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ABSTRACT
In the energy sector, prosumers are typically houses with rooftop PV. With the drastically falling prices of PV panels, the number of installations is rising. Prosumers can have negative impacts, on power grids especially in the distribution grid. In order to mitigate this effect, and for the own benefit of the prosumers, they can function as groups sharing their resources. A literature overview is given focusing on studies that deal with this issue from the prosumer perspective, showing that many optimization studies focus on maximizing economical benefits and others on self-consumption or related indicators by means of energy management strategies and market models, most often hourly based. A case study is presented in the context of the current Danish net-metering scheme. The results show that savings for prosumers and increase of total self-consumption can be achieved by redistributing energy within the building cluster with rule-based control.
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INTRODUCTION
Prosuming buildings are buildings that both “produce” and “consume” energy (Schleicher-Tappeser, 2012). Typically the term prosumer in the energy sector refers to a house with rooftop photovoltaic (PV) panels (www.energy.gov). An estimate of 25-35% of the global cumulative installed PV capacity is at the residential level (Couture et al., 2014). Because of the high electricity tariff, PV has reached grid-parity in Denmark, like in most other European countries (Schleicher-Tappeser, 2012). In order to support renewable energy, some countries have implemented net-metering schemes for residential prosumers. This means that the surplus energy can be stored in the grid within a set period. In Denmark the net metering is on an hourly basis (www.iea.org). Electricity production at the residential level can have a negative impact on the grid, especially at the local scale, amongst others by causing overvoltage in some cases (Vallée et al., 2013). In order to mitigate this, it has been suggested to increase the self-consumption (Luthander et al., 2015). The hypothesis of this study is that the impact on the grid can be decreased and the economical benefit of the users can be increased by forming groups of single-family house prosumers A case study is carried out in the context of Danish hourly based net metering, based on a literature review.

LITERATURE REVIEW OF PROSUMER CLUSTERS
For the present literature search, a systematic search for documents containing the terms “prosumer” and “energy” on Web of Science and Scopus was done. Papers were selected based on the following two rules:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective function</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>KPI</th>
<th>reference</th>
<th>Time Step</th>
<th>Simulation Time</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>PV</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>case study</td>
<td>increase self-consumption</td>
<td>self-consumption</td>
<td>Bellekom et al., 2017</td>
<td>5 minutes</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>5 scenarios combining residential storage and peer-to-peer exchange</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maximize self-consumption</td>
<td>maximize self-consumption</td>
<td>profit</td>
<td>Broering and Madlener, 2017</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>3 scenarios in the German context varying grid-use and feed-in tariffs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>battery cloud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reduce reverse flow</td>
<td>reduce reverse flow</td>
<td>savings</td>
<td>Brusco et al., 2014</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>clustering in an energy district, energy management with trading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maximize profit</td>
<td>maximize profit</td>
<td>net revenue</td>
<td>Giuntoli and Poli, 2014</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>MILP for a VPP including prosumers</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>CHP, thermal storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-consumption maximization</td>
<td>self-consumption maximization</td>
<td>demand and supply ratio</td>
<td>Liu et al., 2016</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>12 hours</td>
<td>dynamic pricing in non-cooperative game</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Demand response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maximize profit</td>
<td>maximize profit</td>
<td>net loads and profits</td>
<td>Ma et al., 2016</td>
<td>½ hour</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>heuristic method to reach Stackelberg equilibrium</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>CHP, Demand response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimize cost</td>
<td>minimize cost</td>
<td>cost and spillage savings</td>
<td>Martin-Martinez et al., 2016</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>12 representative days</td>
<td>MCP for prosumers in microgrid; game theory in imperfect competition case</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Demand response, thermal storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limit power flows</td>
<td>limit power flows</td>
<td>PV hosting capacity</td>
<td>Palacios-Garcia et al., 2017</td>
<td>1 minute</td>
<td>4 days</td>
<td>increasing self-consumption, soft and hard curtailment</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimize dispatch with constraints</td>
<td>optimize dispatch with constraints</td>
<td>cost savings, self-consumption</td>
<td>Rigo-Marian et al., 2014</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>heuristic methods; sequential forecast; microgrid</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investment resiliency</td>
<td>investment resiliency</td>
<td>cost savings</td>
<td>Sanduleac et al., 2017</td>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>Uni-directional Resilient Consumer (UniRCon) architecture</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimize loss of delivery and cost</td>
<td>minimize loss of delivery and cost</td>
<td>delivery loss, self-consumption, cost</td>
<td>Sha, Aiello, 2016</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>24 hours</td>
<td>flow optimization with &quot;Arc Dynamic Direction Matrix&quot;</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Wind turbines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimize cost</td>
<td>minimize cost</td>
<td>simple payback period</td>
<td>Tedesco et al., 2015</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Economic MPC for prosumer microgrid; battery lifetime considered</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Wind turbines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maximize local consumption</td>
<td>maximize local consumption</td>
<td>local consumption</td>
<td>Velik, Nicolay, 2014 &amp; 2015</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>modified simulated annealing triple-optimizer/cognitive decision agent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maximize social welfare</td>
<td>maximize social welfare</td>
<td>power imbalance</td>
<td>Verschae et al., 2016</td>
<td>10 minutes</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>coordinated management approach based on ADMM</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>Demand response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three objectives translated to total annualised cost</td>
<td>three objectives translated to total annualised cost</td>
<td>cost, CO2 and unavailability</td>
<td>Wouters et al., 2017</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>MILP for system design of small neighborhood</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>CHP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ES = Electric Storage, MILP = Mixed Integer Linear Programming, VPP = Virtual Power Plant, MCP = Mixed Complementarity Problem, ADMM = Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers, CHP = Combined Heat and Power KPI = Key Performance Indicator
1) included Q1 and Q2 journal papers focusing on groups of residential grid-connected prosumers of electricity from renewable energy sources and 2) excluded the papers that focus on design of trading models, clustering method, demand response models, social science, politics or business, or has a more general viewpoint. An overview is given in Table 1. As can be seen, in the recent years, the number of optimization studies about energy prosumers has been growing rapidly. The objective function in most of these studies is either an economical indicator related to the interest of each prosumer or the prosumer cluster, or a grid-related indicator like maximizing the self-consumption or local consumption. These two objectives are correlated and studies that choose one often pick the other as a key performance indicator. In most studies, the focus is on the operational costs, as opposed to investments. It is difficult to compare the efficiency of the employed methods directly, as different system setups are used. The time step of the simulation is commonly one hour and the simulation time 24 hours. Also, the consumption profiles used are often generic ones, scaled down from national domestic consumption. Based on the above literature study, both economic benefits and self-consumption were chosen as indicators for this study. A one minute based time step is used with the simulation run for one year, in order to gain a helicopter view of the prosumer cluster.

**METHODS**

**Consumption profiles and PV electricity generation**

The energy consumption in one minute resolution for 2015 was generated with the open source generator “CREST Demand Model” provided by McKenna & Thomson (2016). Three single family houses of the same building type and each with four residents but with different orientations were considered. The house type was defined by “building index 1” in the CREST Demand Model, which is a detached house of 136 m².

The PV production was simulated with TRNSYS. For the weather file, a Meteonorm generated typical meteorological year for Copenhagen Taastrup was used. The Parameters for the PV panel were taken from the datasheet for REC (www.recgroup.com), for a panel with a nominal power of 300W. The model for PV production was validated by comparing the efficiency of the Panel in the simulation against the efficiency stated by the manufacturer.

**Setup for simulation scenarios**

The three single family houses were oriented towards east, south and west, respectively (see figure 1). The slope of the roofs with the PV panels installed was set to 55°, which is close to the latitude of Copenhagen, as recommended for all-year round PV systems with a fixed slope (Agrawal & Tiwari, 2009; Phadke, 2010). Each house was simulated with 10 PV-modules of 1.67 m², and a total PV installation of 16.7 m² aperture area. Two scenarios were considered: 1) base case scenario, in which each house is operated separately, and 2) cluster scenario, in which a common controller is used to redistribute energy flows from houses with excess production to houses with energy deficiency. This flow redistribution was performed in each simulation step.

Figure 1. – Houses with orientations
Control algorithm for energy flow redistribution

Rule-based control was used for the flow redistribution. If any house has production at a given time, covering one’s own demand is prioritized. After subtracting the energy use from the respective productions in a time step, the net energy flows are assessed and if there is simultaneous surplus and deficit, the surplus is then sent to the house with energy deficit. The prioritization is based on the absolute value of surplus or deficit, meaning electricity is first sent to/from the one with the larger deficit/surplus.

The indicators for the evaluation are self-consumption and electricity cost savings. Self-consumption is defined as the ratio of the momentary consumption of the power produced on-site (Luthander et al., 2015). It was calculated according to the following equations:

\[
E_{SC}^{time \ step} = \min(E_{prod}^{time \ step}, E_{cons}^{time \ step})
\]

\[
SC = \frac{E_{SC}^y}{E_{prod}^y}
\]

Where \( E_{SC}^{time \ step} \) is the self-consumed energy in each time step, \( E_{prod}^{time \ step} \) is the energy produced and \( E_{cons}^{time \ step} \) is the energy consumed in each time step. \( SC \) is the self-consumption ratio, \( E_{SC}^y \) is the yearly total self-consumed energy and \( E_{prod}^y \) the yearly total energy produced on-site. In the second scenario, the effective self-consumption \( SC_{eff} \) (or local consumption), for each house was based on the effective consumption (or local consumption of the energy produced by that house) \( E_{ec,i}^{time \ step} \), calculated as in equation (3), and the on-site production of each house, as in the base case scenario.

\[
E_{ec,i}^{time \ step} = E_{cons,i}^{time \ step} + flow_{i}^{time \ step}
\]

\[
SC_{eff} = \frac{E_{ec,i}^y}{E_{prod,i}^y}
\]

Where \( flow_{i}^{time \ step} \) represents the total redirected flow from the given house \( i \) to other houses. The Danish Net-metering scheme is hour-based (iea.org), making it one of the most restrictive carryover provisions. This was taken into account when modelling the cash flow. When the net hourly energy was positive, it was multiplied with the feed-in tariff of 0.07 €. When it was negative it was multiplied with the retail electricity price of 0.31 €. Due to this difference, there is incentive to self-consume as much of the produced electricity as possible, in order to make the PV installation more profitable.

RESULTS

Self-consumption in the building cluster

Table 2. shows the self-consumption and its relative increase after clustering the three buildings and redirecting the surplus flows. The total self-consumption (or local consumption) is based on the total instantaneous production and the total instantaneous consumption.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Separate scenario</th>
<th>Clustered scenario</th>
<th>Increased, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House 1</td>
<td>40.56</td>
<td>54.41</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House 2</td>
<td>36.91</td>
<td>51.07</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House 3</td>
<td>44.14</td>
<td>57.61</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40.15</td>
<td>52.93</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Electricity cost and savings
The calculated yearly electricity cost for each house, and in total, are presented in Table 3. For reference, the electricity cost without installed PV panels is shown in the third column. Based on this reference the savings were calculated for both the base case scenario and the clustered scenario. These can be seen in Table 4. The increase in savings of the clustered scenario is calculated in comparison with the separate scenario. The yearly electricity cost is reduced after clustering, with the increase in self-consumption. This is because the retail price of electricity from the grid is higher than the feed-in tariff for surplus electricity sent to the grid.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline case (no PV)</th>
<th>Separate scenario</th>
<th>Clumped scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House 1</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>1121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House 2</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House 3</td>
<td>1661</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>1138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>4809</td>
<td>3564</td>
<td>3276</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSIONS
In order to represent the grid-impact and the instantaneous self-consumption more accurately, in this study a time step of 1 minute was used, simulated over a year. The case setup was a simple example to give an indication of the effect on the correlation of the savings with the grid-impact reduction for the given tariff scheme. In this case study, it was assumed that the three houses freely share their surplus energy with rule-based control. The increase in self-consumption was slightly higher than the increase in electricity cost savings. The difference in savings is expected to be more pronounced with no net-metering. In this study the houses had a similar production and shared their surplus production freely and it was not necessary to consider the local trading dynamics. For a more general case, a remuneration has to be agreed upon, with a price between the feed-in tariff and the retail price. Additional wiring and controller costs for the local redistribution should be considered for making a more comprehensive economical analysis that also includes investment costs, for example by calculating the Net Present Value (NPV). This calculation was out of scope for this study. Some technologies for smart grids that enable local energy management are still in early stages and are expected to become more affordable in the future.

CONCLUSIONS
A literature overview was presented, focusing on studies about groups of prosuming buildings with PVs. It was found that most previous studies were on an hourly basis with a 24 hour time-frame. In those studies, both impact on grids and economic gains for users were often investigated. A case study of three prosumer houses was conducted under Danish hourly net metering conditions. Simulations were run for one year to investigate the effect of energy distribution within this building cluster. In the clustered scenario, self-consumption ratio increased 32% in total, indicating a decrease of the impact on the grid. Electricity cost savings with respect to the baseline case with no local production were calculated for both scenarios. In the clustered scenario, the savings increased 23% compared to the separated scenario. It is in line with the expectations that the savings increased when the self-consumption increased, as
the electricity retail price is higher than the feed-in tariff. The control in the current study is rule-based. In further research MPC for buildings will be considered with flexible electric load.
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