

The effect of time-of-use tariffs on the demand response flexibility of an all-electric smart-grid-ready dwelling

Fabiano Pallonetto^{a,*}, Simeon Oxizidis^b, Federico Milano^c, Donal Finn^d

^a*Electricity Research Centre University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland*

^b*International Energy Research Centre, Tyndall National Institute, Cork, Ireland*

^c*School of Electrical & Electronic Engineering, University College Dublin, Dublin, Ireland*

^d*School of Mechanical and Materials Engineering - University College Dublin, Ireland*

^e*room 338, Eng.Building - Electricity Research Centre, University College Dublin, Belfield, Dublin 4, Ireland*

Abstract

The paper is concerned with the development and evaluation of control algorithms for the implementation of demand response strategies in a smart-grid enabled all-electric residential building. The dwelling is equipped with a 12 kW heat pump, a 0.8m³ water storage tank, a 6 kW photovoltaic (PV) array, solar thermal collectors for domestic hot water heating and an electric vehicle. The building, located in Ireland, is fully instrumented. An EnergyPlus building simulation model of the dwelling was developed and calibrated using monitored data from the building. The developed model is used to assess the effectiveness of demand response strategies using different time-of-use electricity tariffs in conjunction with zone thermal control. A reduction in generation cost (-22.5%), electricity end-use expenditure (-4.9%) and carbon emission (-7.6%), were estimated when DR measures were implemented and compared with a baseline system. Furthermore, when the zone control features were enabled, the efficiency of the control improved significantly giving, an overall annual economic saving of 16.5% for the residential energy cost. The analysis also identified an annual reduction of consumer electricity consumption of up to 15.9%, lower carbon emissions of 27% and facilitated greater utilisation of electricity generated

*Corresponding author

Email address: fabiano.pallonetto@ucdconnect.ie (Fabiano Pallonetto)

by grid-scale renewable resources, resulting in a reduction of generation costs for the utility of up to 45.3%.

Keywords: residential building, control algorithms, demand response, renewable energy, time of use tariff, energy management system, thermal storage, building simulation, flexibility, smart grid

1. Introduction

Over the past decade, government policy initiatives have established ambitious targets for the increased penetration of renewable generation in power systems to combat the threat of climate change. Large-scale renewable generation penetration presents major challenges for Transmission System Operator (TSO),
5 challenging established methods of balancing supply and demand [1]. Traditionally, supply-demand balancing measures have been achieved by controlling the output of conventional generation in response to changes in the demand. With increasing renewable generation, however, there are greater fluctuations on the
10 supply side, requiring faster-balancing response from grid operators. Conventional generation units, however, may not have sufficient ramping capabilities to counter rapid fluctuations in renewable energy. In Ireland and UK, the domestic sector accounts for more than 27% of the total end-use electricity consumption [2]. This electricity demand peaks in winter due to increased lighting and heating
15 demand, and these peaks result in high wholesale electricity prices and reduced reliability due to tight generation reserve margins. Without sufficient forward planning on the generation side, high penetration levels of renewable generation and high demand peaks may lead to system contingencies, or in an extreme case, system blackouts [3]. Demand Response (DR) is one of the Demand Side Management (DSM) measure that has being promoted since 1970's in the UK and
20 other countries, so as to reduce high winter peaks as well as avoiding associated grid upgrade costs [4]. More recently, there has been renewed interest in DR as a mechanism to increase the percentage of renewable energies in the system [5]. Demand response (DR) has been defined as “changes in electricity use by

25 demand-side resources from their normal consumption patterns in response to
changes in the price of electricity or to incentive payments designed to induce
lower electricity use at times of high wholesale market prices or when system
reliability is jeopardized” [5]. DR can be price-based such as Real Time Price
(RTP), Critical Peak Price (CPP) and Time of Use Tariff (TOU) or incentive-
30 based, where the participating customers are rewarded for reducing their load
when requested by an aggregator or TSO [4]. DR measures can have different
levels of automation. Manual DR requires human intervention to shift or force
loads or to change set point temperature. In the semi-automated measures, an
energy manager operates a centralised system to initialise the demand response
35 strategy. In the fully automated DR strategies, an external communication sig-
nal triggers the pre-programmed methods, and thus does not require human
interaction. In the latter case, the responsible subject should be able to over-
ride the event at any time [6]. Among several challenges for DR schemes, is
the reliable availability of the resources. The DR system may not be in a po-
40 sition to respond to high peak prices. Capturing the time-varying availability
using advanced metering and tailored metrics is a necessity for the success of
DR schemes. Furthermore, the impact of stochastic consumer behaviour can af-
fect the benefit of DR programs. However, such irregularities can be smoothed
by resource aggregation. As noted in Nolan et al. [7], the aggregation of few
45 thousands of households represents a stable DR system resource. Hence, the do-
mestic sector electricity demand can provide services such as spinning reserve,
frequency control or short term operating reserve.

Therefore, exploiting residential flexible electricity demand, facilitated by
clear and appropriate regulation to promote the operation of demand response
50 programmes, can be part of the solution for the power system balancing chal-
lenges [8]. In this work, demand flexibility is considered as the ability to force
(activate) or shift (defer) building electrical energy consumption, based on sup-
ply constraints at a current or future time. In a residential building, the flexible
loads can be appliances, electric vehicles or space and water heating systems.
55 Flexibility is generally enabled by means of energy storage systems, which can be

electrical (e.g., electrical vehicle, battery) or active thermal storage (e.g., phase change material, water tank) or passive thermal storage (e.g., building fabric). By using an Energy Management System (EMS), capable of integrated control of the overall domestic electrical demand, it is possible to dynamically adapt
60 the supply to demand response signals, thereby providing short-term reserve to the power system without affecting the thermal comfort of the occupants. In fact, with the improvements in computer and communication technology, it is possible to conceive a fully automated DR systems in the domestic sector. However, to utilize residential buildings as flexible electricity demand resource,
65 additional communication infrastructure and large-scale data is required. The data required includes real-time prices, weather forecasts, energy mix generation and end-use consumption. To this end, the upcoming smart grid has the objective to provide a bidirectional communication system to exchange data from electricity generation to end-use though better control. Such technologies
70 aim to increase the resiliency of the network, integrate a higher percentage of renewable energy and storage resources, as well as maximising asset utilization. Alam et al. [9] define a smart dwelling as the end node of the smart grid which provides services in the form of ambient intelligence, remote home control, or home automation. In a smart house, the EMS adapts the house energy
75 consumption to the overall grid requirements without affecting the comfort of the occupants. Furthermore, each dwelling or node of the smart grid has the possibility to broadcast information about its electricity consumption profile and status. Advanced communication infrastructure, along with appropriate end-use optimization algorithms, can potentially allow end-users to shape their
80 electricity consumption according to price signals, which would follow the real-time balance between renewable energy generation and power system demand. The use of price signals based on TOU tariffs to manage household electricity demand has been extensively explored in the literature [4]. Nevertheless exposing end-users to price variations does not necessarily lead to energy cost
85 savings [10]. Especially for residential buildings, the daily economic benefit of peak reduction may be of little financial incentive to the consumer, and thus

may not result in a change in consumer behaviour. For this reason, the majority of the projects in the DR area include the use of information technology to develop automated systems for the management of the end-use participation
90 [11]. A residential building energy management system can analyse the data provided by the Smart Grid to trigger DR measures to assist grid operators in maintaining the supply-demand balance on the power system. At the same time, the system tries to optimise electricity consumption and production in a manner that delivers the households energy services demands while minimising
95 their energy costs. Furthermore, increasing the integration of advanced energy management systems presupposes significant electrification of building thermal loads, on-site generation and highly energy efficient building envelopes.

In the future, electrification of domestic heating systems through the deployment of heat pumps is expected to alter residential electrical energy demand
100 patterns substantially [12]. Hydronic heat pumps are an especially efficient way of electrifying residential thermal loads and can be easily coupled with thermal energy storage systems, either active, such as water tanks, or passive, such as building thermal mass. This trend towards greater levels of electrification of thermal loads in buildings is already present with IEA [13] anticipating significant
105 growth in the number of heat pump installations worldwide in the coming decade. As illustrated by Hong et al. [14], heat pumps can provide flexibility while meeting the end-user thermal comfort expectations. A simulation desk study performed as part of this research illustrates how the comfort temperature settings can affect the available shifting time provided by the combination
110 of a heat pump and thermal storage. In energy efficient buildings, electrically driven heating systems such as heat pumps in conjunction with sophisticated control algorithms can provide demand response capabilities to the power grid [15]. However, according to Fuller et al. [16], until equipment and algorithms can be validated and benchmarked, it is difficult for utilities and regulators to
115 install, operate and exploit these new resources. Therefore, the use of advanced analytical tools, building simulation software and appropriate metrics can help to assess the value and the risks of new technologies that provide electricity

demand flexibility.

In the literature, there are numerous examples on how to exploit building flexi-
120 bility and quantify its value at an aggregated level. Nuytten et al. [17] assessed
the thermal flexibility of a centralised heating system and a thermal storage fa-
cility of 800 kWh connected to an aggregate residential district of 100 buildings.
Such analysis is useful for small district heating, but it is challenging to apply
this analysis to a single building where occupancy profiles and different heating
125 systems could affect the results significantly. Furthermore, Mohsenian-Rad et al.
described an optimal residential control algorithm capable of reducing the peak
energy load and shift loads to periods of lower electricity prices [18]. The assess-
ment is based on a mathematical model which cannot be easily implemented in
a real building. Other researchers have focused on the EMS hardware design
130 incorporating demand response capabilities [19] or on how to reduce the elec-
tricity cost for a single residential building [20]. Kolokotsa et al. [21] developed
an integrated indoor management system for buildings using a fuzzy controller.
They were able to consider the comfort constraints of the occupants by tuning
and optimising the system using two demonstration buildings in Greece. How-
135 ever, the control algorithm assessment in real buildings could require years of
analysis before having consistent results, and it is difficult to validate the benefit
of small control flow variations.

Tahersima et al.[15] highlighted how a ground source residential heat pump
controlled by a smart algorithm can compensate for grid imbalances utilising
140 the thermal storage of the building mass within a thermal comfort band. In
order to maximise the stored energy while keeping the temperature within an
established range, a flexible temperature set-point was defined, which was ad-
justed according to electricity tariffs. It was clear from this research that the
thermal mass associated with the residential building can reduce undesirable
145 temperature fluctuations and maintain occupant thermal comfort. Neverthe-
less, further assessment of the overall economic and environmental benefits of
these solutions are required.

The contribution of this paper is the development of a demand response

control algorithm that reduces the overall cost of energy and annual carbon
150 emissions for different stakeholders. The objective of the control algorithm is to
minimise energy costs for both the house owner and electricity generation, by
taking advantage of time-of-use electricity tariffs, as well as enabling reductions
in CO_2 emissions. The algorithms use thermal comfort criteria as a constraint
and facilitates a clear assessment of benefits derived, based on market and power
155 grid data. A key feature of the implemented control system is a dynamic as-
sessment of the system flexibility which is capable of being calculated every 15
minutes, and thus can be used by DR aggregators to activate demand response
actions in real time. To assess the benefit of the control system, a software
model of an all-electric dwelling and its associated energy conversion system
160 was developed using EnergyPlus and calibrated using on-site data, which was
monitored over a full heating season. The paper is organised as follows: Section
2 includes the description of the building, the installed energy systems, the oc-
cupancy profile and the tariffs used. Section 3 describes the control algorithm.
In Section 4, the performance results are presented utilising different demand
165 response strategies. Section 5 concludes the paper.



Figure 1: Test bed house and EnergyPlus model

2. Building description

The all-electric building used as a test bed in the current work is situated in a rural location in eastern Ireland (Figure 1). The dwelling was retrofitted in 2012 and fully instrumented. The building was renovated to meet 2020 scenario as outlined in the Residential Energy Roadmap for Ireland [22]. This publication sets out scenarios that show what reduction level of CO_2 emissions is achievable with different retrofit measures. The scenarios include a higher penetration of solar thermal and solar PV, storage heating and heat pump systems. The majority of these systems are present in the test building considered in the current study. Moreover, the test building energy consumption and the CO_2 emissions are also aligned with the 2020 scenario. Furthermore, the building was equipped with technologies that have been identified by the Irish Commission for Energy Regulation as appropriate to offer demand response services. These technologies, which if adopted in the residential sector would enable demand response in the Irish power system [23], are summarised in Table 1, where their presence in the test bed building is also reported. One measure absent from the current building is frequency response capabilities, which would typically be enabled by home automation systems. Given the rural position of the building and the associated network distribution system layout, the dwelling is at the terminal side of a distribution branch. In this location, the electricity supply is more prone to voltage fluctuations that mitigate against the implementation of frequency response measures. An EnergyPlus building model was developed and calibrated against metered data using an hourly resolution according to ASHRAE recommendations [24]. The Average Percentage Error (APE) was used to indicate the accuracy of the calibrated building model and is based on an annual error specification calculated using one year of data (2012).

2.1. Architecture and building physics

The dwelling, a single storey building, was constructed using a two leaf concrete wall with core insulation. Therefore, the inner wall displays significant

Table 1: CER Index: Demand Response Measures[23]

Technologies	Delivery Cost	Ranking	Test Bed House
Energy efficiency - Domestic	Medium	High	Present
Smart meter system - Dynamic ToU tariff	Medium	High	
Home automation - Direct load control	Medium	High	Present
Home automation - Autonomous	Low	High	Present
Home automation - Frequency-responsive	Medium	High	
Storage - Heat	Low	High	Present
Smart meter system - Advanced displays	Low	Medium	Present
Smart meter system - Static ToU tariff	Low	Medium	Present
Electric vehicles - Price responsive charging	Medium	Medium	
Behavioural change - Education	Low	Low	Present
Heat pumps - fitted with storage	High	Low	Present
Storage - Electric	High	Low	
Electric vehicles - Night charge	Low	Neutral	Present
Electric vehicles - Hybrid vehicles	Medium	Neutral	
Microgeneration – Controllable	Low	Neutral	Present

Table 2: U-Value of different building elements

Building Element	U-Value Test building (W/m^2K)	U-Value Irish Building Regulations[25] (W/m^2K)
Walls	0.25	0.21
Roof	0.25	0.21
Windows	1.7	1.6
Floor	0.21	0.21

passive thermal energy storage capacity. The floor area is $205m^2$ and the overall window to wall ratio is 15%, with a 22% and 10% ratio on the south and north facades, respectively. The house has 12 rooms and an unused attic space at roof level. Although its architectural characteristics are those of a typical rural Irish bungalow dwelling of the 1970s, its fabric specifications are very close to the current Irish building regulation values [25] as outlined in Table 2. According to [26], the building category considered in the current work is classified as a detached house, which represents 40% of the Irish building stock and is the most common single building category.

2.2. HVAC and energy systems

For space heating, the house is equipped with a 12 kW ground source heat pump, which is connected to a hot water tank of $0.8m^3$ for thermal storage, and an associated hydronic heating system. Convectors are present in each room, while there is an additional 5 kW wood stove in the kitchen. The wood stove is used only during the heating period, from October to April. A photovoltaic panel array consisting of 30 panels, of a total nominal power of 6 kWp is also installed. It is located 30 meters from the house and any power losses from cables are taken into account. The PV system was metered for one year with a 15 minute resolution. The electricity produced by the PV system and the Ener-

215 gyPlus model was found to be accurate to within APE +/- 5.8%. Solar thermal
collectors of surface area 6.15 m² are used for heating of Domestic Hot Water
(DHW) in conjunction with a 250 litre water storage tank. A 2 kW electric
immersion heater is used as backup. The water tank is modelled in EnergyPlus
as a fully mixed system [27]. The overall DHW system was calibrated with
220 measured data and was found to be accurate to within APE +/- 13%.

2.3. Air Exchange

The building is equipped with a Heat recovery ventilation (HRV) system
with air extraction points located in the kitchen and bathroom. The particu-
lar HRV system has an average sensible heat transfer effectiveness of 80% and
225 operates only during the heating period while during summer, natural ven-
tilation (window opening) is being used. Based on the approach outlined in
[28], the combined infiltration and ventilation rates were adjusted such that
an average annual value was utilised. For infiltration and ventilation purposes,
the building is divided into two sections with the following ACH settings: a
230 kitchen/living/bathroom zone (ACH 1.5) and a sleeping/utility zone (ACH 1.0).
Infiltration and ventilation rates are adjusted in each time-step using weather
data (wind speed and temperature differential between indoors and outdoors)
according to ASHRAE [29]. Therefore, seasonal (summer/winter) and daily
(day/night) variations of both infiltration and ventilation rates were taken into
235 account based on environmental conditions resulting in modifications to the
above design flow rates.

2.4. Electric car

A Nissan Leaf with a 24 kWh battery pack is used for daily commuting
of approximately 50 km. According to Smith [30], the energy consumption by
240 Electric Car (EV) depends on the season due to the air conditioning require-
ments of the cabin, which can significantly affect the energy performance of the
car. The electricity consumption of the EV for the system simulation model
was set to 150 Wh/km during the summer and 250 Wh/km during the winter.

The car is charged overnight when electricity prices are lower. The daily energy
245 requirement of the car is 12.5 kWh in the winter and 7.5 kWh in the summer.
During night time charging, the electricity drawn is assumed to follow the pat-
tern suggested by Marra et al. [31]. The model used in EnergyPlus was found
to be accurate to within APE +/- 3.5% of the referenced data.

2.5. *Occupancy profiles*

250 Two adults occupy the house. Occupancy profiles, domestic hot water usage
patterns, use of electric equipment and lighting, and the respective distribution
of internal heat gains were calculated based on the national time of survey
resident activity data. As outlined in [32], using time of use data, Markov
Chain Monte Carlo techniques were applied to develop high time resolution and
255 disaggregated residential appliance electricity use patterns. In the current work,
daily power consumption patterns, for different household sizes and different day
types, were quantitatively and qualitatively validated against metered data. The
synthesized profiles were calibrated with the appropriate occupant adjustments
to replicate better the real life activity patterns.

260 2.6. *Weather data*

The weather data used was collected from the closest available weather sta-
tion (Dublin Airport) which is located 35 km from the dwelling. In order to
generate an appropriate weather data file, measured data from 2012 was ana-
lyzed using the Real Time Weather Converter software package [33]. This tool
265 creates weather files by combining observed weather data from the Integrated
Surface Database (ISD) with the STRÅNG mesoscale solar radiation model.

2.7. *Building model*

The building model was calibrated with measured data from the site. A
15 minute time step was used for the simulations. Given that the objective
270 of the paper is to assess the building demand flexibility as secondary reserve
and not for frequency response, a 15 minute resolution was considered to be

Table 3: Time of Use electricity tariffs (€/kWh)

	Weekdays						Weekdays					
	A	B	C	D	Flat	SMP (avg)	A	B	C	D	Flat	SMP (avg)
	€/KWh	B	C	D	Flat	SMP (avg)	A	B	C	D	Flat	SMP (avg)
00:00-08:00	0.12	0.11	0.1	0.09	0.135	0.046	0.12	0.11	0.1	0.09	0.135	0.044
08:00-17:00	0.14	0.135	0.13	0.125	0.135	0.065	0.14	0.135	0.13	0.125	0.135	0.062
17:00-19:00	0.2	0.26	0.32	0.38	0.135	0.097	0.14	0.135	0.13	0.125	0.135	0.088
19:00-23:00	0.14	0.135	0.13	0.125	0.135	0.071	0.14	0.135	0.13	0.125	0.135	0.067
23:00-00:00	0.12	0.11	0.1	0.09	0.135	0.053	0.12	0.11	0.1	0.09	0.135	0.053

sufficient according to the technical specifications associated with the provision of ancillary services in the Irish electricity market[34]

2.8. Electricity price

275 During the last decade, time of use electricity tariffs are increasingly being utilised in the US and to a lesser extent in European markets[23] . In 2010, the Irish Commission for Energy Regulation initiated a residential smart meter trial, with associated tariffs (A, B, C, D, Flatrate) as shown in Table 3 [35]. The pricing scheme reflects the trend of the Irish System Marginal Price (SMP) Average and consequently of the overall electricity demand. These tariffs, along 280 with a PV electricity export of 0.09 € per kWh were used in the current work.

3. Demand response control algorithms

The demand response algorithm implemented in the current paper had to be capable of being integrated into a high-resolution simulation environment such 285 as EnergyPlus while keeping any hardware installation as simple as practicable. This required the use of the simplified programming language embedded with the simulation engine (ERL) [27]. Due to the technical limits of the programming language, the selection of suitable controlling algorithms was limited. Other constraints include that the algorithm had to be adaptable to occupant 290 comfort profiles without the need for processing historical data. Furthermore, residents should be able to override the algorithm on demand. A rule-based algorithm capable of been easily tuned by occupants based on their profile was

therefore chosen, as it could be tested in the simulation environment while meeting all the mentioned requirements. The rule-based control algorithm was developed, tested and subjected to the three different case scenarios described in Table 4, as well as being compared with a baseline case. Control is based on a heuristic response to a time-of-use (TOU) price scheme described in Section 2.8. The control algorithm was embedded in an energy management system within the EnergyPlus model using the native programming language [36]. The objective function (Eqn 1) of the energy management system is to reduce the owner energy cost while maintaining the comfort constraints (Eqn 2), which can be written as follows:

$$\min_{(T_{tk}, C_{set})} \left(\sum_{t=1}^{24} C_e(t) P_e(t, T_{tk}, C_{set}) \right) \quad (1)$$

$$T_{set}(t) - T_{bd} \leq T_{int}(t) \leq T_{set}(t) + T_{bd} \quad t = 1..24 \quad (2)$$

$$T_{min} \leq T_{tk} \leq T_{max} \quad t = 1..24 \quad (3)$$

where $C_e(t)$ is the price of electricity (€/kWh) and P_e is the electricity consumption. $P_e(t, T_{tk}, C_{set})$ is the energy consumption in kWh of the building simulation model described in this research at each time step t . The cost optimisation depends on two control variables as follows: (i) the temperature of the tank (T_{tk}) which is maintained within the range T_{max} and T_{min} and, (ii) the energy supplied to the zones by means of the circulation pump which can be either ON or OFF (C_{set}). At each time step, the zone temperature (T_{int}) is maintained at set point as illustrate in Table 5 with an associated 2°C bandwidth (i.e., +/- 1°C around the setpoint), as shown in Eqn 2; while Eqn 3 constrains the storage tank temperature between its Max and Min temperature settings, as illustrated in Table 5. The algorithm, outlined in Figure 2, has four input variables: the building zone temperature, the time, the PV electricity production rate and the storage tank temperature. These input variables are evaluated by the algorithm at each time step and control the heat pump and the circulation pump. The heat pump exchanges heat with the Thermal En-

ergy Storage (TES) storage tank by means of a tank heat exchanger coil. The
320 building hydronic circuit is coupled directly to the TES tank. The tank can also
be by-passed, thereby allowing the dwelling to be heated directly. The control
algorithm, as outlined in Figure 2, utilises four input variables: time, building
zone temperature, storage tank temperature and PV electricity production rate.
The control algorithm optimises the charge of the TES and associated heating
325 of the building, while the direct heating of the dwelling can only be manually
enabled. The algorithm is based on four different rules as follows (see Figure
2):

(Rule 1 Comfort constraint): This rule is activated whenever the building zone
temperature is below the zone comfort constraint for the period, or when the
330 photovoltaic electricity production is greater than the heat pump electrical de-
mand. When this condition is verified, the heat pump is switched on to charge
the TES system. If the inside temperature is below the comfort constraint, then
the circulation pump is switched on to heat the building.

(Rule 2 TES charging time): This rule switches on the heat pump during the
335 night (23:00 – 08:00) to charge the TES. When the TES is fully charged and
the temperature is below the set point, then the circulation pump is switched
on to supply heat to the house. During weekdays, between 15:00 and 17:00, the
heat pump is switched on to charge the TES.

(Rule 3 Off-peak rule): During the off-peak period when the PV production is
340 above the threshold, the heat pump is switched on to charge the TES. If the
inside temperature is below the comfort constraint, then the circulation pump
is also switched on to heat the building.

(Rule 4 On-peak rule): On the weekdays, the heat pump is switched off during
the peak period (17:00 – 19:00) or when the house is not occupied (between
345 09:00 – 15:00), and the PV production is below the threshold illustrated in Ta-
ble 4. The threshold corresponds to the heat pump nominal power consumption
(3 kW). When the PV system produces electricity above this threshold, the heat
pump is switched on to exploit PV electricity. The system is turned on for at
least one hour, using the weather data as forecast, in order to avoid intermittent

switching of the heat pump.




Figure 2: Algorithm Diagram Flow Chart

350

3.1. Simulation parameters

An analysis of the simulation results using two configurations were chosen and these are illustrated in Table 4

355

1. The first control parameter is based on the number of thermostatic controls in the house. For the Baseline Case and Case 1, a single temperature input variable, located in the hallway, controls the heating for the dwelling. For Cases 2 and 3, multiple temperature measurement control points are used.

360

2. The second control parameter is the minimum and maximum temperature set point of the thermal energy storage. For the Baseline Case and Case 1, the two set points are set at 40°C and 55°C. The maximum temperature of

Table 4: Control system for each case

Parameter	Description	Baseline	Case 1	Case 2	Case 3
Building Setpoints	No. of programmable thermostats	1	1	5	5
Thermal Storage	Min temperature	40°C	40°C	40°C	35°C
	Max temperature	55°C	55°C	55°C	55°C
PV System	Min HP activation power PV	Not applicable	3 kW	3 kW	2 kW
TES Charging	Charging start time before peak	Not applicable	2 hrs	2 hrs	2 hrs

the TES is set with a 5K difference between the outlet temperature from the heat pump (60°C) and the TES set point. The minimum temperature was set at 40°C. Case 3 uses 35°C as the minimum temperature

3. The third control parameter is the PV output. If the produced PV power is higher than the nominal maximum power demand of the heat pump (3 kW), the heat pump is switched on to charge the TES. Cases 1 and 2 use a threshold of 3 kW, while Case 3 lowers the threshold to 2 kW.

Test simulations were performed and revealed that switching on the heating system two hours before the peak electricity price was sufficient to store energy in the TES to maintain the comfort level while reducing the electricity consumption during the peak period.

3.2. Heating period and control

The heating season considered is between 01 Jan-30 Apr and 01 Oct-Dec 31 for the year 2012. The energy assessment uses two different thermostatic set point configurations utilised in four different cases. Each case represents a different rule setting of the algorithm where the objective is to reduce the overall electricity cost and increase the use of renewable energy or the energy stored in the tank. The baseline and Case 1 uses a single thermostatic set point (Configuration 1) for the whole building resulting in a partial cost reduction. The objective of Case 1 is to charge the storage tank fully and slightly increase the indoor temperature during the night, thereby slightly reducing the daily consumption. Meanwhile, Case 2 and 3 increase the energy efficiency of the

Table 5: Building thermostatic set points for each case

	Configuration 1		Configuration 2			Configuration 1	Configuration 2
Weekdays	Baseline and Case 1		Case 2 and Case 3		Weekends	Baseline and Case 1	Case 2 and Case 3
	Corridor	Bedrooms	Corridor	Bedrooms			
00:00-06:30	19°C	19°C	17°C	17°C	00:00-06:30	20°C	20°C
06:30-09:00	18°C	18°C	19°C	19°C	06:30-09:00		
09:00-16:00	16°C	16°C	16°C	16°C	09:00-16:00		
16:00-19:00	18°C	18°C	18°C	16°C	16:00-19:00		
19:00-24:00	18°C	18°C	18°C	18°C	19:00-23:59		

system by using different set points for each room category (Configuration 2). In this specific test case, the set points of the kitchen and living room are ignored because the internal heat gains from the wood stove increase the ambient temperature beyond the set points without leading to a significant cost reduction. The two different thermostatic set point configurations are summarised in Table 5 and they represent the thermal comfort constraints. Given that the constraints above are satisfied for each case, the economic savings, the environmental impact, and the flexibility assessment of the strategies adopted are presented in section 4.

4. Case study simulation results

Four metrics were used to assess the performance of the control algorithm and the energy flexibility in the building. The metrics are as follows:

- Consumer annual electricity consumption
- Consumer annual electricity cost
- Utility electricity cost
- System flexibility potential

Each of these metrics are considered in the following sections and are assessed against a baseline scenario.

4.1. Assessment of consumer annual electricity consumption




Figure 3: Annual total electricity consumption.

Figure 3 illustrates the annual house electricity consumption which is imported from the grid for each case. Charging the storage tank before the peak period and subsequently utilising this energy during the peak period can result in additional energy consumption, due to additional temperature lift required to charge the TES system as well as the associated TES storage losses. Nevertheless, in the current work, the overall net electricity consumption has been reduced, due to the contribution of the PV system. This is because the heating system is switched on to charge the TES when the PV electricity generation reaches a threshold (Table 4). The net reduction attributed to the control strategy is equal to the power consumption difference between the Baseline and Case 1. However, in Case 2 and 3 compared to Baseline and Case 1, the net reduction is mainly due to the zone thermostatic set point strategy. Thus, during the unoccupied hours, the heating system operates, maintaining the temperature of the zones at the lower bound of the thermal comfort band, resulting in a lower electricity demand.

Figure 4 shows the house electricity consumption minus the local renewable energy production for the baseline case and for each of the three cases. A 15 minute time resolution is used, where each data point is determined by sum-




Figure 4: Annual summated electricity consumption and power system CO_2 emission

420 ming each time associated electricity consumption value (kWh) for that data
 point (365 instances) for the entire year. The PV contribution, is determined
 in a similar way, but is subtracted from the consumed electricity to allow a net
 value to be determined. The average SMP is also shown, which is based on the
 wholesale single island-wide price for each half hour trading period in a typical
 425 day[37]. For the baseline case, to meet the dwelling comfort constraints, the
 heat pump is switched on whenever needed, even during peak times. Case 1
 exhibits increased electricity consumption between midnight and 0200 hrs due
 to a rebound effect associated with the earlier demand response action between
 1800 and 1900 hrs. This results in additional electricity consumption in order

430 to restore both the zone set point temperature (19°C) and the tank set point
temperature (55°C) after the demand response event (see Tables 4 and 5). Cases
2 and 3, which exhibit broadly similar consumption patterns, result in a sig-
nificant reduction of energy consumption during the peak period (17:00-19:00),
compared to Case 1 and the baseline. For the period 21:00-23:00, additional
435 electricity consumption is evident for Cases 2 and 3, compared to Case 1, due
to the additional heating requirement to increase the bedroom temperatures
from a set point of 16°C to 18°C after 1900 hrs (see Table 5). Moreover, Case
3 aims to increase the energy extraction from the TES, by using a lower tem-
perature set point (35°C) as specified in Table 5. Case 1 exhibits increased
440 electricity consumption between midnight and 0200 hrs due to a rebound effect
associated with the earlier demand response action between 1800 and 1900 hrs.
This results in additional electricity consumption in order to restore both the
zone set point temperature (19°C) and the tank set point temperature (55°C)
after the demand response event (see Tables 4 and 5). Cases 2 and 3, which
445 exhibit broadly similar consumption patterns, result in a significant reduction
of energy consumption during the peak period (17:00-19:00), compared to Case
1 and the baseline. For the period 21:00-23:00, additional electricity consump-
tion is evident for Cases 2 and 3, compared to Case 1, due to the additional
heating requirement to increase the bedroom temperatures from a set point of
450 16°C to 18°C after 1900 hrs (see Table 5). Moreover, Case 3 aims to increase the
energy extraction from the TES, by using a lower temperature set point (35°C)
as specified in Table 4.

4.2. Consumer electricity cost

Figure 5 shows the annual electricity cost for the baseline and the three
455 cases using the TOU tariffs outlined in Table 3. With reference to the baseline
which exhibits the highest annual cost, Case 1 exhibits the next highest cost,
which can be attributed to the use of a single thermostatic set point control for
all controllable zones (bedrooms and corridor), resulting in additional heating
of unoccupied zones. Considering Case 2, relative to the baseline, savings of

460 between 15% for tariff A and 20% for tariff D (which most closely follows the
 SMP price) are evident. Case 3 is optimised to utilise PV electricity production,
 as well as using a lower TES set point (35°C). Therefore, it exhibits the greatest
 savings relative to the baseline.




Figure 5: Electricity cost for different time of use tariffs and algorithm cases

4.3. Utility electricity cost

465 Figure 6 shows the generation cost using Irish electricity SMP prices [37].
 The electricity consumption is multiplied by the relevant SMP price for each
 time step in order to evaluate the yearly electricity production cost from a
 utility perspective. Considering Case 2, where the control strategy aims to move
 electricity consumption from peak (17:00-19:00) to off peak (15:00-17:00) times,
 470 a generation cost reduction from €316 to €245 is evident (22% reduction).
 Considering Case 3, a 45% (€173) reduction is evident. The difference between
 the SMP peak price and the off-peak can reach a ratio of 1 to 6. This ratio
 rationalizes such significant reduction of generation cost between the cases.




Figure 6: Annual electricity generation costs

4.4. Environmental Impact

475 Eirgrid, the Irish transmission system operator, provides 30 minutes averaged carbon emissions (gCO_2/kWh), based on technical data from all generation units, including renewable energy, for the overall production of electricity [38]. For 2012, the footprint varied from 29 (gCO_2/kWh) to 846 (gCO_2/kWh). Figures 4 illustrates the annual carbon emissions per hour. The maximum annual carbon emission is verified during the peak time hours (1700 – 1900 hrs).
 480 Therefore, a significant reduction in CO_2 emission is expected as a result of the control algorithm. Figure 7 illustrates the annual CO_2 footprint as determined for the baseline and the three cases. Case 3 is observed to give the greatest reduction, which is 74% relative to the baseline case, as PV power is used to
 485 charge the TES via the heat pump system whenever possible, thereby reducing the overall electricity drawn from the grid and consequently the associated carbon emissions.

4.5. System Flexibility

In the current paper, system flexibility is defined as the accrued or deferred
 490 energy dividend (kWh) facilitated by thermal storage and residential renewable energy generator like Photovoltaic (PV), made possible by the temporal




Figure 7: Annual carbon dioxide emissions

decoupling of the building thermal energy and power demands. In the building under consideration, this is achieved by means of the PV array, which acts as a grid-independent electricity production device capable of converting electrical

495 energy to thermal energy via the heat pump system, which in turn is stored in the 800 litre water tank. The methodology to calculate the system flexibility is based on establishing upper and lower temperature bounds for the TES system, knowledge of the TES thermophysical characteristics, the heat pump rating and the PV system rating. In the current work, the storage tank default lower and

500 upper temperature set points were set at 35°C and 55°C, respectively, as outlined earlier in Table 4 (Case 3). These bounds were chosen with reference to the heat pump nominal thermal output and a system sensitivity analysis. As long as the heat pump control maintains the tank temperature T_{tk} between T_{max} and T_{min} , the TES system can be used to meet the heat demand of the

505 building. If the temperature of the TES is close to the T_{max} , as illustrated in Fig. 8 between 0200 hrs and 0700 hrs, the shifting potential is close to its maximum. During such period, the building can be heated by discharge of the TES, without active use of the heat pump, until T_{tk} reaches T_{min} , where the equivalent amount of electricity that is deferred or shifted (kWh) is given by

510 Eqn. 4 as follows:




Figure 8: Yearly average flexibility potential for time of use price signal

$$S(t) = PV(t + dt) + \int_t^{t+1} \frac{C_{pw} * M * (T_{tk}(t) - T_{min})}{3.6 * 10^6 * COP_{hp}} dt \quad (4)$$

$S(t)$ is the sum of the PV power production plus any deferrable heat pump power consumption, which is provided by the TES system, where the PV output for the next time period is given by $PV(t + dt)$ and the TES potential is estimated with reference to the lower tank set point. This value represents the upper limit of the deferred dwelling space heating power demand plus any on-site PV electricity production.

The forcing potential $F(t)$ is calculated by Equation 5 and is defined as the accruable heat pump power consumption when the heat pump thermal output is not used to meet the zone thermal demand but is instead stored by the TES system.

$$F(t) = \int_t^{t+1} \frac{C_{pw} * M * (T_{max} - T_{tk}(t))}{3.6 * 10^6 * COP_{hp}} dt \quad (5)$$

Although the zone temperature is equal or greater than the thermostatic set point, the heat pump can be forced to operate. In this case, the expected electric profile is altered by the forced operation of the heating system, which generates additional energy that is stored in the TES. The maximum amount
515 of electricity (kWh) that can be used by the heat pump to charge fully the TES defines the flexibility potential.

Figure 8 illustrates the system flexibility shifting and forcing potentials, as well as the average TES storage temperature, based on the average daily flexibility for the 2014 heating year. It can be observed that the forcing and shifting curves
520 are inversely proportional, as they are calculated with reference to the TES upper and lower set-point temperatures. Further examination shows that the TES is fully charged at 55°C, where the shift and forcing potential are maximised and minimised, respectively. During peak periods (17:00-19:00), the shifting potential decreases significantly because the heat pump is not operational and
525 the building thermal load is met by the TES system, while the forcing potential increases. It can also be observed that between 14:00 and 15:00, the PV is often utilised thereby increasing the thermal energy stored in the TES tank. Figure 8 also shows the variation in hourly flexibility based on averaged data for the heating season. During the peak times from 17:00 to 19:00 hours, the shifting
530 flexibility can be observed to decrease significantly, which can be attributed to the scheduled non-operation of the heat pump. During this period, the heating system, in order to maintain zone comfort temperatures, extracts heat from the TES, thereby resulting in periods when the average tank temperature goes below the setpoint. Maximum shifting flexibility can be observed during the
535 night periods, when the heating system fully charges the TES and thus exhibits a maximum shifting potential. It can also be observed that between December and February, for the period after peak time, that the forcing potential is greater than the shifting, which results from the control strategy of avoiding active use of the heat pump during peak periods, thereby resulting in the average tank
540 temperature being closer to the lower bound.

Figure 9 and 10 summarise the cumulative shifting and forcing flexibility for





Figure 9: Average hourly shifting flexibility $S(t)$ Figure 10: Average hourly forcing flexibility $F(t)$

each month. Total shifting flexibility potential (Figure 9) is greatest for March and April, while the forcing flexibility potential (Figure 10) is greatest for December, January and February, when the TES system often operates closest to its lowest setpoint temperature. Considering the accumulated total daily flexibility potential over the October-April period, a total shifting and forcing potential of 366 kWh and 146 kWh, respectively, exists, which if averaged on a daily basis is approximately 4.0 kWh per day or 5.5% of the heating season energy consumption.

It is noted that the two metrics reported in Eqns 4 and 5 are an estimate of the potential flexibility available, and thus they do not give any indication of the building energy demand. Therefore, the charging and discharging rates depend on the energy demand of the building which vary based on the inter-




Figure 11: Monthly flexibility potential for the heating season

Table 6: Results summary in percentage compare to Baseline

	CO_2 emissions	Electricity Consumption	Electricity Cost (Tariff D)	Generation Cost
Case 1	- 7.6%	- 4.1%	- 4.9%	- 22.5%
Case 2	- 26.4%	- 13.9%	- 16.2%	- 44.3%
Case 3	- 27.0%	- 15.9%	-16.5%	- 45.3%

nal heat gains, outdoor weather conditions and temperature set points. In any
 555 case, from a grid perspective, the maximum energy that could be shifted or
 forced during any period, is capped by the nominal electric power consumption
 of the heating system. Further analysis could be performed based on the flexi-
 bility variance for different conditions to estimate the maximum duration that
 a demand response event could last.

560 *4.6. Discussion*

This paper proposes a rule-based algorithm that reduces the electricity ex-
 penditure of a residential building while maintaining the thermal comfort for
 the occupants. The control system is designed to optimise energy consumption
 using the heating system, the building thermal features and to provide flexibility
 565 to reduce peak load or respond to DR events based on a time use tariff scheme.
 The algorithm was tested using three test cases against a baseline. Referring to
 Table 6 and with reference to the baseline case, Case 1 illustrates the potential

benefits arising from the DR measures alone, which are accrued through the PV and TES systems only. The results show a 22.5% reduction in generation cost, a 4.1% reduction in energy consumption, a 4.9% reduction in electricity end-use costs and a 7.6 % reduction in carbon emissions all relative to the baseline. Case 2 shows the increased operational efficiency compared to Case 1 resulting from better setpoint control of the bedroom zones. These include an additional electricity cost reduction of up to 11.3% (Tariff A), as well as a decrease of 18.8% in associated CO_2 emissions and a reduction in the electricity consumption of 9.8%. Case 3 shows a limited reduction of emission (0.6%) and a decreased electricity demand (2%) due to the lower PV output threshold.

The control system, which is based on the presented rule-based algorithm, is capable of being easily implemented and installed in buildings with different characteristics, by adapting the parameters outlined in Table 4.

However, in the case of high penetration percentage in the residential building stock, the algorithm could pose some challenges to grid operators. The first problem involves the simultaneous switching ON or OFF of the heating systems after and before a TOU peak price signal, which could result in a significant peak clipping and shifting. A solution to smooth any peak clipping and the associated rebound effect is to wait a random time interval before switching on the heating system after the DR signal. Other challenges can be associated with the tuning of the parameters for different building categories and to adapt the settings for multiple or dynamic peak windows.

Compared to other work, it should be noted that the algorithm proposed does not require sophisticated hardware or different training periods to be utilised for various building type and it was implemented and tested in a calibrated Energy-Plus simulation environment. Furthermore, the overall end-use cost reduction of the rule-based algorithm is 16.5%, lower than more complex algorithms. Kolotsa et al. [21] estimated an average electricity bill reduction of 23% for the heating system while Mohsenian et al. [18] indicate an overall 25% reduction. The unique feature of the associated control system is the flexibility metric that is independent of the building where it is installed. Flexibility is a function of the

charge status of TES, the nominal power of the heating system and local re-
600 newable energy production. At each time step, the algorithm outputs flexibility
in terms of forcing and shifting potential. This metric can be dynamically used
by DR aggregators to calculate aggregate flexibility potential at each time step
and design a signal to trigger the DR event.

5. Conclusion

605 In the current study, a rule-based demand response algorithm is applied to
a residential building which resulted in energy and carbon emission reduction
as well as monetary savings, while maintaining thermal comfort. The algo-
rithm was developed to minimise the electricity expenditure under TOU tariff,
enhancing the control of zone temperature. The study shows the results of
610 two different versions of the control algorithm; the first version implements DR
measures and on-site renewable and TES control while in the second version
the zone thermal control features have been enabled. The simulation results of
the first control version show a reduction of generation cost (-22.5%), electricity
end-use cost (-4.9%) and carbon emission (-7.6%). In the case of zone thermal
615 control features enabled, a reduction of up to 15.9% in annual electricity con-
sumption, compared to a baseline reference system, was achieved. Furthermore,
annual monetary savings of up to 20% (Tariff D) in end-use electricity costs,
as well as a decrease of 27% in associated CO_2 emissions were also evident. In
the context of the dwelling under consideration, it was also shown that elec-
620 tricity utilities can reduce the cost of generation by up to 45.3%. The heating
system can provide 366 kWh in load shifting flexibility and 146 kWh in forcing
flexibility, which together represents approximately 5.5% of the annual heating
load. At a more general level, given the increasing likelihood of the adoption of
TOU tariffs in many European countries, the use of advanced demand response
625 control, such as rule-based control, coupled with thermal storage in all-electric
residential buildings can positively contribute to the power system flexibility
as well as reducing the electricity costs and carbon footprint of EU building

stock. Further research on algorithms, which can adapt on the basis of end-user
behaviour, occupant preferences could further enhance the capabilities of the
630 described approach.

Acknowledgements

This work was conducted in the Electricity Research Centre, University Col-
lege Dublin, Ireland, which is supported by the Commission for Energy Regula-
tion, Bord Gás Energy, Bord na Mna Energy, Cylon Controls, EirGrid, Electric
635 Ireland, Energinet, EPRI, ESB International, ESB Networks, Gaelectric, Intel,
SSE Renewables, and UTRC. This publication has emanated from research
conducted with the financial support of PRLTI[R12681]. The authors would
like to thank the building owner for his essential support.

Acronyms

640 **APE** Average Percentage Error. 8, 11, 12

CPP Critical Peak Price. 3

DHW Domestic Hot Water. 11

DR Demand Response. 2–4, 28, 30

DSM Demand Side Management. 2

645 **EMS** Energy Management System. 4, 6

EV Electric Car. 11

HRV Heat recovery ventilation. 11

PV Photovoltaic. 23

RTP Real Time Price. 3

650 **SMP** System Marginal Price. 13, 20

TES Thermal Energy Storage. 14, 15, 17, 19, 22, 24, 26

TOU Time of Use Tariff. 3, 4, 21

TSO Transmission System Operator. 2, 3

Nomenclature

655 C_e Electricity price (€/kWh)

C_{set} Circulation pump status

COP_{hp} Heat pump average COP

C_{pw} Specific heat capacity J/(kg * K)

F Forcing flexibility

660 M TES water mass

P_{hp} Heat pump energy consumption (kWh)

PV PV electricity production

S Shifting flexibility

T_{bd} TES setpoint bandwidth (°C)

665 T_{in} Internal zone temperature (°C)

T_{max} TES maximum set point temperature (°C)

T_{min} TES minimum set point temperature (°C)

T_{out} Outside temperature (°C)

T_{set} TES minimum set point temperature (°C)

670 T_{set} Temperature set point (°C)

T_{tk} TES temperature (°C)

References

- [1] DCENR, Department of communication energy and natural resources - strategy for renewable energy:2012-2020 (2012).
675 URL http://www.dcenr.gov.ie/NR/rdonlyres/C0498ADB-362B-449C\ -B381-0099B552EBD1/0/RenewableEnergyStrategy2012_2020.pdf
- [2] L. Pérez-Lombard, J. Ortiz, C. Pout, A review on buildings energy consumption information, *Energy and buildings* 40 (3) (2008) 394–398.
- [3] P. B. Eriksen, T. Ackermann, H. Abildgaard, P. Smith, W. Winter, J. R. 680
García, System operation with high wind penetration, *Power and Energy Magazine, IEEE* 3 (6) (2005) 65–74.
- [4] V. Hamidi, F. Li, F. Robinson, Demand response in the UK’s domestic sector, *Electric Power Systems Research* 79 (12) (2009) 1722–1726.
- [5] H. C. Gils, Assessment of the theoretical demand response potential in 685
europe, *Energy* 67 (2014) 1–18.
- [6] M. A. Piette, D. Watson, N. Motegi, S. Kiliccote, E. Linkugel, Automated demand response strategies and commissioning commercial building controls, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.
- [7] S. Nolan, M. OMalley, Challenges and barriers to demand response de- 690
ployment and evaluation, *Applied Energy* 152 (2015) 1 – 10. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2015.04.083>.
- [8] L. Dale, D. Klaar, L. Fischer, J. Rodriguez, F. Vermeulen, W. Winter, European wind integration study (EWIS) for a successful integration of wind power into european transmission system, in: *Power and Energy Society General Meeting - Conversion and Delivery of Electrical Energy in the 21st* 695
Century, 2008 IEEE, 2008, pp. 1–2. doi:10.1109/PES.2008.4596648.
- [9] M. R. Alam, M. B. I. Reaz, M. A. M. Ali, A review of smart homes: Past, present, and future, *Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part C: Applications and Reviews, IEEE Transactions on* 42 (6) (2012) 1190–1203.

- 700 [10] T. Sweetnam, C. Spataru, M. Barrett, Exploring price as a demand response control signal.
- [11] M. H. Albadi, E. El-Saadany, A summary of demand response in electricity markets, *Electric Power Systems Research* 78 (11) (2008) 1989–1996.
- [12] E. Veldman, M. Gibescu, H. Slootweg, W. Kling, Impact of electrification of residential heating on loading of distribution networks, *PowerTech*, 2011 IEEE Trondheim 0 (2011) 1–7.
- [13] IEA, International energy agency - energy-efficient buildings: Heating and cooling equipment, Tech. rep., IEA (2011).
URL https://www.iea.org/publications/freepublications/publication/\buildings_roadmap.pdf
- 710 [14] J. Hong, N. J. Kelly, I. Richardson, M. Thomson, Assessing heat pumps as flexible load, *Proceedings of the Institution of Mechanical Engineers, Part A: Journal of Power and Energy* 227 (1) (2013) 30–42.
- [15] F. Tahersima, J. Stoustrup, S. A. Meybodi, H. Rasmussen, Contribution of domestic heating systems to smart grid control, in: *Decision and Control and European Control Conference (CDC-ECC)*, 2011 50th IEEE Conference on, IEEE, 2011, pp. 3677–3681.
- 715 [16] J. C. Fuller, K. P. Schneider, D. Chassin, Analysis of residential demand response and double-auction markets, in: *Power and Energy Society General Meeting*, 2011 IEEE, IEEE, 2011, pp. 1–7.
- 720 [17] T. Nuytten, B. Claessens, K. Paredis, J. Van Bael, D. Six, Flexibility of a combined heat and power system with thermal energy storage for district heating, *Applied Energy* 104 (2013) 583–591.
- [18] A.-H. Mohsenian-Rad, A. Leon-Garcia, Optimal residential load control with price prediction in real-time electricity pricing environments, *Smart Grid, IEEE Transactions on* 1 (2) (2010) 120–133.
- 725

- [19] Q. Hu, F. Li, Hardware design of smart home energy management system with dynamic price response, *Smart Grid, IEEE Transactions on* 4 (4) (2013) 1878–1887.
- 730 [20] D. Ren, H. Li, Y. Ji, Home energy management system for the residential load control based on the price prediction, in: *Online Conference on Green Communications (GreenCom)*, 2011 IEEE, 2011, pp. 1–6. doi:10.1109/GreenCom.2011.6082525.
- [21] D. Kolokotsa, K. Niachou, V. Geros, K. Kalaitzakis, G. Stavrakakis, M. Santamouris, Implementation of an integrated indoor environment and energy management system, *Energy and Buildings* 37 (1) (2005) 93–99.
- 735 [22] SEAI, Residential energy road map (2011).
URL http://www.seai.ie/Renewables/Residential_Energy_Roadmap.pdf
- 740 [23] CER, Commission for energy regulation - demand side vision for 2020 (2011).
URL <http://www.cer.ie/docs/000654/cer11078.pdf>
- [24] ASHRAE, Measurement of energy and demand savings (2002) pg 17,ASHRAE Guideline 14-2002.
- 745 [25] E. C. Irish Government Publications, Building regulations 2011, conservation of fuel and energy - dwellings, section L. (2001).
- [26] Ireland central statistics office - the roof over our heads, pg 60 (2011).
URL <http://www.cso.ie>
- 750 [27] Energy plus - engineering reference manual, Building Technologies Program, US Department of Energy (DOE).
URL <http://apps1.eere.energy.gov/buildings/energyplus/pdfs/engineeringreference.pdf>

- [28] C. Ahern, P. Griffiths, M. O’Flaherty, State of the irish housing stock, modelling the heat losses of ireland’s existing detached rural housing stock & estimating the benefit of thermal retrofit measures on this stock, Energy Policy 55 (2013) 139–151.
- [29] Handbook fundamentals, ASHRAE American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers, Atlanta 2001-2005, chapter 26;Chapter 27.
- [30] W. J. Smith, Can ev (electric vehicles) address irelands carbon emissions from transport?, Energy 35 (12) (2010) 4514–4521.
- [31] F. Marra, G. Y. Yang, C. Traholt, E. Larsen, C. N. Rasmussen, S. You, Demand profile study of battery electric vehicle under different charging options, in: Power and Energy Society General Meeting, 2012 IEEE, IEEE, 2012, pp. 1–7.
- [32] F. Pallonetto, S. Oxizidis, D. Finn, Exploring the demand response potential of a smart-grid ready house using building simulation software, IBPSA Building Simulation Conference 2013.
- [33] L. Lundstrom, Weather data for building simulation: New actual weather files for north europe combining observed weather and modeled solar radiation, n n (2012) 0.
- [34] CER, Commission for energy regulation - ds3 system services technical definitions. (2013).
URL <http://www.allislandproject.org/GetAttachment.aspx?id=28a87af5-6de5-42f4-8673-2dee3400e949>
- [35] CER, Commission for energy regulation - smart metering cost-benefit analysis and trials findings reports. (2012).
URL <http://www.cer.ie/en/information-centre-reports-and-publications.aspx?article=c03aebf5-8048-456c-ba8b-3a79319a818>

- 780 [36] P. G. Ellis, P. A. Torcellini, D. B. Crawley, Simulation of energy management systems in EnergyPlus, National Renewable Energy Laboratory, 2008.
- [37] SEMO, Single electricity market operator.
URL <http://www.sem-o.com/Pages/default.aspx>
- 785 [38] J. Torriti, M. G. Hassan, M. Leach, Demand response experience in europe: Policies, programmes and implementation, Energy 35 (4) (2010) 1575–1583.