



HAL
open science

Synthesis of Solar Production and Energy Demand Profiles Using Markov Chains for Microgrid Design

Hugo Radet, Bruno Sareni, Xavier Roboam

► **To cite this version:**

Hugo Radet, Bruno Sareni, Xavier Roboam. Synthesis of Solar Production and Energy Demand Profiles Using Markov Chains for Microgrid Design. *Energies*, 2023, 16 (23), pp.7871. 10.3390/en16237871 . hal-04547778

HAL Id: hal-04547778

<https://hal.science/hal-04547778v1>

Submitted on 29 Oct 2024

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.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License

1 *Type of the Paper: Article*

2 **Synthesis of Solar Production and Energy Demand Profiles us-** 3 **ing Markov Chains for Microgrid Design**

4 **Hugo Radet¹, Bruno Sareni¹ and Xavier Roboam¹**

5 ¹ LAPLACE, Université de Toulouse, CNRS, INPT, UPS, France

6 e-mail : {radet, roboam, sareni}@laplace.univ-tlse.fr

7 * Correspondence: sareni@laplace.univ-tlse.fr

8 **Abstract:** Uncertainties related to the energy produced and consumed in smart grids especially in
9 microgrids are among the major issues for both the design and optimal management. In that context,
10 it is essential to have representative probabilistic scenarios of these environmental uncertainties.
11 The intensive development and massive installation of smart meters will help to better characterize
12 local energy consumption and production in the following years. However, models representing
13 these variables over large time scales are essential for microgrid design. In this paper, we explore a
14 simple method based on Markov chains capable of generating a large number of probabilistic pro-
15 duction or consumption profiles from available historical measurements. We show that the devel-
16 oped approach can capture the main characteristics and statistical variability of real data on both
17 short-term and long-term scales. Moreover, the correlation between both production and demand
18 is conserved in generated profiles with respect to historical measurements.

19 **Keywords:** Microgrids, uncertainties, integrated design, stochastic modeling, Markov chains, en-
20 **ergy demand, solar production**

22 **1. Introduction**

23 The design and operation of microgrids are challenging and have to be robust, espe-
24 cially because many parameters (e.g., future energy demands, renewable production,
25 electricity tariffs) are inherently uncertain. So their future values cannot be predicted with
26 perfect accuracy when making decisions during the system design phase or for setting the
27 optimal operation strategy. On one hand, the design of microgrids under uncertainty
28 might be based on stochastic programming optimization techniques [1] where a large
29 number of scenarios are required. On the other hand, once the size of the assets has been
30 fixed, short-term probabilistic forecasts might be needed for real-time operation strategies
31 to optimize the power flows between the equipment under uncertainty. For instance,
32 look-ahead control strategies [2] solve, at each time step, a multi-stage optimization prob-
33 lem, based on several probabilistic forecasts, each of them associated with a given proba-
34 bility. In both cases, a large number of data over multi-time scales are essential to accu-
35 rately solve the problems.

36 Having said that, decision-makers and modelers often lack appropriate data to run
37 the models, especially in a stochastic context. In many real case studies, no historical data
38 are available or the dataset is of poor quality only covering short periods. Therefore, de-
39 cision-makers might come up with inappropriate design decisions while modelers do not
40 have enough data to assess the design and control approaches they are implementing. To
41 overcome these difficulties, scenario generation methods have been widely implemented
42 in the literature [3, 4]. This work mainly focuses on the generation of solar production and
43 energy demands (i.e., electricity and heat) profiles at an hourly time step. However, the
44 generation procedure may be extended to a wide spectrum of environmental variables for
45 any engineering systems.

Citation: To be added by editorial staff during production.

Academic Editor: Firstname Last-name

Received: date

Revised: date

Accepted: date

Published: date



Copyright: © 2023 by the authors.

Submitted for possible open access

publication under the terms and

conditions of the Creative Commons

Attribution (CC BY) license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

46 While short-term forecasting is a relatively new topic driven by efficient real-time
47 operation needs, long-term forecasting for energy systems has been studied for a long
48 time [3]. Indeed, the latter has been used for decades to anticipate the energy demand
49 growth in order to plan future energy production and transmission infrastructures. How-
50 ever, the recent and strong development of variable renewable energy (VRE) has led to
51 new long-term forecast requirements where short temporal granularity (i.e., at an hourly
52 time step) is needed to cope with the short-time scale variability of the production [5, 6].
53 Also, as noticed by Hong et al in [3] “another important step in the recent history is the
54 transition from a deterministic to a probabilistic point of view”: taking into account the
55 variability of production and consumption in future microgrids exploiting a growing part
56 of VRE requires a shift from optimal design with regard to deterministic scenario to robust
57 design under multiple-scenarios. Generating multiple scenarios integrating the correla-
58 tions of those stochastic variables is then critical in order to assess the efficiency of the
59 microgrid design [7].

60 Recently, Mavromatidis et al [4] draw a great review of uncertainty characterization
61 for the design of distributed energy systems, which is of first interest for this work. A large
62 number of methods are documented for both the generation of solar production and en-
63 ergy demand profiles [8]. The readers could refer to this article for an in-depth discussion
64 about the different approaches. The objective of this part is to summarize the main con-
65 clusions and provide a clear insight into the direction of this paper. Therefore, the first
66 observation from their review is that the generation method depends on whether or not
67 historical data are available. These approaches can be classified into top-down (i.e., his-
68 torical data are available) and bottom-up categories, respectively. While obtaining solar
69 production data is today relatively straightforward [9], the availability of energy demand
70 measurements is generally rarer. Furthermore, the synchronicity between all environmen-
71 tal variables must be kept by the data generation method: “in the particular case of a solar
72 generator based microgrid system design, it is not the same to have a huge solar produc-
73 tion during low energy demand or on the contrary during huge consumption phase”.

74 In the top-down case, the most frequent and easiest generation method is the use of
75 probability distribution functions (PDFs), derived from historical profiles for each hour.
76 Then, a scenario is built by sampling from the PDFs. The drawback of such a method is
77 that the uncertain parameters are treated as independent random variables between con-
78 secutive time steps, which might lead to unrealistic behavior where the autocorrelation
79 and periodicity of the initial dataset are lost. To overcome this issue, more sophisticated
80 and hybrid methods have been developed such as autoregressive models [10], Markov
81 approaches [11], and machine learning based methods [12] to name just a few. The latter
82 is probably the most popular approach for both the production and energy demands
83 when large datasets are available [13]. Other recent methods are presented in [14,15].

84 On the other hand, when the case study lacks adequate energy demand measure-
85 ments (e.g., newly built buildings), physical model-based methods are usually imple-
86 mented to generate profiles. In smart building applications, the most common approaches
87 are probably the use of ready-made Building Performance Simulation (BPS) tools (e.g.,
88 energyPlus [16]), but other model-based techniques are also implemented (e.g., resistance-
89 capacitance (RC) models [17], a stochastic model where the input parameters are charac-
90 terized based on interview information [18]). More elaborate methods are derived for
91 large-scale districts where the previous approaches might not be appropriate (creating a
92 model for each building of a district is quite laborious...) [19]. In the bottom-up case, un-
93 certainty is added to the input parameters of the simulation. The drawback of these meth-
94 ods is that a non-negligible amount of development time is usually required to get familiar
95 with BPS tools and collect all the numerous input parameters. Thus, energy modelers who
96 are only seeking a fast generation method to test their design and operation algorithms
97 might be discouraged by these approaches.

98 The main objective and contribution of this work is to provide an efficient and
99 straightforward method to generate a large number of probabilistic energy production

and demand profiles when historical measurements are available. It is essential to mention that this generation method keeps the correlation between production and demand time signals which is really relevant while design and operation optimization issues are concerned. The energy modeler's perspective is deliberately adopted in this work: the focus is on creating large datasets at an hourly time step to build different microgrid design and operation algorithms. Nevertheless, the last section will show that the proposed method can capture the main statistical features and variations of real data despite the method's simplicity. Also, another important aspect is that the generation approach can be used simultaneously to generate long term scenarios for design and short-term forecasts for optimal operation purposes. Hence, the method is intended for modelers seeking a simple generation approach without spending too much time on this phase.

Therefore, the method implemented in this work is based on Markov chains over representative periods. The approach only requires historical measurements of the time series of the uncertain parameters in order to provide a wide range of contingencies. Differently from other existing works, here the states of the Markov chain are represented by multiple environmental variables, so to keep the time-relationships between them.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: the methodology for generating synthetic profiles is developed in section 2. Next, the performance of the approach is demonstrated on a microgrid in a residential case study from the Ausgrid (Australian distributor of electricity) dataset in section 3. Finally, conclusions are drawn in section 4

2. Methodology for generating synthetic profiles from historical data

The uncertain parameters (here the electricity consumption, heat demands and solar production) of multi energy systems are modeled as discrete random variables. The following work aims at providing a method to build a discrete sample space where a scenario is a sequence of all the random variable realizations over a given time horizon H , associated with a given probability.

Starting from an initial set of historical data, the method for generating synthetic and representative profiles of the random variables is illustrated by the process in Fig. 1 that can be divided into 4 different steps. The initial dataset contains the short and long term evolution of the random variables considered. Each element in this set can be defined as a sample state $X(h)$ composed of observable realizations of the underlying random variables at hour h . The finite set of observed states is called the state space. In our case, as previously mentioned, states contain 3 components: the electricity and heat demands and the PV production measurements.




Figure 1. Description of the scenario generation method based on Markov chains: from historical data (0); days are divided into representative week and week-end days for each month (1); for each hour, a given number of states is selected using a clustering algorithm (2); then the transition matrices based on the probabilities of going from one state to another between two consecutive hours are computed (3); finally, synthetic scenarios are generated by giving an initial state, a timestamp and the length of the horizon (4)

2.1. Analysis and classification of the initial dataset

This first step of the methodology (step 1 in Fig. 1) is to identify representative periods from the historical annual dataset to account for the different time scales variability. The Markov chains will be later computed over these periods. Therefore, in our case, each month of the year is considered separately to avoid losing seasonality features. Furthermore, week and weekend days of each month are considered separately, as the energy demand pattern usually depends on the working activity. One Markov chain is built for each of these representative days. Finally, each day is segmented into 23 hourly transitions to account for intraday variability (i.e., daily cycles for PV production and load demands). Thus, 552 (12 (months) \times 2 (week or week end) \times 23 (hourly transitions)) Markov chains will be computed from the historical dataset. The classification of the representative periods is depicted in Fig. 2.




Figure 2. Representative periods classification to account for the different time scales variability. Data are classified at the level of the day for each month and for all available years, distinguishing weekdays from weekends.

It should be noted that this *a priori* classification is based on both statistical exploration of the historical dataset and the intuition of the authors for taking account of deterministic features in the random variables (i.e., daily and seasonal cycles). Other more refined segmentations could probably be used by analyzing the historical data set in depth with classification methods such as [20, 21], which are out of the scope of this paper.

2.2. Data reduction using clustering


State variable data $X(h)$ associated with the same hour h of a day (week or week-end days) of the same month, for all available years, are gathered and reduced to $C_i(h)$ clusters with a clustering algorithm [22]. In practice, this can be simply carried out with the k-means [23] or k-medoids [24] methods. It should be mentioned that the components of the state variables have to be normalized in order to take account of the different scaling between load demands and PV production data. This clustering step (step 2 in Fig. 1) allows the determination of transitions matrices related to the state evolution between two consecutive hours (hourly transitions) as explained in the next section.

2.3. Data reduction using clustering

Our generation process based on Markov chains [11, 25] requires the exploitation of transition matrices related to the random states considered (step 3 in Fig. 1). As indicated in section 2.1, 23 transition matrices are built for each month and day type (week, week end day) for characterizing the evolution of the random state variables during each day. The calculation of those matrices is illustrated in Fig. 3 for a simple case of 3 clusters identified at hours h and $h+1$ from 8 historical data scenarios. In the general case, the expression of a transition matrix $T_{h+1}(i, j)$ is given by (1):

$$T_{h+1}(i, j) = \left(\frac{N(C_i(h) \rightarrow C_j(h+1))}{\text{card}(C_i(h))} \right), \quad (1)$$

where $N(C_i(h) \rightarrow C_j(h+1))$ denotes the number of elements in the cluster $C_i(h)$ going to the cluster $C_j(h+1)$, $\text{card}(C_i(h))$ being the size of the cluster $C_i(h)$. This matrix is of



185
 186 **Figure 3.** Illustration of the transition matrix calculation for a simple example with 3 clusters at
 187 hour h and $h+1$.

188 **2.4. Scenario generation**

189 In this section, we describe in details the profile synthesis process based on Markov
 190 chains (step 4 in Fig. 1). Starting from an initial cluster $C(0)$ at random, associated with the
 191 first month that has to be generated, the Markov process provides a sequence of 23 clusters
 192 over the first day using the transition matrices described in the previous section, according
 193 to (2):

$$C(0) \xrightarrow{T_1} C(1) \xrightarrow{T_2} C(2) \cdots \xrightarrow{T_h} C(h) \cdots \xrightarrow{T_{23}} C(23), \quad (2)$$

194 For each cluster $C(h)$ of the random sequence, a state $X(h) \in C(h)$ can be for instance
 195 chosen with respect to three different strategies:

- 196 1. $X(h)$ is randomly selected among all elements of the cluster $C(h)$ with uniform
 197 probability.
- 198 2. $X(h)$ is selected among all elements of the cluster $C(h)$ considering the closest distance
 199 to the previous state $X(h-1)$.
- 200 3. $X(h)$ is the medoid of the cluster: this strategy results in systematically replacing the
 201 cluster $C(h)$ by its corresponding medoid.

202 While the first strategy should certainly improve the randomness and diversity of
 203 state sequences, the second on the contrary increases the deterministic characteristics of
 204 state transitions as in persistence models [26, 27]. The third strategy consisting in only
 205 generating medoids can be considered as intermediate between the previous ones.

206 If the previous process allows the complete generation of the states over the day, the
 207 transitions between days of a same month have also to be explained. Again, three
 208 strategies can be employed similar to what was described earlier. For each day to be
 209 generated:

- 210 1. Start from an initial cluster $C(0)$ at random (i.e., random row of the first transition
 211 matrix T_1 of the month considered)
- 212 2. Start from the first cluster $C(0)$ which is the closest to the last of the previous day $C(23)$
- 213 3. Build an additional transition matrix T_{24} which characterizes the transition between
 214 consecutive days of the month in the initial dataset $T_{24}=T(X(23) \rightarrow X(0))$

215 Here again, it should be mentioned that the first strategy implies that successive days
 216 are supposed to be uncorrelated while the second induces a persistence effect. The third

strategy is probably a good compromise between the previous ones but it requires the computation of a 24th transition matrix each month. Similar strategies can also be implemented for characterizing the transitions between consecutive months or years.

In order to define $C(h+1)$ knowing $C(h)$ we apply a classical technique based on the drawing of a uniform density random number (between 0 and 1) which is compared to the sum of the probabilities of the line $C(h)$. If we take the example of the matrix in Fig. 3, let us suppose that we have $C(h) = C_2$, we draw a random number r between 0 and 1 ($r=U(0,1)$ with uniform random probability distribution):

- example 1: if $r = 0.1$ then the cluster $C(h+1) = C_2$ is chosen as successor because r greater than $p(C_1)=0$ but r lower than $p(C_1)+p(C_2)=2/3$;

- example 2: if $r=0.8$, while r is between $p(C_1)+p(C_2)$ and $p(C_1)+p(C_2)+p(C_3)$, the cluster $C(h+1)= C_3$ is chosen as successor.

As a consequence, N random draws are thus necessary to define the N sequences of transitions related to the N transition matrices.

As conclusion of this section, it is important to note that this Markov process only generates existing states of the historical data and therefore keeps the synchronicity and possible correlations between the state components (i.e., intercorrelations between PV production, heat and electricity consumption). This issue is even more important as it concerns the sizing of devices: for example, storage device sizing is driven by the difference between production and demand over the time. On the other hand, Markov based approaches are not able to predict and extrapolate extreme unforeseen behaviors (e.g. extreme weather conditions or consumption evolutions due to sudden policy changes) which are not present in the initial data set and will occur with small probabilities.

3. Evaluation on a case study

The generation method is evaluated using the Ausgrid (Australian distributor of electricity) dataset [28] where 3 years of measured energy demands and production time series (at a 30 min time step) are openly available for 300 residential customers: finally, historical data are upscaled to 1 hour resolution. In order to illustrate the generation process, the 39th customer is arbitrarily chosen. Among all the strategies presented in section 2.4, we only consider the following scheme for the scenario generation:

- clustering is carried with the k-medoid algorithm considering a fixed value of $k = 10$;
- states of each cluster are only represented by the medoids associated with random sequences of the cluster generated by the Markov process;
- transition between days in a month are performed using a 24th transition matrix.


The investigation and the comparison of other generation strategies among the ones illustrated in section 2.4 is not in the scope of the paper but naturally come in perspective of this work. While well-established metrics (e.g., root-mean-square error (RMSE), mean absolute error (MAE), etc.) are usually derived to assess the performance of short-term forecasting methods, the evaluation of long-term scenarios is less obvious at first glance. Therefore, following [11], [12] and [18] the evaluation for long-term scenarios will be based on a combination of both statistical and visual examination in comparison with the measured data.

3.1. Statistical assessment over large representative periods

To run the evaluation, Markov chains are built from the 3-year historical dataset of measured data. Then, 1000 scenarios of one year at an hourly time step are generated for the study. Fig. 4 shows the 3-year time series at an hourly time step for the electrical and thermal demands, in addition to the normalized solar production (in gray) followed by a one-year scenario generated with the Markov model (in color). Note that the first hour corresponds to the 1st of July as the season cycle is opposite to Europe. A first general

267
268
269


visual observation is that the shape of the profiles seems consistent with the measured data depicted in gray in the figure.



270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277

Figure 4. Overview of the 3-year time series from the 39th Ausgrid customer (in gray) followed by a one-year scenario generated with the Markov model (in color).

This conclusion is also verified at a lower time scale as depicted in Fig. 5 and Fig. 6. Indeed, the latter show the comparison between the real historical data and the Markov model for both the week and weekend days of each month.



278
279

Figure 5. Comparison between the Markov model (in blue) and the real historical data (in red) for each **week day** of each month. Mean values are depicted with a solid and dash line for the model and the real data, respectively. All the values are given in the background of each figure for both cases.




Figure 6. Comparison between the Markov model (in blue) and the real historical data (in red) for each **weekend day** of each month. Mean values are depicted with a solid and dash line for the model and the real data, respectively. All the values are given in the background of each figure for both cases.

As observed in the figures, it appears that the Markov model correctly reproduces both the shapes and the main statistical features of the historical dataset for each of the representative days (e.g., the model mean values match those of the historical dataset). Furthermore, the seasonal issues are accurately addressed by the model as it follows the monthly variations of the real data. This latter observation is reinforced by comparing the power level amplitudes, in addition to the sunrise and sunset times of the different months. Note that for this case study, there are no major differences between the week and weekend day energy demand patterns. This latter observation might not be true with other residential customers.

3.2. Short-time scale variability

Beyond those statistical similarities, the Markov model still introduces short time scale variability from one scenario to another as shown in Fig.7, where the energy demands and production are depicted over one week for 10 scenarios randomly chosen in July. Indeed, power values are not simultaneously the same between scenarios which leads to a wide range of contingencies. This latter aspect is of first importance when dealing with the robust design and operation under uncertainties of microgrids. Also, remember that each scenario is associated with a given probability which is computed thanks to the transition matrices (see section 2). Thus, the generation procedure is also suitable for short-term probabilistic forecasts, which can be later used by look-ahead control strategies [2] to operate microgrids.




Figure 7. Short time scale variability over one week for 10 randomly chosen scenarios in July. The mean values are depicted in red.

3.3. Quantitative comparisons

In addition to the previous qualitative comparisons, we provide in this section two quantitative criteria for characterizing our Markov synthesis process. Autocorrelation and load duration curves are computed over the 1000 scenarios generated and compared with those of the initial set of data (i.e. the 39th Ausgrid customer) for the three stochastic variables (PV generation, heat and electricity demands). It should be noted that both criteria are commonly employed for assessing the quantitative correspondence of synthesized profiles with initial sets of data (e.g. [11, 12] for the use of autocorrelation and [8, 18] for the use of load duration curves). Note that other classic statistical criteria such as Probability Density Functions (PDF) and Cumulative Density Functions (CDF) could also have been used but load duration curves are more meaningful and popular in the field of microgrid design.

Autocorrelation refers to the correlation of a time series with a lagged copy of itself. The goal is to determine if the signal shows similarities between observations at different time lags. The result is given as a function of the delay (also called lags in Fig.8). Despite the Markovian property attached to the generation method (i.e., the future state of the stochastic process only depends on the current state, without any memory of the past), the autocorrelation of the three variables is also recovered by the model as shown in Fig.8. This might be explained as Markov chains are computed for each hour of representative days, leading to realistic power level sequences. Fig.8 also shows the duration curves of the three variables. The duration curve [29] defines in abscissa the number of hours during one year for which the production or demand power is greater or equal to the value defined in ordinate. For example, one can see that the PV production has a positive value during less than 4380 hours (less than 2000 hours for the heat demand) while the electric demand is nearly always positive along the year. The area under the duration curve corresponds to the total energy consumed (or produced) over the horizon. As shown in the Fig. 8, the Markovian approach tends to generate scenarios (blue curves) with annual energy demands close to the average of the 3-year historical dataset (in red): “the synthesis

312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343

approach is then consistent in the sense of average values". Furthermore, with this representation, the values are sorted in descending order, which makes easier the comparison between the real data and the synthetic scenarios at a yearly time scale. In this sense, this indicator can be assimilated to the CDF statistical indicator. While the whole shape of the duration curves are very close comparing historical data and Markov's model, "one can also say that the statistical content of both signals are consistent on a large (yearly) time scale. Finally, the first values ($h=1$) on the left of the duration curves provide a clear information on the peak values which are also in accordance between historical data and Markov's model.




Figure 8. Autocorrelation of the three variables and Load/production duration curves for both the synthetic scenarios (in blue) and the 3-year historical dataset (in red).

To conclude this section, all these visual and statistical indicators emphasize the relevance of the Markov's synthesis process with respect to the input data (i.e., the historical data). It should be noted that, while the generated profiles are really variable on a short (daily) time scale (see Fig.7), the key statistical characteristics (e.g. mean, peak value) are recovered over the long term (annual) (see Fig.8).

4. Conclusions and perspectives

In order to generate scenarios for both long and short-term applications, a simple but relevant stochastic model based on Markov chains was presented in this paper. First, the methodology was introduced where the Markov chains are computed over representative periods to account for the different time scale variability. Then, the method was applied to a residential case study where the objective was to build several (electric and heat) energy demands and solar production scenarios. The results have shown that the main cycle and statistical features of the initial dataset have been recovered with this straightforward Markov model while introducing realistic temporal variability to the annual time series. Finally, the last section has demonstrated that the Markovian approach is also suitable to generate short-term profiles, later used to control microgrids.

374 A first perspective beyond this work may come from the classification procedure
375 manually operated to identify the representative periods. Indeed, the performance of the
376 Markov method is directly related to the expert knowledge concerning the structure and
377 patterns of the initial dataset. Other approaches (mostly based on machine learning as in
378 [12] for instance) do not require this first step and might be more relevant if little infor-
379 mation is available about the stochastic processes. Concerning the generation process, sev-
380 eral strategies were discussed in the section 2.4 but only one has been implemented. A
381 good perspective should be to compare and evaluate them with regard to their complex-
382 ity, CPU time and other performance criteria associated for example with the diversity of
383 the synthesized profiles. Furthermore, a fixed size clustering has been used while the
384 number of clusters per hour could be optimized by using metrics such as the silhouette
385 [30] or other well-known statistical criteria [31]. It seems quite obvious that the number of
386 clusters strongly differs during the day, especially between day and night (with null PV
387 production) periods.

388 Since the Markov generation model is based on “historical data”, the relevance of the
389 generated profiles clearly depends on the accuracy of these historical data. A complemen-
390 tary adaptation of the process is necessary to address prospective scenarios of data. For
391 instance, what happens if the future PV production and the energy demands increase, or
392 if the shape of the daily consumption changes due to policy changes or extreme weather
393 conditions?

394 Finally, Markov-based approaches have to be compared with other profile synthesis
395 methods (e.g. machine learning techniques or classical stochastic processes using regres-
396 sive or autoregressive models) with respect to several criteria: accuracy, complexity, CPU
397 time and sensitivity to possible errors in the initial datasets used as reference. These latter
398 points are beyond the scope of this paper but should be addressed in future works.

401 **Acknowledgements:** This work has been supported by the ADEME (French national agency on
402 environment, energy and sustainable development) in the framework of the HYMAZONIE project.

403 References

- 404 1. King, A. J. *Modeling with stochastic programming*. Springer series in operations research and financial engineering, New York: Springer, 2012.
- 405 2. Hu, J.; Shan Y.; Guerrero, J. M.; Ioinovici, A.; Chan, K. W.; Rodriguez, J. Model predictive control of microgrids – An overview,
406 *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 2021, vol. 136, pp. 1-12.
- 407 3. Hong, T.; Pinson, P.; Wang, Y.; Weron, R.; Yang, D.; Zareipour, H. Energy Forecasting: A Review and Outlook. *IEEE Open Access*
408 *Journal of Power and Energy*, 2020, vol. 7, pp. 376–388.
- 409 4. Mavromatidis, G.; Orehounig, K.; Carmeliet, J. A. review of uncertainty characterisation approaches for the optimal design of
410 distributed energy systems. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 2018, vol. 88, pp. 258–277.
- 411 5. Koltsaklis, N. E.; Dagoumas, A. S. State-of-the-art generation expansion planning: A review. *Applied Energy*, 2018, vol. 230,
412 pp. 563–589.
- 413 6. Gandoman, F. H. ; Abdel Aleem, S. H. E. ; Omar, N. ; Ahmadi, A. ; Alenezi, F. Q. Short-term solar power forecasting considering
414 cloud coverage and ambient temperature variation effects. *Renewable Energy*, 2018, vol. 123, pp. 793-805.
- 415 7. Radet, H.; Sareni, B. ; Roboam, X. On the interaction between the design and operation under uncertainties of a simple distrib-
416 uted energy system. *COMPEL-The international journal for computation and mathematics in electrical and electronic engineering*, 2022,
417 vol. 41, pp. 2084-2095.
- 418 8. Köhler, S.; Rongstock, R.; Hein, M.; Eicker, U. Similarity measures and comparison methods for residential electricity load pro-
419 files. *Energy and Building*, 2022, vol. 271, pp. 1-20.
- 420 9. Pfenninger, S.; Staffell, I. Long-term patterns of European PV output using 30 years of validated hourly reanalysis and satellite
421 data. *Energy*, 2016, vol. 114, pp. 1251–1265.
- 422 10. Debnath, K. B.; Mourshed, M. Forecasting methods in energy planning models. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 2018,
423 vol. 88, pp. 297–325.
- 424 11. Patidar, S.; Jenkins D. P.; Simpson, S. A. Stochastic modelling techniques for generating synthetic energy demand profiles.
425 *International Journal of Energy and Statistics*, 2016, vol. 04, pp. 1-26.
- 426
- 427

- 428 12. Chen, Y.; Wang, Y.; Kirschen, D.; Zhang, B. Model-Free Renewable Scenario Generation Using Generative Adversarial Net-
429 works. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 2018, vol. 33, p. 3265-3275.
- 430 13. Ghalekhondabi, I.; Ardjmand, E.; Weckman, G. R.; Young, W. A. An overview of energy demand forecasting methods pub-
431 lished in 2005–2015. *Energy Systems*, 2017, vol. 8, pp. 411–447.
- 432 14. Anvari, M.; Proedrou, E.; Schäfer, B.; Beck, C.; Kantz, H.; Timme, M. Data-driven load profiles and the dynamics of residential
433 electricity consumption, *Nature Communications*, 2022, vol. 134, pp. 1-11.
- 434 15. Salazar Duque E. M.; Vergara, P. P.; Nguyen, P. H.; van der Molen, A.; Slootweg, J.G. Conditional Multivariate Elliptical Copulas
435 to Model Residential Load Profiles From Smart Meter Data. *IEEE Trans on smart Grids*, 2021, vol. 12, pp. 4280-4293.
- 436 16. Crawley, D. B.; Pedersen, C. O.; Lawrie, L. K.; Winkelmann, F. C. EnergyPlus: Energy Simulation Program. *ASHRAE Journal*,
437 2000, vol. 42, pp. 49–56.
- 438 17. Berthou, T.; Stabat, P.; Salvazet, R.; and Marchio, D. Development and validation of a gray box model to predict thermal behav-
439 ior of occupied office buildings. *Energy and Buildings*, 2014, vol. 74, pp. 91–100.
- 440 18. Lombardi, F.; Balderrama, S.; Quoilin, S.; Colombo, E. Generating high-resolution multi-energy load profiles for remote areas
441 with an open-source stochastic model. *Energy*, 2019, vol. 177, pp. 433–444.
- 442 19. Fonseca, J. A.; Schlueter, J. Integrated model for characterization of spatiotemporal building energy consumption patterns in
443 neighborhoods and city districts. *Applied Energy*, 2015, vol. 142, pp. 247–265.
- 444 20. Agarwal, C.C. Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery Series, 2015.
- 445 21. Bouveyron, C.; Celeux, G.; Murphy T.B.; Raftery, A.E. *Model-based clustering and classification for data science: with applications*
446 *in R*. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- 447 22. Xu R.; Wunsch, D. Survey of clustering algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on neural networks*, 2005, vol. 16, pp. 645-678.
- 448 23. MacQueen, J. Some methods for classification and analysis of multivariate observations. Proc. 5th Berkeley Symp. on Mathe-
449 matical Statistics and Probability, 1967, University of California Press, pp. 281–97.
- 450 24. Schubert E.; Rousseeuw, P. J. Faster k-Medoids Clustering: Improving the PAM, CLARA, and CLARANS Algorithms. In Simi-
451 larity Search and Applications: 12th International Conference, SISAP 2019, Newark, NJ, USA, October 2–4, 2019, Proceedings
452 12, Springer International Publishing, pp. 171-187.
- 453 25. Ibe. O. *Markov processes for stochastic modeling*. 2nd edition, Elsevier Insights, 2013.
- 454 26. Chang, W. A. Literature Review of Wind Forecasting Methods. *Journal of Power and Energy Engineering*, 2014, vol. 2 pp. 161-168.
- 455 27. Zhang, Y.; Qin, C.; Srivastava, A. K.; Jin, C.; Sharma, R.K. Data-driven day-ahead PV estimation using autoencoder-LSTM and
456 persistence model. *IEEE Transactions on Industry Applications*, 2020, vol. 56, pp. 7185-7192.
- 457 28. Ratnam, E.L.; Weller, S. R.; Kellett, C. M.; Murray, A. T. Residential load and rooftop PV generation: an Australian distribution
458 network dataset. *International Journal of Sustainable Energy*, 2017, vol. 36, pp. 787–806.
- 459 29. Poulin, A.; Dostie, M.; Fournier, M.; Sansregret, S. Load duration curve: A tool for technico-economic analysis of energy solu-
460 tions", *Energy and Building*, 2008, vol. 40, pp. 29-35.
- 461 30. Rousseeuw, P. J. Silhouettes: a graphical aid to the interpretation and validation of cluster analysis, *Journal of Computational and*
462 *Mathematics*, 1987, vol. 20, pp. 53–65.
- 463 31. Sheng, W.; Swift, S.; Zhang, L.; Liu, X. A weighted sum validity function for clustering with a hybrid niching genetic algorithm.
464 *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics-Part B: Cybernetics*, 2005, vol. 35, pp. 1156–1167.