

University of Stuttgart

IER Institute of Energy Economics and Rational Energy Use

Energie (Nu $E_N = \rho F^{*CF^{*Q}}$ Energieverlust $7 * \lambda_s * l$

How well do we understand our power system models?

A HANDS ON EXEMPLARY ANALYSIS OF THE TIME RESOLUTION

42nd IAEE International Conference, Montreal. May 29 – June 1, 2019

> Savvidis, G. Hufendiek, K.

Content





and Energy

Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs



Supported by:

Model Description

E2M2 - European Electricity Market Model (Sun, 2013)



- Fundamental, bottom-up, LP model for Europe
- Electricity (spot market) prices for a market with complete competition
- Simultaneous optimization of unit commitment and investment decisions
- MILP mode for highly detailed unit commitment and investment decisions available (disregarded for the current work)
- Depicts: generation technologies (conventional, CHP, RES), storages, grid, PtX, DSI, curtailment

Motivation



Supported by:

Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs

and Energy

Motivation

IER University of Stuttgart

The role of time resolution





Method

Explaining the zero crossing effect



on the basis of a decision by the German Bundestag



Difference after aggregation

Saved generation: 1.5 GWh

Lost pump energy: 1.5 GWh

Hour (1H) step		
	Generation	Pumping
13:00	1.0 GWh	0.0 GWh

Quarter hour (QH) steps			
	Generation	Pumping	
13:00	1.5 GWh	0.0 GWh	
13:00	1.0 GWh	0.0 GWh	
13:30	0.0 GWh	0.5 GWh	
13:45	0.0 GWh	1.0 GWh	
Total	2.5 GWh	1.5 GWh	

Method

Introducing the 2 most important metrics



$$R_{Gen}(T) = \begin{cases} R(T) \text{ for all } R(T) > 0\\ 0 \text{ for all } R(T) \le 0 \end{cases} \quad R_{Pump}(T) = \begin{cases} R(T) \text{ for all } R(T) < 0\\ 0 \text{ for all } R(T) \ge 0. \end{cases}$$

$$E_{savedGen}^{Pot}(T_{\kappa}^{1H}) = \sum_{i} \left(R_{Gen}(T_{i}^{QH}) \right) - R_{Gen}(T_{\kappa}^{1H}), \quad \forall i \text{ which belong to } j \in Z$$

$$E_{lostSto}^{Pot}(T_{\kappa}^{1H}) = \sum_{i} \left| R_{Pump}(T_{i}^{QH}) \right| - \left| R_{Pump}(T_{\kappa}^{1H}) \right|, \quad \forall i \text{ which belong to } j \in Z.$$



Method

The model: keeping it simple

- Simplified unit commitment model:
 - No investments
 - No ramping restrictions
 - No grid
 - Aggregated unit types
- Model scope (year 2015):
 - 50 Hertz Region of Germany (isolated) (ENTSOE, 2019)
 - Scaled RES to match German 2030 targets
 - Scaled storage capacities
- 127 zero crossing occurences



60

Installed Capacities in GW



Results

Differences between QH and VAR (zero crossing = 1H; rest = QH)









- Storages are less used in the aggregated model
- Underestimation of storage use: -8 GWh (1.2% difference)

- Thermal power plants are less used in VAR model •
- Overestimation of RES: -3 GWh thermal plant usage •



But what EXACTLY happens?



Results

Detailed analysis





and Energy

Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs



Supported by:

Summary and Outlook



- Aggregating time steps in order to minimize model size leads to result deviation of the model (e.g. total operation cost changes)
- We propose a quantification method for the potential error caused by the zero crossing effect which can be calculated prior to a model run
- Models with variable time resolution capabilities can be used to analyze the error mechanism behind time aggregation
- We analyze the error mechanism at zero crossing points by comparing a highly resolved model (QH) to a variable resolved model (1H aggregation at zero crossing points, QH at the rest)
- We observed: storage efficiencies and storage volume drive the deviation
- Future topics to be addressed: ramping restrictions, availability of units, linearized start-up costs, grid, PtX technologies, investments



University of Stuttgart *IER* Institute for Energy Economics and Rational Energy Use

Thank you!



Georgios Savvidis

e-mail	georgios.savvidis@ier.uni-stuttgart.de
phone	+49 (0) 711 685- 878-35
fax	+49 (0) 711 685- 878-73

Universität Stuttgart Institute of Energy Economics and Rational Energy Use (IER) Heßbrühlstraße 49a, 70565 Stuttgart, Germany



- Deane et al., 2014: Deane, J.P.; Drayton, G.; Ó Gallachóir, B.P. (2014). The impact of sub-hourly modelling in power systems with significant levels of renewable generation. Applied Energy 113, 152–158. 10.1016/j.apenergy.2013.07.027.
- ENTSOE, 2019: ENTSO-E Transparency Platform. [Online]. Available:https://transparency.entsoe.eu/
- Graeber, 2002: B. Graeber (2002), Grenzübergreifende integrierte Elektrizitätsplanung im südlichen Afrika. Holzgartenstr. 16, 70174 Stuttgart: Universität Stuttgart.
- Savvidis et al., 2018: Savvidis, G.; Hufendiek, K. (2018). Variable Time Resolution in LP Electricity Market and Investment Models, in: 2018 15th International Conference on the European Energy Market (EEM). 2018 15th International Conference on the European Energy Market (EEM), Lodz. 6/27/2018 - 6/29/2018. IEEE, Piscataway, NJ, pp.
- Sun, 2013: Sun, N. (2013). Modellgestützte Untersuchung des Elektrizitätsmarktes: Kraftwerkseinsatzplanung und –investitionen. Holzgartenstr. 16, 70174 Stuttgart: Universität Stuttgart.
- Vom Stein et al., 2017: vom Stein, D.; van Bracht, N.; Maaz, A.; Moser, A. (2017). *Development of adaptive time patterns for multidimensional power system simulations*, in: 2017 14th International Conference on the European Energy Market (EEM). 6-9 June 2017, Dresden, Germany. 2017 14th International Conference on the European Energy Market (EEM), Dresden, Germany.
 6/6/2017 - 6/9/2017. IEEE, Piscataway, NJ, pp. 1–5.