Multi-objective optimization of an energy community: an integrated and dynamic approach for full decarbonisation in the European Alps

Supplementary material

Diego Viesi^{*a}, Md Shahriar Mahbub^b, Alessandro Brandi^a, Jakob Zinck Thellufsen^c, Poul Alberg Østergaard^e, Henrik Lund^e, Marco Baratieri^d, Luigi Crema^a

a Fondazione Bruno Kessler (FBK), Via Sommarive 18, 38123 Povo (TN), Italy

b Ahsanullah University of Science & Technology (AUST), Love Road 141&142, Tejgaon Industrial Area, Dhaka-1208, Bangladesh

c Aalborg University, Rendsburggade 14, DK-9000 Aalborg, Denmark

d University of Bozen-Bolzano, Faculty of Science and Technology, Universitätsplatz 5 - Piazza Università, 5, 39100 Bozen-Bolzano (BZ), Italy

Supplementary Material A

Input data for the use of EnergyPLAN in the CEIS case study

Table 1: National electricity grid production mix. Electricity generation efficiency from fossil fuels considered equal to 45% in 2018, 53% in 2030 and 56% in 2050 (**[1]***,* **[2]** *).*

Table 2: Efficiencies.

^{*} Corresponding Author, viesi@fbk.eu

Table 3: CAPEX.

*Heating demand per unit = 15000 kWh/year

Table 4: OPEX.

Small Solar Thermal	$\frac{0}{0}$ CAPEX	1.24	1.36	1.44	EnergyPLAN ^[12]
Solar Heat Storage	$\frac{0}{0}$ CAPEX	0.7	0.7	0.7	EnergyPLAN [12]
Individual Oil/LPG/Gas/Biomass Boilers	$\frac{0}{0}$ CAPEX	4.17	4.17	4.17	IEA $[5]$
Individual Hydrogen Boilers	$\frac{0}{0}$ CAPEX		4.17	4.17	IEA $[5]$
Individual Heat Pump	$\frac{0}{0}$ CAPEX	0.94	1.03	1.09	IEA [5]
Small Gas CHP	$\frac{0}{0}$ CAPEX		3.91	3.99	EnergyPLAN [12]
Small Bio CHP	$\frac{0}{0}$ CAPEX		0.83	0.85	EnergyPLAN [12]
DH	$\frac{0}{0}$ CAPEX		0.76	0.76	EnergyPLAN [12]
Energy Efficient Building Envelopes LC (MWh)	$\frac{0}{0}$ CAPEX	θ	θ	$\mathbf{0}$	IEA [5]
Alkaline Electrolyzer	$\frac{0}{0}$ CAPEX		9.0	11.0	IEA [8]
Fuel cell P2P	$\frac{0}{0}$ CAPEX		9.0	11.0	IEA [8]
H ₂ Storage	$\frac{0}{0}$ CAPEX		9.0	11.0	IEA [8]
Battery	$\frac{0}{0}$ CAPEX		1.5	2.31	IEA $[9]$
$ICEV + Ref. Station$	$\frac{0}{0}$ CAPEX	2.47	2.31	2.08	FIF [10]
$BEV + Ch.$ Station	$\frac{0}{0}$ CAPEX		1.19	1.36	FIF [10]
$FCEV + Ref. Station$	$\frac{0}{0}$ CAPEX		2.5	3.04	FIF [10]

Table 5: Lifetimes.

Table 7: CO2 emissions of energy carriers.

Supplementary Material B

CEIS energy system: hourly profiling of productions, demands and national electricity market

Supplementary Material C

Input data for the years 2030 and 2050

To evaluate the CEIS decarbonisation scenarios for the years 2030 and 2050 with the framework EnergyPLAN+MOEA, it is necessary to provide the same type of input data of the Baseline 2018: energy demands in the three sectors (thermal, electrical, transport), available technologies (decision variables) for energy production, energy storage and energy efficiency, together with their respective efficiencies, CAPEX, OPEX, lifetimes, energy carriers cost and emission factors.

Concerning the energy demands, the input data for the years 2030 and 2050 is obtained considering the trend of the population, the reduction of the space heating demand due to building renovations and a projection of the historical trend of "pure" electricity consumption.

Starting from the thermal demand, its trend is linked to two factors: trend of the population and trend of the building renovations (Table 8). The trend of the population in the CEIS area is assumed to be the same of the Province of Trento which is provided by Istituto nazionale di statistica – ISTAT [22]. In a first analysis it is assumed that the thermal demand for SH, HSW and cooking follows the same trend of the population. Then, SH energy savings are considered in each year due to the renovation of the buildings, assuming the LC trend of the PEAP study for the Province of Trento [23].

Table 8: Analysis of the trend of the thermal demand in the CEIS area. Q_{SH} = thermal demand for space heating, Q_{HSW} = thermal demand for hot sanitary water, $Q_{COOKING}$ *= thermal demand for cooking,* Q_{TOT} *= total thermal demand.*

Year	2018	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050
CEIS	8371	8426	8658	8878	9079	9246	9368	9433
population								
Energy eff.	0.539	0.655	0.673	0.690	0.706	0.719	0.728	0.733
build env.								
CEIS LC								
(GWh/year)								
Q_{SH}	36.11	35.03	32.63	30.01	27.16	24.07	20.74	17.22
(GWh/year)								
Q HSW	8.30	8.36	8.59	8.81	9.01	9.17	9.29	9.36
(GWh/year)								
QCOOKING	3.38	3.40	3.50	3.59	3.67	3.74	3.79	3.81
(GWh/year)								
Q TOT	47.79	46.79	44.72	42.41	39.84	36.98	33.82	30.39
\int (GWh/year)								

Regarding the electrical demand, its trend is linked both to the demographic trend and to the projection of the historical trend of "pure" electricity consumption. This historical trend includes the effect of both electrical efficiency measures (e.g., LED lighting and more efficient household appliances), and the growing demand for "pure" electricity (e.g., for more lighting services, greater use of household appliances, electricity consumption in the artisan and industrial sectors). Considering the period 2010-2019, the electricity consumption grows from 28.18 GWh/year to 29.23 GWh/year (+0.413% per year) while the population decreases from 8369 to 8334 inhabitants (-0.042% per year). Therefore, the historical trend of increase in "pure" electricity consumption per capita is equal to $+0.455\%$ per year. In this way, starting from 2019 (which is the last year with available data that are not influenced by the COVID-19 pandemic) it is possible to reconstruct a prediction of the "pure" electrical demand in the CEIS area for the future years until 2050 (Table 9).

Table 9: Analysis of the trend of the "pure" electricity demand in the CEIS area. E_{e,CEIS} = "pure" electricity demand.

Year	2019	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050
$E_{\rm e,CEIS}$	29.23	30.99	32.49	33.96	35.36	36.63	27.72 31.IZ
(GWh/year)							

The transport energy demand is evaluated on the base of the annual distance in Mkm travelled by the vehicles of the CEIS area. In the Baseline 2018 this value is equal to:

$$
d_{CEIS\; vehicles\;Base} = \frac{E_{P,trans\;CEIS\;tot\;Base}}{\eta_{diesel\;cars\;Base}} = \frac{65.73\;GWh}{0.538\;GWh/Mkm} = 122.17\;Mkm
$$

where:

- \bullet $d_{CEIS\ vehicles\ Base}$ is the "ideal" distance (Mkm) travelled by the vehicles of the CEIS area in the Baseline 2018 in order to consume all the primary energy of the transport sector, if they would be all diesel cars
- \bullet $E_{P, trans \text{ } CEIS \text{ } tot \text{ } Base}$ is the total primary energy of the transport sector in the CEIS area in the Baseline 2018 expressed in GWh
- \bullet $\eta_{diesel \, cars \, Base}$ is the average efficiency of the diesel cars in the Baseline 2018 expressed in GWh/Mkm.

Then, the annual distance travelled in the future by the vehicles of the CEIS area (Table 10) is projected following the trend of the population $(+3.4\% \text{ by } 2030 \text{ and } +11.9\% \text{ by } 2050)$.

The calculation of the number of km travelled in one year is done supposing that all the vehicles are cars and with this approach it is also possible to obtain the number of equivalent vehicles supposing that each car travels 12900 km/year. The number of equivalent vehicles (Table 10) is used for the analysis of CAPEX and OPEX.

Table 10: Analysis of the trend of the transport demand in the CEIS area. d_{trans CEIS} = annual distance travelled by the vehicles of the CEIS *area, nequivalent vehicles = number of equivalent vehicles.*

Year	2018	2020	2025	2030	2035	2040	2045	2050
$\mathbf{a}_{\text{trans}}$ CEIS (Mkm/year)	122.17	22.97	26.36	.29.57	132.50	134.95	136.72	137.67
$n_{\text{equivalent}}$ vehicles	9471	9532	9796	10044	10271	10461	10598	10672

Supplementary Material D

MOEA boundaries in the four types of simulation scenarios

*Table 11: MOEA boundaries of scenario S1. * thermal demand.*

*Table 12: MOEA boundaries of scenario S2. * thermal demand.*

TECHNOLOGY		2030	2050	
		MOEA LB MOEA HB MOEA LB MOEA HB		
ELECTRICAL SECTOR				
Hydro (kW)	3339	4732	2016	4732

PV (kW)	4820	81256	$\mathbf{0}$	88192
Biogas (kW)	182	350	$\mathbf{0}$	350
Battery (kW)	$\boldsymbol{0}$	20000	$\boldsymbol{0}$	30000
Battery (MWh)	$\boldsymbol{0}$	40	$\boldsymbol{0}$	60
Import (kW)	$\boldsymbol{0}$	9999999	$\boldsymbol{0}$	9999999
Export (kW)	$\boldsymbol{0}$	9999999	$\mathbf{0}$	9999999
HYDROGEN SECTOR				
Bl-Tr Hydrogen Electrolyser (kW)		defined by EnergyPLAN		defined by EnergyPLAN
Bl-Tr Hydrogen Storage (MWh)	$\boldsymbol{0}$	100	$\boldsymbol{0}$	100
P2P Hydrogen Electrolyser (kW)	$\boldsymbol{0}$	2000	$\mathbf{0}$	2000
P2P Hydrogen Fuel Cell (kW)	$\boldsymbol{0}$	2000	$\boldsymbol{0}$	2000
P2P Hydrogen Storage (MWh)	$\boldsymbol{0}$	500	$\boldsymbol{0}$	500
CHP + THERMAL SECTOR				
Energy eff. build. env. (GWh)	17.826		21.249	
Solar thermal* (GWh)	0.523	437.021	0.000	475.262
Heat Pump* (GWh)	0.854	42.407	0.000	30.391
CHP-DH biomass* (GWh)	0.000	42.407	0.000	30.391
CHP-DH gas* (GWh)	0.000	42.407	0.000	30.391
Boiler oil* (GWh)	9.741	42.407	0.000	30.391
Boiler LPG* (GWh)	4.904	42.407	0.000	30.391
Boiler gas* (GWh)	0.000	42.407	0.000	30.391
Boiler biomass* (GWh)	9.944	16.142	0.000	11.568
Boiler hydrogen* (GWh)	0.000	42.407	0.000	30.391
Solar Heat Storage (in days of average heat demand)	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\overline{2}$	$\boldsymbol{0}$	$\overline{2}$
TRANSPORT SECTOR				
Transport el (Mkm)	$\boldsymbol{0}$	129.572	$\boldsymbol{0}$	137.674
Transport H2 (Mkm)	$\boldsymbol{0}$	129.572	$\boldsymbol{0}$	137.674
Transport diesel (Mkm)	25.914	129.572	$\boldsymbol{0}$	137.674

*Table 13: MOEA boundaries of scenario S3. * thermal demand.*

P2P Hydrogen Fuel Cell (kW)	Ω	2000	$\mathbf{0}$	2000
P2P Hydrogen Storage (MWh)	$\mathbf{0}$	500	$\mathbf{0}$	500
CHP + THERMAL SECTOR				
Energy eff. build. env. (GWh)		17.826		21.249
Solar thermal* (GWh)	0.523	437.021	0.000	475.262
Heat Pump* (GWh)	0.854	42.407	0.000	30.391
CHP-DH biomass* (GWh)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
CHP-DH gas* (GWh)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Boiler oil* (GWh)	9.741	42.407	0.000	30.391
Boiler LPG* (GWh)	4.904	42.407	0.000	30.391
Boiler gas* (GWh)	0.000	42.407	0.000	30.391
Boiler biomass* (GWh)	9.944	16.142	0.000	11.568
Boiler hydrogen* (GWh)	0.000	42.407	0.000	30.391
Solar Heat Storage (in days of average heat demand)	Ω	$\overline{2}$	θ	2
TRANSPORT SECTOR				
Transport el (Mkm)	Ω	129.572	$\mathbf{0}$	137.674
Transport H2 (Mkm)	$\mathbf{0}$	129.572	$\mathbf{0}$	137.674
Transport diesel (Mkm)	25.914	129.572	θ	137.674

*Table 14: MOEA boundaries of scenario S4. * thermal demand.*

Supplementary Material E

MOEA boundaries

Here below are reported some general considerations that are valid for all scenarios. Moreover, Supplementary Materials D details the MOEA boundaries of the four types of simulation scenarios, each with two time steps corresponding to 2030 and 2050.

For what concerns the productions and the storage of the electrical sector, the choices are as follows:

- The higher boundary of the hydroelectric power is equal to the sum of the Baseline 2018 (4132 kW) and one possible future plant with a power of 600 kW
- The higher boundary of the PV power is calculated considering a maximum potential installation in the CEIS area based on 50% of the available roofs surface¹ and a local yield in kW/m^2
- The higher boundary of the biogas power is set at the Baseline 2018 level since there is no expansion planned
- The higher boundary of the battery storage capacity (MWh) is considered initially equal to the annual electricity export of the CEIS area in the Baseline 2018 and then reduced to a value close to the optimal results of some preliminary tests (in order to reduce the search space of the MOEA to values close to the optimized ones), the only exception is S4 where batteries are not considered
- The battery storage power (kW) is set to be half of the battery storage capacity in S1, S2 and S3
- The higher boundaries of the electrical import and export are considered practically unlimited (9999999 kW), to enable the simulation of energy systems free to exchange electricity with the external grid.

The higher boundaries for the hydrogen sector are defined in this way:

 For the power of the electrolyser for boilers (blending) and transport (FCEV) these are defined autonomously by EnergyPLAN as the minimum size to meet the demand for hydrogen boilers and FCEVs, considering also the storage size (the decision variable of the next point)

For the storage of hydrogen for boilers (blending) and transport (FCEV) these are considered initially equal to the annual electricity export of the CEIS area in the Baseline 2018 and then reduced to a value close to the optimal results of some preliminary tests (in order to reduce the search space of the MOEA to values close to the optimized ones)

- For the power of the electrolyser for power to power (P2P) these are considered initially equal to the maximum power exported from the CEIS grid in the Baseline 2018 and then reduced to a value close to the optimal results of some preliminary tests (in order to reduce the search space of the MOEA to values close to the optimized ones)
- For the power of the fuel cell for P2P these are considered initially equal to the maximum power imported to the CEIS grid in the Baseline 2018 and then reduced to a value close to the optimal results of some preliminary tests (in order to reduce the search space of the MOEA to values close to the optimized ones)
- For the storage of hydrogen for P2P these are considered initially equal to the annual electricity export of the CEIS area in the Baseline 2018 and then reduced to a value close to the optimal results of some preliminary tests (in order to reduce the search space of the MOEA to values close to the optimized ones).

¹ With a conservative approach, it is considered that only 50% of the roofs surface in the CEIS area can be used for the installation of PV or solar thermal. The remaining 50% is deemed unsuitable for unfavorable exposure or other obstacles (e.g., chimneys). Moreover, following the current legislation in the Province of Trento, PV or solar thermal systems on the ground are not allowed; the only exception is 1 existing CEIS PV plant called "Sol de Ise" with a power of 637 kW.

As regards CHP and the thermal sector, the following considerations are made:

- The energy savings from the renovation of the building envelopes have no lower or higher boundaries but a single value calculated as explained in the Supplementary Materials C , assuming the LC trend of the PEAP for the Province of Trento [23]
- The higher boundary of the solar thermal is calculated considering a maximum potential installation in the CEIS area based on 50% of the available roofs surface and a local yield in kWh/m^2 , the only exception is S4 where is the residual installed capacity considering the lifetime and the replacement rate
- The heat pump higher boundary is the total thermal demand both in 2030 and 2050 for scenarios S1, S2 and S3, while in S4 is the residual installed capacity considering the lifetime and the replacement rate
- The biomass CHP with DH higher boundary is the total thermal demand both in 2030 and 2050 for scenarios S1 and S2, while in S3 and S4 is not considered (no DH)
- The natural gas CHP with DH higher boundary is the total thermal demand both in 2030 and 2050 for scenarios S1, S2 and S4, while in S3 is not considered (no DH)
- The higher boundaries for all the types of boilers (oil, LPG, gas, hydrogen), except the biomass boilers, are the total thermal demand both in 2030 and 2050 in all scenarios
- The biomass boilers higher boundary is calculated, both in 2030 and 2050, in a different way: in S1 is the total thermal demand, in S2 and S3 maintain the same percentage of the Baseline 2018 (38% of the total thermal demand), in S4 is the residual installed capacity considering the lifetime and the replacement rate
- The solar thermal storage, expressed in days of average heat demand, can range from zero to the whole year in S1 and from zero to two days in S2, S3 and S4.

For the transport sector the boundaries are set in terms of Mkm/year for each considered technology:

- BEV: the higher boundary is the total transport demand, both in 2030 and 2050, for scenarios S1, S2 and S3, while in S4 is not considered (only FCEV vs ICEV)
- FCEV: the higher boundary is the total transport demand, both in 2030 and 2050, for all scenarios
- ICEV: the higher boundary is the total transport demand, both in 2030 and 2050, for all scenarios.

Supplementary Materials F

Extra formulas (additional algorithms for model adjustment)

In order to accurately evaluate total annual costs and $CO₂$ emissions of CEIS energy scenarios in 2030 and 2050, it is necessary to include some extra formulas (additional algorithms) in the EnergyPLAN+MOEA framework to overcome some limitations of EnergyPLAN:

- The CAPEX and OPEX of the two types of CHP connected to DH (biomass and gas) in EnergyPLAN are set to zero and they are calculated using extra formulas. This is done in order to differentiate the costs of these two types of CHP, something not possible with EnergyPLAN in the individual heating screen
- The hydrogen boilers are considered in EnergyPLAN as "H2 micro-CHP", with CAPEX and OPEX set to zero and calculated using extra formulas (for the same reasons mentioned above)
- For FCEV, solar thermal storage and building energy efficiency there are no direct ways to consider CAPEX and OPEX in EnergyPLAN, these are therefore included with specific extra-formulas
- Electricity distribution costs are considered as variable costs with a specific extra formula that includes a 41% discount for locally produced and self-consumed electricity (this discount is not activated on imports)
- H2 distribution costs are considered as variable costs with a specific extra formula, a function of the hydrogen demand of the H2 boilers and of the same distribution cost considered at national level for natural gas
- \bullet Two specific extra formulas consider the CO₂ emissions related to oil and gas included in the national electricity generation mix and associated with the CEIS import
- Finally, an extra formula is dedicated to a particular constraint to be respected: the sum of the surfaces of PV and solar thermal installations cannot exceed 50% of the surface of the roofs in the CEIS area (higher boundary). Therefore, PV and solar thermal are two competing technologies to occupy the same roofs of the CEIS buildings.

Supplementary Material G

CEIS energy system: results of the EnergyPLAN+MOEA scenarios in S1 2050, S2 2030, S2 2050, S3 2030, S3 2050, S4 2030, S4 2050

1.20

1.40

1.60

1.80

8 $\sqrt{6}$ $\overline{4}$ $\overline{2}$ $\,0\,$

 0.00

 0.20

 0.40

 0.60

 0.80

 1.00

CO2 emission (t/year inhabitant)

· LPGBoil · OilBoil · NGasBoil · BioBoil · H2Boil · NGasCHP · BioCHP · HP · SolarTh

References

- [1] *https://www.gse.it/dati-e-scenari/monitoraggio-fer/monitoraggio-nazionale/settore-elettrico,* Accessed 13/12/2022.
- [2] *MISE, 2018. Proposta di piano nazionale integrato per l'energia e il clima,* https://www.mise.gov.it/images/stories/documenti/Proposta_di_Piano_Nazionale_Integrato_per_Energia _e_il_Clima_Italiano.pdf.
- [3] *IEA, 2014. Technology Roadmap. Solar Photovoltaic Energy,* https://www.iea.org/reports/technologyroadmap-solar-photovoltaic-energy-2014.
- [4] *IEA, 2012. Technology Roadmap. Bioenergy for Heat and Power,* https://www.iea.org/reports/technology-roadmap-bioenergy-for-heat-and-power.
- [5] *IEA, 2011. Technology Roadmap. Energy-efficient Buildings: Heating and Cooling Equipment,* https://www.iea.org/reports/technology-roadmap-energy-efficient-buildings-heating-and-coolingequipment.
- [6] *https://www.airu.it/teleriscaldamento/,* Accessed 13/12/2022.
- [7] *ENEA, 2018. Le detrazioni fiscali del 65% per la riqualificazione energetica del patrimonio edilizio esistente - Rapporto Annuale 2018 (Dati 2017),* https://www.efficienzaenergetica.enea.it/pubblicazioni/rapporto-annuale-detrazioni-fiscali/le-detrazionifiscali-del-65-per-la-riqualificazione-energetica-del-patrimonio-edilizio-esistente.html.
- [8] *IEA, 2015. Technology Roadmap. Hydrogen and Fuel Cells,* https://www.iea.org/reports/technologyroadmap-hydrogen-and-fuel-cells.
- [9] *IEA, 2014. Technology Roadmap. Energy storage,* https://www.iea.org/reports/technology-roadmapenergy-storage.
- [10] *Cambridge Econometrics, 2018. Fuelling Italy's Future: How the transition to lowcarbon mobility strengthens the economy,* https://www.camecon.com/what/our-work/fuelling-italys-future/.
- [11] *IEA, 2012. Technology Roadmap. Hydropower,* https://www.iea.org/reports/technology-roadmaphydropower.
- [12] *D Connolly, 2015. ENERGYPLAN COST DATABASE. Version 3.0,* https://www.energyplan.eu/useful_resources/costdatabase/.
- [13] *https://dgsaie.mise.gov.it/,* Accessed 13/12/2022.
- [14] *https://www.iea.org/etp/etpmodel/assumptions/,* Accessed 13/12/2022.
- [15] *https://www.arera.it/it/prezzi.htm,* Accessed 13/12/2022.
- [16] *https://www.aielenergia.it/,* Accessed 13/12/2022.
- [17] *https://www.mercatoelettrico.org/It/Default.aspx,* Accessed 13/12/2022.
- [18] *http://www.rse-web.it/home.page,* Accessed 13/12/2022.
- [19] *https://ec.europa.eu/energy/en/topics/energy-strategy-and-energy-union,* Accessed 13/12/2022.
- [20] *http://www.rse-web.it/home.page,* Accessed 13/12/2022.
- [21] *Covenant of Mayors, 2016. The Covenant of Mayors for Climate and Energy Reporting Guidelines,* https://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/handle/JRC103031.
- [22] *https://www.istat.it/en/,* Accessed 13/12/2022.
- [23] *Viesi, D., Crema, L., Mahbub, M.S., Verones, S., Brunelli, R., Baggio, P., Fauri, M., Prada, A., Bello, A., Nodari, B. and Silvestri, S., 2020. Integrated and dynamic energy modelling of a regional system: A costoptimized approach in the deep decarbonisation of the Province of Trento (Italy). Energy, 209, p.118378, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2020.118378*.