T.T.H. Pham, *Influences de la production décentralisée sur la gestion des infrastructures critiques des réseaux de puissance*, PhD thesis, INP Grenoble, 2006.
4. V. Courtecuisse, *Supervision d'une centrale multisource à base d'éoliennes et de stockage d'énergie connectée au réseau électrique*, PhD thesis, ENSAM Paris, 2008.
5. M.A. Fontela Garcia, *Interaction des réseaux de transport et de distribution en présence de production décentralisée*, PhD thesis, INP Grenoble, 2008.
6. M.C. Alvarez Hérault, *Architecture des réseaux de distribution du futur en présence de production décentralisée*, PhD thesis, INP Grenoble, 2009.
7. Ministère de l'écologie, du développement durable, des transports et du logement, *Section Indicateurs et Indices, Développement durable, Indicateurs de développement durable nationaux, Défi 4 : changement climatique et énergies, Consommation d'énergie des secteurs résidentiel et tertiaire*, 2011.
8. E.H. Mathews, D.C. Arndt, C.B. Piani and E. Heerden, *Developing cost efficient control strategies to ensure optimal energy use and sufficient indoor comfort*, Applied Energy 66 (2000) 135-159.
9. D. Kolokotsa, K. Niachou, V. Geros, K. Kalaitzakis, G.S. Stavrakis and M. Santamouris, *Implementation of an integrated indoor environment and energy management system*, Energy and Buildings 37 (2005) 93-99.
10. TRNSYS, Transient System Simulation Tool, http://www.trnsys.com.
11. Legifrance, Arrêté du 24 mai 2006 relatif aux caractéristiques thermiques des bâtiments nouveaux et des parties nouvelles de bâtiments, 2006.
12. Centre Scientifique et Technique du Bâtiment (CSTB), *Méthode de calcul TH-CE 2005*, 2006.
13. Meteonorm, Base de données météorologiques mondiales, http://www.meteonorm.com.
14. B. Ai, H. Yang, H. Shen and X. Liao, *Computer-aided design of PV/Wind hybrid system*, Renewable Energy 28 (10) (2003) 1491-15212.