4th Inverse Problems, Design and Optimization Symposium, Albi, June 26-28, 2013

Optimal design of energy production and storage systems in buildings

<sup>1</sup> PROMES-CNRS, Perpignan, France

<sup>2</sup> University of Perpignan Via Domitia, Perpignan, France



**CNrS** 

Aurélie Chabaud<sup>1,2</sup> Julien Eynard<sup>1,2</sup>

Stéphane Grieu<sup>1,2</sup>

# Summary

Context and objectives

### 2 Energy management strategy

- Criteria
- Overview of the strategy

## **3** Modeling

- Load modeling in TRNSYS
- Modeling of production and storage systems





#### 5 Conclusion and outlook

Chabaud, Eynard, Grieu

# Context of the study

Growing environmental concerns

Decentralized energy production booming

Intermittent renewable energy resources

Integration of production systems in individual houses

Chabaud, Eynard, Grieu

## Context of the study

#### <u>lssue</u>:

➤ A massive penetration of the renewable energy production impacts on the electricity grid operation

Necessary changes in electricity grid leading to an increase in flexibility and security

#### Solution:



> Develop intelligent management systems that minimize the impact induced by the injection of the distributed generation

#### Chabaud, Eynard, Grieu

Context Objectives

# Objectives

Develop a comprehensive and multi-criteria approach for energy management in individual multi-energy houses (equipped with production and storage systems)

Optimize local energy consumption

Minimize production impact on the local grid

- Satisfy the peak demand
- Store energy and thus optimize its use
- Adjust supply and demand in energy

## Energy criteria

- Use of renewable energy:  $J_{EnR} = \frac{\%_{EnR_c} \times \%_{SC}}{100}$
- <u>Energy self-consumption</u>:  $%_{SC} = 100 \times \frac{EnR_c}{EnR_n}$
- <u>Renewable energy coverage rate</u>:  $\%_{EnR_c} = 100 \times \frac{EnR_c}{EnR_c + E_{EDF}}$ 
  - $\%_{sc}$  : Ratio of the renewable energy consumed in situ to the renewable energy produced (%)
  - $\mathscr{W}_{EnR_c}$ : Ratio of the renewable energy produced and consumed in situ to the total energy consumed (%)
  - $J_{EnR}$  : Global criterion (%)
  - $E_{EDF}$  : Energy extracted from the electricity grid (kWh)
  - $EnR_c$  : Renewable energy consumed (kWh)
  - $EnR_p$  : Renewable energy produced (kWh)

Chabaud, Eynard, Grieu

## Economic cost criteria

$$J_{cost} = \sum_{t} \left( E_{inj}(t) P_{En}(t) - E_{EDF}(t) P_{En}(t) \right)$$

 $J_{cost}$  : Criterion about economic cost ( $\in$ )

 $E_{EDF}$  : Energy extracted from the electricity grid (kWh)

- $E_{inj}$  : Energy injected to the grid (kWh)
  - $P_{En}$  : Electricity price (€)

Chabaud, Eynard, Grieu

**Criteria** Overview of strategy

	Dy	IIdIIII	c pric	ing		
	$P_{En}(t)$	$=\sum_{i,j}$	$u_{ii} \times L^i_a$	$(t) \times T_{c}^{j}$	(t)	
	2n(y) = 0, j + j + g(y) + 0 u(y)					
	~		A 14			
;\ ;	Coe	efficients o	of the ener	gy price 1	model	
j\i 0	0 6.58×10 <sup>1</sup>	efficients o	of the ener $\frac{2}{7.67 \times 10^{-2}}$	gy price 1 3 -5.12×10 <sup>-4</sup>	nodel 4 3.48×10-7	5 6.37×10-
j\i 0 1	0 6.58×10 <sup>1</sup> -1.77×10 <sup>1</sup>	efficients o <u>1</u> -0.38×10 <sup>1</sup> 9.27×10 <sup>-1</sup>	of the ener 2 7.67×10 <sup>-2</sup> -1.64×10 <sup>-2</sup>	gy price 1 <u>3</u> -5.12×10 <sup>-4</sup> 1.30×10 <sup>-4</sup>	4 3.48×10 <sup>-7</sup> -4.04×10 <sup>-7</sup>	5 6.37×10 <sup>-1</sup>
$\frac{j \setminus i}{0}$ $\frac{1}{2}$	0 6.58×10 <sup>1</sup> -1.77×10 <sup>1</sup> 6.04×10 <sup>-2</sup>	efficients c <u>1</u> -0.38×10 <sup>1</sup> 9.27×10 <sup>-1</sup> -3.12×10 <sup>-3</sup>	2 7.67×10 <sup>-2</sup> -1.64×10 <sup>-2</sup> 4.41×10 <sup>-3</sup>	3 -5.12×10 <sup>-4</sup> 1.30×10 <sup>-4</sup> 2.29×10 <sup>-7</sup>	nodel <u>4</u> <u>3.48×10<sup>.7</sup></u> <u>-4.04×10<sup>.7</sup></u>	5 6.37×10 <sup>-1</sup> -
$j \setminus i$ 0 1 2 3	0 6.58×10 <sup>1</sup> -1.77×10 <sup>1</sup> 6.04×10 <sup>-2</sup> -5.16×10 <sup>-4</sup>	efficients o <u>1</u> -0.38×10 <sup>1</sup> 9.27×10 <sup>-1</sup> -3.12×10 <sup>-3</sup> -1.96×10 <sup>-4</sup>	2 7.67×10 <sup>-2</sup> -1.64×10 <sup>-2</sup> 4.41×10 <sup>-3</sup> 2.38×10 <sup>-6</sup>	gy price 1 3 -5.12×10 <sup>-4</sup> 1.30×10 <sup>-4</sup> 2.29×10 <sup>-7</sup>	nodel <u>4</u> <u>3.48×10<sup>-7</sup></u> <u>-4.04×10<sup>-7</sup></u> -	5 6.37×10 <sup>-1</sup> - -
$j \setminus i$ 0 1 2 3 4	0 6.58×10 <sup>1</sup> -1.77×10 <sup>1</sup> 6.04×10 <sup>-2</sup> -5.16×10 <sup>-4</sup> 4.11×10 <sup>-4</sup>	efficients o 1 -0.38×10 <sup>1</sup> 9.27×10 <sup>-1</sup> -3.12×10 <sup>-3</sup> -1.96×10 <sup>-4</sup> 1.19×10 <sup>-5</sup>	2 7.67×10 <sup>-2</sup> -1.64×10 <sup>-2</sup> 4.41×10 <sup>-3</sup> 2.38×10 <sup>-6</sup>	gy price 1 3 -5.12×10 <sup>-4</sup> 1.30×10 <sup>-4</sup> 2.29×10 <sup>-7</sup> -	nodel <u>4</u> <u>3.48×10<sup>.7</sup></u> <u>-4.04×10<sup>.7</sup></u> <u>-</u> <u>-</u> -	5 6.37×10 <sup>-;</sup> - - -

- $P_{En}$  : Electricity price (€)
- $L_g$  : Grid load (MWh)

*T<sub>out</sub>* : Outdoor temperature (°C)

 $a_{ij}$ : Polynomial model coefficient

Chabaud, Eynard, Grieu



Chabaud, Eynard, Grieu

## Impact on the grid

- <u>Extracted impact</u>:  $I_{ext} = -\frac{1}{1000} \times \sum_t (E_{EDF}(t) \times \Delta E_{thres}(t))$
- <u>Global impact</u>:  $I_{over} = I_{inj} + I_{ext}$

 $E_{EDF}$  : Energy extracted from the electricity grid (kWh)

 $\Delta E_{thres}$ : Normalized deviation between the fixed threshold and the status of the grid



Chabaud, Eynard, Grieu

IPDO, Albi, June 26-28, 2013

11/23

> **Modeling** Design and impact Conclusion and outlook

Load modeling in TRNSYS Production and storage systems modeling

### TRNSYS thermal model of an individual house

<u>Case study</u>: 150 m<sup>2</sup> single-storey house located in Perpignan (south of France), facing south and inhabited by four persons (two adults and two children)



Chabaud, Eynard, Grieu

> **Modeling** Design and impact Conclusion and outlook



## TRNSYS thermal model of an individual house

<u>Characteristics of the materials used in the considered single-storey house</u>:

Element	Material	Thickness [m]	U [W.m <sup>-2</sup> .K <sup>-1</sup> ]	U <sub>RT2005</sub> [W.m <sup>-2</sup> .K <sup>-1</sup> ]	
	BA13	0.013			
External mall	Rockwool	0.06	0.602	0.45	
External wan	Cinderblock	0.2	- 0.002	0.45	
	Surface coating	0.02	_		
	BA13	0.013		1	
Internal wall	Glass wool	0.04	0.845		
	BA13	0.013	-		
	Tiles	0.022		0.4	
Floor	Mortar	0.05	0.415		
FIOOI	Heavy concrete	0.16	- 0.415		
	Expanded polystyrene	0.08	-		
	BA13	0.013			
Cailing	Glass wool	0.1	- 0.106	0.34	
Cenng	Air knife	0.5	- 0.190		
	Terracotta	0.01	_		
Carago coiling	BA13	0.013	3 27	0.24	
Garage centing	Terracotta	0.2	- 2.37	0.54	
Window	Double glazed	0.2	1.43	2.6	

Chabaud, Eynard, Grieu

> Modeling Design and impact Conclusion and outlook

# Modeling of lifestyle and habits

#### Conventional occupation scenario set by RT 2005

Week occupancy	Weekend occupancy
0h-10h ; 18h-24h	0h-24h

#### <u>Conventional RT 2005</u> temperature set-point

Set point	Occupancy	Non occupancy	
	periods	periods	
Heating	19°C	16°C	
Air conditioning	28°C	30°C	



#### Chabaud, Eynard, Grieu

#### IPDO, Albi, June 26-28, 2013

#### 14/23

#### **Behavior scenario**

> Modeling Design and impact Conclusion and outlook

## Production and storage systems modeling Energy mix

PV panels

Vertical-axis windmill



Chabaud, Eynard, Grieu

Context and objectives Energy management strategy Modeling Design and impact

Conclusion and outlook

Design of energy production and storage systems and grid impact

## Design of PV panels and vertical-axis windmill (no energy storage)



Chabaud, Eynard, Grieu

Conclusion and outlool

# Design of PV panels and vertical-axis windmill (no energy storage)

PV panels (kWp) Vertical axis windmill (kWp)	3-	6.9 -	3.8 11
EnR <sub>c</sub> (kWh)	3305	5345	10994
EnR <sub>inj</sub> (kWh)	1132	4860	9124
E <sub>EDF</sub> (kWh)	26078	24038	18390
% <i>sc</i> (%)	74.49	52.38	54.65
$\mathscr{W}_{EnR_{c}}(\mathscr{W})$	11.25	18.19	37.41
$J_{EnR}$ (%)	8.38	9.53	20.45
J <sub>cost</sub> (€)	-1281.30	-977.20	-468.52

		Optimized PV (6.9 kWp) vs. standard PV (3 kWp)	Optimized PV and vertical-axis windmill vs. optimized PV
	% <sub>sc</sub> (%)	<b>⊅</b> 61.7%	⊅ 50%
	E <sub>EDF</sub>	7.8% ⊻	≥ 11%
	J <sub>cost</sub> (€)	ע 25%	⊻ 52%
Chabaud, Eynard,	Grieu	IPDO, Albi, Ju	ine 26-28. 2013 17/23

Design and impact

Conclusion and outloo

Design of energy production and storage systems and grid impact

## Design of PV panels and vertical-axis windmill (no energy storage)

<u>PV: 6.9 kWp</u>





Chabaud, Eynard, Grieu

Context and objectives Energy management strategy Modeling Design and impact

Conclusion and outlook

With PV panels and batteries

With PV panels, a vertical-axis

## Design of energy production and storage systems Grid thresholds is 70%



Chabaud, Eynard, Grieu

IPDO, Albi, June 26-28, 2013

J<sub>EnR</sub> (%)

40.4

36,0

31.6

27,1

22,7

18,3

13,8

9,4

4,9

0.5

Context and objectives Energy management strategy Modeling Design and impact

Conclusion and outlook

## Design of energy production and storage systems Grid thresholds is 70%

PV panels (kWp)	6.9	8	3.8	5.8
Va. windmill	-	-	11	15
(KWP) Batteries (kWh)	40 (-)	50 (-)	200 (-)	200 (-)
EnR <sub>c</sub> (kWh)	7117 (5345)	7959 (5746)	14251 (10994)	17313 (12917)
EnR <sub>inj</sub> (kWh)	2695 (4860)	3370 (6087)	4621 (9124)	9373 (15431)
E <sub>EDF</sub> (kWh)	22266 (24038)	21425 (23638)	15132 (18390)	12070 (16466)
Estock (kWh)	2166 (-)	2717 (-)	4504 (-)	6058 (-)
%sc (%)	69.74 (52.38)	67.26 (48.56)	70.84 (54.65)	61.07 (45.57)
$\mathscr{W}_{EnR_{e}}(\mathscr{W})$	24.22 (18.19)	27.09 (19,55)	48.50 (37.41)	58.92 (43.96)
$J_{EnR}$ (%)	16.89 (9.53)	18.22 (9.49)	34.36 (20.45)	35.99 (20.03)
J <sub>cost</sub> (€)	-997.27 (-977.20)	-927.33 (-901.44)	-531.54 (-468.52)	-136.38 (-52.35)
I <sub>inj</sub> (-)	1034 (616)	1292 (762)	942 (-662)	911 (-1166)
I <sub>ext</sub> (-)	6383 (6645)	6238 (6634)	3790 (4634)	3036 (4326)
I <sub>over</sub> (-)	7417 (7261)	7529 (7396)	4732 (3972)	3947 (3160)

	Optimized batteries	%sc	∕33-39%
EnR <sub>c</sub>	∕ 33 - 39 %	J <sub>EnR</sub>	⊅ 68 - <del>9</del> 2 %
EnR <sub>inj</sub>	∖ 44 - 49 %	Jcost	20 - 100 €
E <sub>EDF</sub>	∖ 7 - 27%	Grid impact	$\nearrow I_{inj}, \searrow I_{ext}, \nearrow I_{over}$

Chabaud, Eynard, Grieu

IPDO, Albi, June 26-28, 2013

20/23

# Conclusion

Configurations promoting energy selfconsumption are highlighted

Impact of local production on the grid is minimized

Better match between decentralized production, energy needs and injection to the grid

Chabaud, Eynard, Grieu

Conclusion Outlook

# Outlook

- Energy resources, energy consumption and load of the grid forecasting
- Development of a predictive approach to improve the strategy
- Analysis of the location impact, insulation level and behavior scenarios

Chabaud, Eynard, Grieu

4th Inverse Problems, Design and Optimization Symposium, Albi, June 26-28, 2013

Optimal design of energy production and storage systems in buildings

<sup>1</sup> PROMES-CNRS, Perpignan, France

<sup>2</sup> University of Perpignan Via Domitia, Perpignan, France



**CNrS** 

Aurélie Chabaud<sup>1,2</sup> Julien Eynard<sup>1,2</sup>

Stéphane Grieu<sup>1,2</sup>