

---

# AN ONLINE HIERARCHICAL ENERGY MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FOR ENERGY COMMUNITIES, COMPLYING WITH THE CURRENT TECHNICAL LEGISLATION FRAMEWORK

---

A PREPRINT

✉ **Antonino Capillo**

DIET Dept.  
University of Rome “La Sapienza”  
Rome, IT, Via Eudossiana 18, 00184  
antonino.capillo@uniroma1.it

✉ **Enrico De Santis**

DIET Dept.  
University of Rome “La Sapienza”  
Rome, IT, Via Eudossiana 18, 00184  
enrico.desantis@uniroma1.it

✉ **Fabio M. Frattale Mascioli**

DIET Dept.  
University of Rome “La Sapienza”  
Rome, IT, Via Eudossiana 18, 00184  
fabiomassimo.frattalemascioli@uniroma1.it

✉ **Antonello Rizzi**

DIET Dept.  
University of Rome “La Sapienza”  
Rome, IT, Via Eudossiana 18, 00184  
antonello.rizzi@uniroma1.it

February 6, 2024

## ABSTRACT

Efforts in the fight against Climate Change are increasingly oriented towards new energy efficiency strategies in Smart Grids (SGs). In 2018, with a proper legislation, the European Union (EU) defined the Renewable Energy Community (REC) as a local electrical grid whose participants share their self-produced renewable energy aiming at reducing bill costs by taking advantage of proper incentives. That action aspires to be an accelerator to the spread of local renewable energy exploitation, whose costs could not be within everyone's reach. Since a REC is technically a SG, the aforementioned strategies can be applied and, specifically, effective Energy Management Systems (EMSs) are required. Therefore, in this work, an online Hierarchical Energy Management System (HEMS) is synthesized for REC cost minimization to evaluate its superiority over a local self-consumption approach. EU technical indications (as inherited from Italy) are diligently followed aiming at as realistic as possible results. Power flows between REC nodes or Microgrids (MGs) are optimized by taking Energy Storage Systems (ESSs) and PV plant costs, energy purchase costs and REC incentives. A hybrid Fuzzy Inference System - Genetic Algorithm (FIS-GA) model, with the GA encoding the FIS parameters, is implemented. Power generation and consumption, which are the overall system input, are predicted by a Long Short-Term Memory Neural Network (LSTM), trained on historical data. The proposed hierarchical model achieves good precision in short computation times and it outperforms the self-consumption approach leading to about 20 % savings compared to the latter. In addition, the Explainable AI (XAI), which characterizes the model through the FIS, makes results more reliable thanks to a good human interpretation level. To finish, the HEMS is parametrized so that it is very simple to switch to another Country's technical legislation framework that, together with its good precision and computation time, should make it worthy of further development also by considering a proper business model for real-life applications.

**Keywords** Energy management system · smart grid · renewable energy community · evolutionary optimization · fuzzy inference system · ai explainability

## 1 Introduction

Among the proper countermeasures against Climate Change, energy efficiency strategies in Smart Grids (SGs) are relevant. In 2018, with the RED II European Union 2018 directive, the European Union (EU) defined the Renewable Energy Community (REC) as a local electrical grid whose participants share their self-produced renewable energy aiming at reducing bill costs by taking advantage from specific incentives. That aspires to be very useful for making Renewable Energy Source (RES) technologies more affordable for everyone by helping to face often too much expensive RES generators and Energy Storage System (ESS) installation and wear. Indeed, being grouped together, REC participants could save on electricity bills. However, without a suitable EMS in charge of making optimal decisions about energy flows (e.g. about when and how much to charge the ESS), the above savings, if they occurred, might not be appreciable. Being RECs a subset of SGs in all respects, both because of its architecture and its operating principle, the EMSs technology is widely applicable to them.

EMSs in Smart Grids (SGs) are extensively discussed in the recent literature. Cost minimization in terms of SGs elements operational wear is a very important objective that real-time EMSs Ju et al. 2018 have to achieve in a short time. In fact, online optimization procedures should be followed to avoid forecast errors due to long prediction horizons. In this respect, Neural models are often adopted for power predictions (e.g. load profiles) in support of EMSs Uremović et al. 2023 Fang et al. 2022. Likewise, Machine Learning (ML) comes to help in the optimal decision processes Y. Ye et al. 2023, to face problem complexity at the cost of a reasonable approximation.

As regards EMSs in Energy Communities (EC), even though it is a relatively new research topic, a not negligible volume of works can be found in literature.

One of the most common EMS objectives is cost minimization Putratama et al. 2023 Berg, Rana, and Farahmand 2023, i.e. the energy purchase cost from the Main Grid, PV plant and ESS installation costs and also operational costs like, for example, the ESS wear cost as expressed in Srithapon and Månsson 2023. In Lilla et al. 2020, energy selling is taken into account in the problem formulation and that helps to amortize the expenditure. However, the REC self-consumption, which logically speaking distances itself from an energy trading with the Main Grid Lilla et al. 2020, is often the energy management operation purpose. As an example, in Jo et al. 2021, energy flows between the overall ECs and the Main Grid are minimized and in Lazzari et al. 2023, similarly, excess in PV energy production is reduced as much as possible. It is not unusual to find some works that contemplate also  $CO_2$  emissions minimization as an objective Houben et al. 2023 Cosic et al. 2021, generally in addition to the above aims, in a multi-objective fashion.

For the sake of realism, technical legislation framework dictates can be included in the problem formulation Cosic et al. 2021, although only in a fraction of the reviewed works about ECs EMSs. In Srithapon and Månsson 2023 there is not a strong reference to EC regulations and some mention to incentives is made in Tomin et al. 2022. Moreover, in Putratama et al. 2023, an EC business model is investigated in detail by involving the roles of Community Manager and Distribution System Operator (DSO).

Like a SG, an EC is composed of nodes or Microgrids (MGs), that are the participants or *prosumers* in the incentive mechanism. Besides the fundamental EC elements, (loads - the participants or *prosumers* - RESs generators and ESSs, with a possible connection to the Main Grid), Electric Vehicles (EVs) can be added for a Vehicle-to-Grid (V2G) strategy Dolanyi et al. 2022 Feng et al. 2020 Liu, Li, et al. 2022. Moreover, architectures equipped with fuel-cell generators and micro-CHP de São José, Faria, and Vale 2021 can also be found in the literature. Focusing on the ESS, amid the other elements, is essential for a realistic representation of the ECs operations, since it represents the energy buffer in a RES context. Both a centralized ESS and a distributed ESS (one ESS for each prosumer) strategies are being explored. About the former, in Tostado-Véliz et al. 2023 a centralized ESS consists in a whole EVs parking area, where it is possible to exploit groups of vehicles as batteries (V2G). In Srithapon and Månsson 2023 a distributed strategy is adopted and a wear cost model for the ESS is implemented. More precisely, the aforesaid cost is directly proportional to the ESS exchanged power by a wear cost coefficient. However, an ESS wear cost model is not always implemented, as in Liu, Fan, et al. 2022.

The strategy scope, i.e. the particular task the EMS simulation is conducted to accomplish, can be both large and slight. In the former case, optimal energy flows between nodes or, at most, between them and the Main Grid, are settled Houben et al. 2023. In the latter case, a more detailed optimal energy flow network is decided, fulfilling the Demand-Response task by shifting controllable household appliances Good and Mancarella 2019 Feng et al. 2020 Deng et al. 2023. Furthermore, for what concerns the simulation time horizon, real-time Srithapon and Månsson 2023 and day-ahead Lilla et al. 2020 EMSs for ECs are both provided in the literature.

As concerns the technical side, many EMSs for ECs rely on Mixed-Integer Linear Programming (MILP) Good and Mancarella 2019 Nagpal et al. 2022 Houben et al. 2023 and Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM)

Putratama et al. 2023 Lilla et al. 2020 as optimization paradigms. However, Computational Intelligence (CI) is confirmed to be very useful for facing problem complexities and OF non differentiability. In fact, Genetic Algorithms (GAs), multi-objective purpose Non-dominated Sorting Genetic Algorithms (NSGA-II and NSGA-III) Lazzari et al. 2023 Deng et al. 2023 Liu, Li, et al. 2022 Liu, Fan, et al. 2022 and Monte Carlo Tree algorithms Tomin et al. 2022 are implemented in a not negligible number of works on the topic at hand.

Also, hierarchical energy management is successfully adopted in the field. In Nagpal et al. 2022, a MILP local EMS (i.e. one for each MG) aimed at costs minimization returns household appliance profiles that are passed as an input to a global EMS (MILP-based) whose objective is the whole EC self-consumption. In Mustika et al. 2022, a REC cost minimization by an energy management strategy is performed in France. Both global REC-level and single-participant bill savings are considered by making many attempts not only to achieve a good global REC cost minimization but also good electricity bill savings for each participant, encouraging future participants to join. Such a two-level optimization is possible only through a realistic business model that provides details about the REC environment (i.e. relations between REC Manager, participants and suppliers, community payments and billing information, and so on).

In the Italian context, the ESS is confirmed to be a crucial element Cielo et al. 2021 Barberi et al. 2022 Guiducci et al. 2023. In Guiducci et al. 2023, the decision variable is a real-valued number that rules the amount of energy to exchange with the ESS. In Cielo et al. 2021, a power flows optimization, based on the optimal ESS management, is operated for a hypothetical REC in Italy, also by taking into account different business models. Nevertheless, ESS wear modeling is often not treated in deep. In Zatti et al. 2021, no explicit ESS operational cost model is implemented but ESS OPEX are assumed to be a function of capital expenditure. Also in Cielo et al. 2021, the ESS OPEX is assumed to be a fixed quantity without a wear model behind it. In Barberi et al. 2022, a proper wear battery cost model is not included in the problem formulation since the ESS can perform one charge/discharge cycle per day and a fixed number of maximum lifespan cycles number is set. The same can be said for Guiducci et al. 2023 and Stentati, Paoletti, and Vicino 2022, where a battery cost is included into the formulation although a wear model is not directly explicated.

In line with many aforementioned abroad works the EMS objective is often the minimization of energy exchanges with the Main Grid Proietti et al. 2023 Martirano et al. 2021 but in Cutore et al. 2023a the overall REC costs are minimized, like in Cielo et al. 2021 and in Barberi et al. 2022 where an overall REC cost minimization is performed for a site in the Pantelleria island. However, in Ghiani et al. 2019, electricity bill costs minimization is pursued by self-consumption maximization.

For what concerns simulation realism and reference to the EC legislation, one of the most detailed works is Zatti et al. 2021, where high care is taken in embedding the Italian legislation framework in the problem formulation. Nonetheless, the energy selling price to the Main Grid is only estimated as the mean hourly Italian Market value using 2019 time series, rather than taking it from the technical legislation. That is reasonably due to the legislation updates that occurred from 2020 (when the aforementioned work was written) to the present day. In addition, PV production data are estimated using PVGIS tool, (a European Commission empirical model that takes geographical coordinates as an input) in place of measured data. Since that work mainly aims at the REC PV and ESS sizing, rather than energy management as such, a proper power forecasting model is not implemented.

As for the technical sphere, both exact and heuristic optimization paradigms are adopted. In Zatti et al. 2021 a MILP optimization algorithm is implemented. Similarly, in Cutore et al. 2023a an exact optimization model is developed in the MathWorks<sup>®</sup> Matlab environment. ML and CI are preferred in Guiducci et al. 2023, where a Reinforcement Learning (RL) EMS is synthesized, and in Proietti et al. 2023, where a GA-based EMS, developed in Python, is in charge of optimally control in a REC with also Electric Vehicles (EVs).

Speaking of nodes, architecture both distributed (PV roofs distributed among participants) and centralized (one PV plant for the whole Community) configurations are explored Cutore et al. 2023b, and for optimal power flow decisions a real-time approach is generally preferred to the day-ahead scheduling, as in Proietti et al. 2023.

Being ML and CI (so, in general, Artificial Intelligence - AI - more and more used in SGs and ECs EMSs), as explained above, it is worth mentioning the Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) research field Mendel and Bonissone 2021 Tao et al. 2023 Chamola et al. 2023 van Zyl, X. Ye, and Naidoo 2024. Instead of relying on black-box models (e.g. Neural Networks), even though their efficiency is undisputed, a grey-box AI algorithm could bring more information about its inner reasoning process. In this context, Fuzzy Logic (FL) is very useful thanks to the structure of Fuzzy Inference Systems (FISs) represented in a way that is very close to Natural Language D'Alterio, Garibaldi, and John 2020.

To sum up, to the best of our knowledge, the following considerations can be made. The real-time approach is the best choice for more realistic results and the alternation of self-consumption and cost minimization as REC global objectives is a constant also in the Italian context. The same is true for the technical side, with ML and CI sometimes preferred to

exact optimization (much less in Italy) but there is no mention of XAI in the topic at hand (EMSs in ECs). Moreover, ESS wear model implementation can not be found easily in Italy and it is rarely done in depth abroad. As for legislation references, many efforts have been made with remarkable results but it is difficult to find a completely explicated and updated technical legislation reference in the literature. To finish, the hierarchical energy management research line is still not developed in Italy, at least for the topic at hand.

In this work, an online Hierarchical Energy Management System (HEMS) is synthesized for a REC cost minimization. Each participant is equipped with a local EMS that maximized its self-consumption while the global HEMS, aware of the nodes' state, overwrites the local optimal decisions about power flows. That design choice comes from the need to explore more in deep which objective could be more proper for a REC. None of that could be possible without the realism level given by the slavish reference to the EU technical legislation framework, (as inherited by Italy) as well as an ESS wear cost model more complex than the others in the ECs EMSs literature for Italy, at the best of our knowledge. This paper does not include a REC business model. Therefore, revenues and costs are calculated realistically but only for having a yardstick for a comparison between the self-consumption and the hierarchical strategies. It means that economic details are not covered so that final electricity bill costs are not evaluated. In line with the literature, the HEMS relies on ML both for PV power predictions, performed by an LSTM, and for optimization that uses the FIS-GA paradigm in a XAI fashion. More precisely, the GA implemented in this work comes from a development path followed by the authors that led to previous papers about text classification De Santis, Capillo, et al. 2023 and also energy management tasks Capillo, et al. 2022. Since that was a previous version of the algorithm, the updated GA used in this work is accurately re-tested as a stand-alone algorithm on some of the best-known benchmark OFs. Moreover, the use of Fuzzy Logic as an Explainable AI paradigm (especially hybridized with Evolutionary Optimization - EO -) is part of the research team background De Santis, Rizzi, et al. 2013.

The main contributions of this paper are the following:

- Local self-consumption outperformed by the proposed hierarchical management strategy (20 % savings more);
- Slavish reference to the up-to-date EU REC Legislation framework, as inherited by Italy;
- Proper model parametrization in order to an easy implementation with other Countries Legislation;
- Reference to real PV plant and ESS devices, as presented in the Italian Market;
- Adoption of an ESS wear cost model;
- Detailed energy purchase cost, with also fixed costs component;
- Machine Learning grey-box computation aiming at a XAI optimization model;

In Section 2, the REC architecture, with its nodes (MGs) and elements, is depicted while the problem formulation is presented in Section 3; details about MG costs (i.e. the ESS wear) are reported in Section 4; power forecasting and energy flows optimization tasks are described in Section 5 and Section 6, respectively while tests setup and results in Section 7 and Section 8, respectively. Finally, conclusions are drawn.

## 2 REC Architecture

The REC architecture is pictured in Fig. 1 in a generic timeslot  $k$  of 15 minutes.

REC nodes, i.e. (MGs), and power flows between them are in black lines; local (node-level) *EMS* modules and information flows are in green lines while for the *HEMS* (REC-level) are in blue lines; power prediction *LSTM* module and information flows are in orange. The REC involves 7 nodes, enclosed in oval contours, that can exchange power with the external element  $N$ , the Main Grid. Therefore, each node can work both in isolated and grid-connected mode. Two elements compose each node: the ESS  $S_x$  and a composite element named  $GL_x$ , with  $x$  generic node. The latter is the composition of the PV generator (i.e. the PV roof)  $G_x$  and the electrical load  $L_x$ , which comes from the aggregation of the overall household appliances. In turn, both  $S_x$  and  $G_x L_x$  have a sub-element, the *BMS* or Battery Management System and the meter  $M_x$ , respectively. The *BMS*, which in this work is only simulated, evaluates the  $S_x$  State of Energy (SoE) while  $M_x$  provides power measures for the timeslot  $k$  to the *LSTM* prediction module.

Nearly before the end of the current timeslot  $k$ , generated and absorbed power values,  $P_k^{G_x}$  and  $P_k^{L_x}$ , are measured by  $M_x$  and provided to the *LSTM* module. In turn, the *LSTM* predicts the same figures for the next timeslot  $k+1$ ,  $P_{k+1}^{G_x}$  and  $P_{k+1}^{L_x}$ , and passes them to the *EMS* module. Completely unaware of the other nodes in the REC, the *EMS*




Figure 1: The HEMS architecture.

performs a power flows optimization having the auto-consumption of  $x$  as an objective. In other words, each node plans to act as it was isolated from the other nodes. Optimal decisions  $\alpha'_{x,k}$  lead to optimal power flows  $P_{k+1}^{GL_x, S_x}$  and  $P_{k+1}^{GL_x, N_x}$ , i.e. the power that flows between  $GL_x$  and  $S_x$ , positive towards  $S_x$  and the power that flows between  $GL_x$  and  $N_x$ , positive towards  $N_x$ . At this step,  $\alpha'_{x,k}$  is equal to  $\alpha_{x,k}$ , since the *HEMS* has not overwritten the local optimal decision yet, since it will happen in the next phase. Thus, the *BMS* estimates the *SoE* figures of the overall nodes are passed by their *BMS*s to the *HEMS* meaning that the latter acquires information about the state the REC would be in, in  $k + 1$ , if only local auto-consumption would be taken into account. That said, the *HEMS* performs power flows optimization for the whole REC by aiming at the minimum monetary cost for the REC as an objective. The optimal decision  $\hat{\alpha}_{x,k}$  overwrites the local optimal decision  $\alpha'_{x,k}$  only if their values are different, since the *HEMS* is hierarchically superior. Therefore, if  $\hat{\alpha}_{x,k}$  is different from  $\alpha'_{x,k}$ ,  $\hat{\alpha}_{x,k}$  becomes equal to  $\alpha_{x,k}$ , the definitive optimal decision for  $k + 1$ ; otherwise,  $\alpha_{x,k}$  is equal to  $\alpha'_{x,k}$ . In the former case,  $P_{k+1}^{GL_x, S_x}$  and  $P_{k+1}^{GL_x, N_x}$  are recalculated becoming the definitive optimal power flows for  $k + 1$ .

## 2.1 Design Choices

In this work, many choices are made by adhering to the current European technical legislation European Union 2018 European Union 2019 as it is inherited by Italy (where the authors come from) Italian Government 2020b Autorità di Regolazione per Energia Reti e Ambiente (ARERA) 2020 Autorità di Regolazione per Energia Reti e Ambiente (ARERA) 2022 Gestore dei Servizi Energetici (GSE S.p.A) 2022 Italian Government 2020a Italian Government 2021c Italian Government 2021b Italian Government 2021a Italian Government 2019, henceforth named "legislation". A detailed explanation of the reasons behind that choices are shown in the following.

First of all, a hierarchical EMS for the overall REC energy management whose objective is different from the local auto-consumption is compliant with the legislation that, at the best of our knowledge, aims at cost reduction. Indeed, high PV plant and ESS installation costs could make a green-energy-powered home perspective not affordable for the single customer, from which the idea of customer aggregation comes. In addition, thanks to such an sped up spread of distributed generation, more consumers could be led to rely less and less on the Main Grid, resulting in benefits for the latter. In fact, power peaks inside the electrical infrastructure would be reduced, from which less operational cost to face. In light of that, the Government provides incentives to the RECs participants proportionally to the locally-generated

energy they share with each other. Moreover, energy sell is allowed at a fixed price. That way, customers are encouraged to join RECs because they could save on the electricity bill and on installation costs amortization. For what concerns the number of REC nodes, it is derived from data about prototype RECs in Italy, collected by Legambiente Eroee and Polci 2022, an Italian environmental association. More specifically, it turns out that small RECs (equipped with PV generators with overall power between 10 kWp and 20 kWp, in line with the target of this work) count between 2 and 12 residential participants. Thus the average value of 7 nodes is adopted. A 15 minutes long timeslot  $k$  is set according to literature Kurukuru et al. 2022. The choice of unifying generator and load accomplishes the legislation European Union 2018 Italian Government 2020b (Art. 42-bis, par. 4), according to which renewable energy consumption should be instantaneous. It means that renewable energy provided by  $G_x$  must be primarily consumed by  $L_x$  for satisfying the demand, rather than the not completely renewable energy purchased from the Main Grid  $N$  Terna - Rete Elettrica Nazionale S.p.A. n.d. To be precise, the legislation states that also renewable energy stored in the ESSs should be consumed instantaneously but it is trivial that  $L_x$  should primarily rely on  $G_x$  than  $S_x$  for avoiding ESSs wear costs. With that premise,  $G_x$  and  $L_x$  can be represented as a single node  $GL_x$ . Moreover, there are not power flows between  $N_x$  and  $S_x$  for the following reasons:

- If energy would be purchased from the Main Grid to charge the ESS, the REC would implicitly consider fossil fuel energy as a primary resource while, on the contrary, it must be an emergency resource for energy shortages (renewable energy is primary). Therefore,  $S_x$  can be charged only in case of energy overabundance from  $GL_x$  and power flows between  $N_x$  and  $S_x$  towards the latter are not possible;
- Selling energy excess from  $GL_x$  is more convenient than selling the same quantity from  $S_x$  since, in that case, ESSs wear costs would occur. Thus, power flows between  $N_x$  and  $S_x$  towards the former are not possible.

In addition, power flows between  $GL_x$  and  $N_x$  are bidirectional. In fact, in line with legislation Gestore dei Servizi Energetici (GSE S.p.A) 2022(par. 6) Gestore dei Servizi Energetici (GSE S.p.A) n.d.,  $GL_x$  excess energy can be sold to  $N_x$  (other than purchased) at a given price that will be made explicit in Section 3.

### 3 Problem formulation

Node-level *EMSS* pursue MGs auto-consumption while the *HEMS* has the REC costs minimization as an objective. Therefore, different problem formulations have to be considered: the node-level problem, tackled by *EMSS*s, and the REC-level problem, faced by the *HEMS*. Nevertheless, the formulation below (eq. 1- eq. 17), whose flowchart is shown in Fig. 2, is in common because of the decision variable  $\alpha_k$ . In fact, as pictured in Fig. 1, the *EMSS* sets  $\alpha'_{x,k}$  for achieving auto-consumption and the formulation at hand is designed to reach that goal by setting  $\alpha_k$  equal to  $\alpha'_{x,k}$  that always is equal to 1. It is worth mentioning that SoE falls into the given bounds implicitly, i.e. without an explicit constraint equation.

$$P_{k+1}^{GL_x^*} = P_{k+1}^{G_x^*} + P_{k+1}^{L_x^*} \quad (1)$$

$$E_{k+1}^{GL_x^*} = P_{k+1}^{GL_x^*} + \Delta t \quad (2)$$

$$c_k = Q \cdot (SoE^{max} - SoE_{x,k}) \quad (3)$$

$$r_k = Q \cdot (SoE_{x,k} - SoE^{min}) \quad (4)$$

$$SoE^{max} = 0.95 \quad (5)$$

$$SoE^{min} = 0.15 \quad (6)$$

$$P_{k+1}^{GL_x, S_x} = 0 [kW] \quad (7)$$




Figure 2: The node level EMS flowchart.

$$P_{k+1}^{GL_{x,N}} = 0 [kW] \quad (8)$$

$$P_{k+1}^{GL_{x,S_x}} = \alpha_{x,k} \cdot P_{k+1}^{GL_x^*} \quad (9)$$

$$P_{k+1}^{GL_{x,N}} = P_{k+1}^{GL_x^*} - P_{k+1}^{GL_{x,S_x}} \quad (10)$$

$$P_{k+1}^{GL_{x,S_x}} = \alpha_{x,k} \cdot \frac{c_k}{\Delta t} \quad (11)$$

$$P_{k+1}^{GL_{x,S_x}} = \alpha_{x,k} \cdot P^{S,max} \quad (12)$$

$$P^{S,max} = 7 [kW] \quad (13)$$

$$P_{k+1}^{GL_{x,S_x}} = -\alpha_{x,k} \cdot |P_{k+1}^{GL_x^*}| \quad (14)$$

$$P_{k+1}^{GLx, S_x} = -\alpha_{x,k} \cdot \frac{r_k}{\Delta t} \quad (15)$$

$$P_{k+1}^{GLx, S_x} = -\alpha_{x,k} \cdot P^{S,max} \quad (16)$$

$$SoE_{x,k+1} = \begin{cases} \left( SoE_{x,k} + \frac{P_{k+1}^{GLx, S_x} \cdot \Delta t}{Q} \right) \cdot \eta & \text{if } P_{k+1}^{GLx*} > 0 \\ \left( SoE_{x,k} - \left| \frac{P_{k+1}^{GLx, S_x} \cdot \Delta t}{Q} \right| \right) \cdot \frac{1}{\eta} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

The quantity  $E_{k+1}^{GLx*}$  is the amount of energy exchanged in  $k+1$  by  $GLx$  in a  $\Delta t$  of 15 minutes (one timeslot);  $c_k$  is the remaining fraction of the ESS Capacity  $Q$  (expressed in terms of energy amount) in  $k$ , i.e. how much energy the ESS can store yet;  $r_k$  is the remaining energy amount in the ESS, in  $k$ ;  $SoE^{min}$  and  $SoE^{max}$  are the lower and upper bounds of the SoE, respectively, for preserving the ESS health;  $P^{(S,max)}$  is the maximum power that the chosen ESS can exchange due to its technical limits (see Sub-section 4.2 for further details). Once the  $SoS_{k+1}$  is calculated by the  $EMS_x$ , it is passed as an input to the  $HEMS$  that achieves the optimal values of the decision variable  $\hat{\alpha}_{x,k}$  against the REC Objective Function (OF) described by the equations below:

$$\min_{\alpha_{i,k}} (R_{k+1} - C_{k+1}) \quad (18)$$

subject to:

$$\alpha_{i,k} \in [0, 1] \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n \quad (19)$$

$$n = 7 \quad (20)$$

$$R_{k+1} = I_{k+1}^{sha} + I_{k+1}^{ret} + I_{k+1}^{sel} \quad (21)$$

$$C_{k+1} = h_{k+1}^{ESS} + h_{k+1}^{pur} + h_{k+1}^{ins} \quad (22)$$

$$I_{k+1}^{sha} = TP_{REC} \cdot E_{k+1}^{sha} \quad (23)$$

$$I_{k+1}^{ret} = CU_{Af,m} \cdot E_{k+1}^{sha} \quad (24)$$

$$I_{k+1}^{sel} = \begin{cases} PR^3 \cdot \Delta t \cdot P_{k+1}^{GLx,N} & \text{if } P_{k+1}^{GLx,N} > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

$$TP_{REC} = 110 \left[ \frac{\text{€}}{\text{kWh}} \right] \quad (26)$$

$$CU_{Af,m} = TRAS_e + \max(BTAU_m) \quad (27)$$

$$TRAS_e = 7,61 \left[ \frac{\text{€}}{\text{kWh}} \right] \quad (28)$$

$$\max(BTAU_m) = 0,61 \left[ \frac{\text{€}}{\text{kWh}} \right] \quad (29)$$

$$E_{k+1}^{sha} = \min(E_{k+1}^{gen}, E_{k+1}^{dra}) \quad (30)$$

$$E_{k+1}^{gen} = P_{k+1}^{G*} \cdot \Delta t \quad (31)$$

$$E_{k+1}^{dra} = \begin{cases} P_{k+1}^{L*} + P_{k+1}^{GL_x, S_x} & \text{if } P_{k+1}^{GL_x, S_x} > 0 \\ P_{k+1}^{L*} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

$$h_{k+1}^{pur} = \begin{cases} (u_{pur} \cdot P_{k+1}^{GL_x, N} + u_{pur}^*) \cdot (1 + VAT) & \text{if } P_{k+1}^{GL_x, N} < 0 \\ u_{pur}^* \cdot (1 + VAT) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (33)$$

$$h_{k+1}^{ins} = u_{PV} \cdot |P_{k+1}^{G_x}| \cdot \Delta t \quad (34)$$

$$u_{pur} = 0,212 \left[ \frac{\text{€}}{\text{kWh}} \right] \quad (35)$$

$$u_{pur}^* = 0,003 \text{ [€]} \quad (36)$$

The HEMS minimizes the difference between total revenues  $R_{k+1}$  and total costs  $C_{k+1}$  (eq. 18) for the  $n$  nodes.  $R_{k+1}$  (eq. 21) is the sum of revenues from “shared energy”  $I_{k+1}^{sha}$ , revenues from the “return of tariff components” (except system charges)  $I_{k+1}^{ret}$  and revenues from energy sold to the Main Grid  $I_{k+1}^{sel}$ , according to Gestore dei Servizi Energetici (GSE S.p.A), 2023 (par. 6.1). The cost  $C_{k+1}$  (eq. 22) comes from the ESS wear cost  $h_{k+1}^{ESS}$ , the energy purchase from the Main Grid  $h_{k+1}^{pur}$  and the overall PV plant and ESS installation cost  $h_{k+1}^{ins}$ . Revenues are calculated thanks to the “premium tariff” for RECs  $TP_{REC}$ , the “unit consumption of the monthly flat rate”  $CU_{Af,m}$ , the energy sell cost  $PR_3$ , the “tariff for the broadcast service”  $TRAS_e$  and the “maximum value of the distribution component variable”  $max(BTAU_m)$ , according to Gestore dei Servizi Energetici (GSE S.p.A), 2023 and Autorità di Regolazione per Energia Reti e Ambiente (ARERA), 2020-2022. The “shared energy”  $E_{k+1}^{sha}$  is a very important quantity since it is the main revenue factor for the REC. According to Italian Government, 2020b (Law 28th February 2020 n°8):

*The shared energy is equal to the minimum, in each hourly period, between the electricity produced and fed into the grid by the plants to renewable sources and the electricity taken from the whole associated end customers.*

Consistently, eq. 30 formulates that principle with  $E_{k+1}^{gen}$  and  $E_{k+1}^{dra}$  the amount of energy generated by PV plant and the amount of energy the REC absorbs or stores in the ESS, in  $k + 1$ . Costs are calculated through  $u_{pur}$  energy purchase unit price from the Main Grid,  $u_{pur}^*$  energy purchase fixed price from the Main Grid,  $u_{PV}$  PV plant installation cost coefficient,  $h_{k+1}^{ESS}$  ESS wear cost, being  $d$  the number of timeslots. Those prices and costs are derived and discussed in Section 4.

## 4 MG costs

The choices about costs and prices are described in this Section. Together with the energy purchase price from the Main Grid, PV plant installation cost as well as the ESS operating wear cost model are laid out and discussed.

### 4.1 Energy purchase price

Energy price in Italy is composed by a unit price (per  $kWh$ ) and a fixed price. Both of them are derived from the economic conditions of an Italian energy operator, fund using the ARERA portal Autorità di Regolazione per Energia Reti e Ambiente (ARERA) n.d. The unit price is  $0.212 \frac{\text{€}}{\text{kWh}}$  while the fixed price, for a single node in the generic timeslot, is  $0.003 \text{ €}$ . Those economic conditions refer to  $6kW$  clients, derived from the average max power absorbed by nodes in the dataset time horizon (year 2019), (shown in Sub-Section 5.1). Those costs are increased by the Italian VAT (10%).

## 4.2 PV and ESS wear costs

The PV plant wear cost  $h_{ins}$ , with reference to eq. 34, is estimated proportionally to the usage, i.e. to the amount of energy exchanged between the generator and the rest of the node elements. The coefficient  $u_{PV}$ , expressed in  $\text{€}/kWh$ , is the average ratio, among the 7 nodes, between the PV installation cost and the overall energy generated during the whole year 2019 (the dataset at our disposal). The PV installation cost is about  $6.000 \text{€}$  ENEL X Italia S.p.A. n.d.(b) for a  $3 kW_p$  PV plant while about  $7.400 \text{€}$  ENEL X Italia S.p.A. n.d.(c) for a  $4 kW_p$  PV plant, according to the store Enel X, an important Italian Company. Those costs include also inspection, design and VAT.

The ESS wear cost comes from a proper wear cost model based on Sekyung Han, Soohee Han, and Aki 2014. The model formulation is presented below:

$$h_{k+1}^{ESS} = \frac{\Delta t}{2} \cdot (W_{SoE_{x,k}} + W_{SoE_{x,k+1}}) \cdot |P_{k+1}^{GL_x, S_x}| \quad (37)$$

with:

$$W_{SoE_{x,k}} = \frac{u_{ESS}}{2 \cdot Q \cdot \eta} \cdot \frac{b \cdot (1 - SoE_{x,k})^{(b-1)}}{a} \quad (38)$$

The ESS installation price  $u_{ESS}$  is about  $5.000 \text{€}$  and, as for the PV plant, it includes also inspection, design and VAT costs. It is a  $5 kWh$  battery ENEL X Italia S.p.A. n.d.(a) whose efficiency  $\eta$  is 0.98 and whose maximum output power  $P^{S,max}$  is  $7 kW$  (Tab. 1).

Table 1: ESS main features.

Feature	Value
Price	5000 €
Capacity	5 kWh
Peak power	7 kW
Efficiency ( $\eta$ )	0.98

The quantity  $h_{k+1}^{ESS}$ , i.e. the ESS wear cost in €, is calculated through  $W_{SoE}$ , in  $\frac{\text{€}}{kWh}$ , that is defined in Sekyung Han, Soohee Han, and Aki 2014 as the ‘‘Average Wear Cost’’ and can be interpreted as a cost density, since it represents the cost at given  $SoE$  value. Moreover,  $a$  and  $b$  are Lithium-Ions battery parameters related to the specific ESS and precisely to the Achievable Cycle Count (ACC) and the Depth of Discharge (DoD) experimental curve interpolation (Fig. 3, eq. 39).

$$ACC(DoD_{x,k}) = \frac{a}{DoD_{x,k}^b} \quad (39)$$

In other words,  $a$  and  $b$  values control the shape of the aforementioned curve, i.e. they provide information about the ESS lifespan. Therefore,  $h_{k+1}^{ESS}$  is the cost of the ESS for changing its  $SoE$  level from  $SoE_{x,k}$  to  $SoE_{x,k+1}$ , due to a power exchange in any direction  $|P_{k+1}^{GL_x, S_x}|$ .

Since ENEL X does not provide an ACC-DoD experimental curve for the chosen ESS,  $a$  and  $b$  are rationally derived from literature Sekyung Han, Soohee Han, and Aki 2014 Kim et al. 2019, whose figures are reported in Tab. 2. To be in line with literature,  $a$  and  $b$  values are 694 and 0.795, respectively.

## 5 Power Forecasting

Thanks to power generation and power consumption historical data (described more in deep in Subsection 5.1), a Long Short-Time Memory (LSTM) Neural Network is trained for power forecasting. At each timeslot, the module predicts




Figure 3: An example of ACC-DoD Lithium-Ions battery experimental curve.

Table 2: ESS  $a$  and  $b$  values for different batteries, according to literature.

Source	$a$	$b$
Sekyung Han, Soohee Han, and Aki 2014	694	0.795
Kim et al. 2019	1131	1.825
Kim et al. 2019	2744	1.665

power figures for the next timeslot, in an Open Loop fashion. That Open Loop choice is made for improving prediction performance, under the assumption that a proper meter measures and provides the power value in  $k$  to the LSTM. That is in line with the EMSs and HEMS optimal decisions that are taken timeslot after timeslot, in an online the energy management approach.

## 5.1 Dataset presentation

The dataset comes from an online open data supply belonging to the OpenAIRE European Project. It counts power generation figures for 3 residential PV plants (one 3 kWp, named *PV 2* and two 4 kWp each, named *PV 1* and *PV 3*) together with power consumption measures for 15 residential homes (each of them named *Home*), for the whole year 2019. Data resolution is 15 minutes, as required for this work. Power consumption of 7 houses, chosen randomly among the overall 15 ones, are included into the computation while the 3 generation profiles are randomly associated to them. An example of power generation and consumption profiles is provided in Fig. 4 and some additional information are reported in Tab. 3.

## 5.2 Model details and workflow

The forecasting model, (an LSTM implemented through MathWorks<sup>®</sup> Matlab libraries), is trained using a 328 days training set, i.e. the 90% of the days in the whole year 2019 (the overall dataset). Ergo, the test set counts 37 days of power figures (10% of the dataset). The LSTM training options and meta-parameters are laid-out in Tab 4.

Roughly at the end of the current day, the LSTM updates its *state* using power predictions for the previous 35 days. Consequently, the *state* update occurs every 24 hours while training is made only once on historical data. As aforementioned, at each  $k$  the LSTM predicts power figures for  $k + 1$  in an Open Loop fashion. Succintly, an Open Loop prediction for  $k + 1$  is performed by considering the *state* at  $k$  like in Closed Loop fashion but, differently, also by taking the real power figure in  $k$  as an input rather than its prediction. Better precision comes from Open Loop




Figure 4: Dataset excerpt with one house and one PV plant power profiles.

Table 3: Dataset information.

Profile	Min [kW]	Max [kW]	Mean [kW]
PV 1	0.000	3.472	0.600
PV 2	0.000	2.797	0.488
PV 3	0.000	3.439	0.433
Home 1	0.020	3.784	0.362
Home 2	0.008	4.980	0.256
Home 3	0.016	6.324	0.362
Home 4	0.004	7.044	0.663
Home 5	0.028	5.852	0.426
Home 6	0.024	6.324	0.556
Home 7	0.016	5.864	0.441

predictions, since real figures are involved in the workflow but a proper meter is assumed to be installed for measuring that figures and providing them to the LSTM at each timeslot. Average computational costs for training, state update and prediction itself, between the overall predictions (homes and PV plants) are displayed in Tab. 5. The model runs on 12<sup>th</sup> Gen Intel(R) Core(TM) i9-12900K workstation with 3.19 GHz processor and 128 GB RAM.

### 5.3 Forecasting results

Power predictions are represented in Tab. 6 for PV plant 1 and home 1 by way of example. Predictions are made for 96 timeslots or 24 h for a wider overview on the figures, keeping in mind a timeslot-by-timeslot forecasting is required.

RMSE is calculated as the average between the single-timeslot predictios RMSE values. Figures are given in Tab. 7.

Figures are in line with literature, as discussed below. In Aslam et al. 2021, LSTM PV power prediction are performed for 21 PV plants that range from 100 kW<sub>p</sub> to 8500 kW<sub>p</sub>. RMSE values fall between 0.04 kW and 0.112 kW with an average of 0.07 kW. Such a result could suggest that the RMSE is roughly independent of the PV plant nominal power.

Table 4: LSTM training options and meta-parameters.

Figure	Value
LSTM layers	128
Max epochs	200
Shuffle	<i>every – epoch</i>
Solver	<i>RMSPropagation</i>
Gradient Decay	0.90
Squared Gradient Decay	0.99
Epsilon	$1.00e^{-08}$
Initial Learning Rate	$1.00e^{-03}$
Learning Rate Schedule	<i>none</i>
Learning Rate Drop Factor	0.10
Learning Rate Drop Period	10
L2 Regularization	$1.00e^{-04}$
Gradient Threshold Method	<i>l2norm</i>
Gradient Threshold	<i>Inf</i>

Table 5: LSTM computational costs.

Figure	Value [s]
Training	180
<i>state update</i>	0.310
Test (prediction)	0.003

Quite similar figures are laid out in Mellit, Pavan, and Lughi 2021, where an LSTM leads to an RMSE of  $0.16 kW$  for a MG PV plant of  $4 kW_p$  (a plant size adopted in this work). That said, since the average RMSE for the PV prediction in this work is  $0.068 kW$  (Tab. 7), it can be stated that those are good results. As concerns load forecasting, in Rajabi and Estebarsari 2019, a minimum RMSE of  $0.79 kW$  results for an house load profile (which spans from roughly  $0 kW$  up to  $8 kW$ ), among different NN-based prediction approaches. In Wen et al. 2019, an LSTM model leads to an RMSE of about  $3 kW$  for a power profile that fluctuates roughly between  $17 kW$  and  $80 kW$ . In Sharma and Jain 2022, an LSTM predictor makes an RMSE error of about  $200 MW$  for an aggregated load profile that spans from approximately  $1000 MW$  up to  $5000 MW$ . Moreover, in Razghandi and Turgut 2020, the RMSE for an LSTM load forecast for a single household appliance (electric heater) is about  $9 W$ , with absorbed power that falls between  $0 W$  and  $90 W$ . Since load profiles means are not provided for the above-mentioned works, peak absorbed power is taken as a reference value for results comparisons, representing a measure of the load profile size. Thus, it turns out that a RMSE-peak power ratio between  $0.04$  and  $0.1$  is acceptable, according to literature. For the load predictions in this work, that ratio falls between  $0.01$  and  $0.03$  with an average of  $0.02$ . That said, predictions are reasonably good.

## 6 Optimization Module

The optimization module refers only to the *HEMS*, since the single MG EMSs belong to auto-consumption, according to the problem formulation described in 3. The module relies on a Fuzzy Inference System - Genetic Algorithm (FIS-GA) paradigm where the GA encodes the FIS parameters (i.e. Antecedents, Consequents, Rule Weights and Membership Function - MFs - abscissas) and optimizes them against the overall REC OF (eq. 18).




Table 6: Power predictions.

Table 7: Power predictions RMSE values.

Prediction	RMSE [kW]
PV plant 1	0.089
PV plant 2	0.057
PV plant 3	0.058
Home 1	0.088
Home 2	0.058
Home 3	0.119
Home 4	0.192
Home 5	0.162
Home 6	0.166
Home 7	0.130

## 6.1 Optimization workflow

The GA encodes the FIS parameters so that a single Individual of the Populations is generated for each FIS model. In other words, the Population counts a set of solutions to the problem at hand each of which is a FIS that takes the MGs *SoEs* as an input and returns the OF values. Thanks to its operators, the GA makes Generations pass and the FIS that encodes the best solution comes as an output.

## 6.2 FIS structure

The FIS is a one-input one-output Mamdany-type model with a Term Set composed by 5 MFs, both trapezoidal and triangular, as represented in Fig. 5. Thus, the Rule Set counts 5 Rules and the overall MFs are 25.

Therefore, the overall *SoE* values for  $k + 1$  are passed as input to the FIS and fuzzyfied by the same input Term Set. Likewise,  $\hat{\alpha}_{.,k}$  outputs are de-fuzzyfied by a single output Term Set. With the aim of reducing the variables number, MFs abscissas come from the formulation presented in [capillo] that makes it possible to have only 2 MF parameters for shaping both a triangular and a trapezoidal MF. For the sake of completeness, that formulation is reported below together with a proper graphic contribution (Fig. 6):

$$\gamma = g'_{very\ low} \gamma_0 \quad (40)$$

$$\beta = g''_{very\ low} \gamma \quad (41)$$




Figure 5: The FIS Term Set.

$$\theta = g'_{very\ high} (1 - \theta_0) \quad (42)$$

$$\lambda = \theta + g''_{very\ high} (1 - \theta) \quad (43)$$

$$\phi = \begin{cases} \phi_0 - \left(\frac{g'_{low}}{2} L_{low} - \frac{L_{tr}}{2}\right) & \text{if } g'_{low} \geq 1 \\ \phi_0 + \left(-\frac{g'_{low}}{2} L_{low} + \frac{L_{tr}}{2}\right) & \text{if } 0.01 \geq g'_{low} < 1 \end{cases} \quad (44)$$

$$\xi = \begin{cases} \xi_0 + \left(\frac{g''_{low}}{2} L_{low} - \frac{L_{tr}}{2}\right) & \text{if } g'_{low} \geq 1 \\ \xi_0 - \left(-\frac{g''_{low}}{2} L_{low} + \frac{L_{tr}}{2}\right) & \text{if } 0.01 \geq g'_{low} < 1 \end{cases} \quad (45)$$

$$\omega = \phi + g''_{low} \frac{(\xi - \phi)}{2} \quad (46)$$

with:

$$\gamma_0 = 0.25 \quad (47)$$

$$\theta_0 = 0.75 \quad (48)$$

$$0.04 \geq g'_{very\ low} \leq 4.00 \quad (49)$$

$$0.01 \geq g''_{very\ low} \leq 0.99 \quad (50)$$

$$0.04 \geq g'_{very\ high} \leq 4.00 \quad (51)$$

$$0.01 \geq g''_{very\ high} \leq 0.99 \quad (52)$$

$$0.01 \geq g'_{low} \leq \frac{1}{L_{tr}} \quad (53)$$




Figure 6: MFs encoding.

$$0.01 \geq g''_{low} \leq 1.99 \quad (54)$$

where  $\gamma$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\theta$ ,  $\lambda$ ,  $\phi$ ,  $\xi$  and  $\omega$  are the MFs abscissas (Fig. 6) and  $\gamma_0$ ,  $\beta_0$ ,  $\theta_0$ ,  $\lambda_0$ ,  $\phi_0$ ,  $\xi_0$  and  $\omega_0$  their default values. The quantities designated by  $g$  are the GA Genes that encode the FIS structure and that will be discussed in the next Sub-section.

### 6.3 GA Encoding

The generic GA Individual encodes the Mamdani FIS structure as shown below:

The Individual counts 30 Genes: 20 MFs abscissa Genes, 5 Weights Genes and 5 Consequents Genes. More precisely, each MF is shaped thanks to two Genes,  $g'$  and  $g''$  (eq. 49-54, that leads to overall 10 Genes for the input Term Set and 10 Genes for the output Term Set. Weights and Consequents Genes number is equal to the number of Rules.

## GA Individual

$g_{\text{very low}}^{1,I}$	...	$g_{\text{very high}}^{n,O}$	$w_1$	...	$w_5$	$c_1$	...	$c_5$
-----------------------------	-----	------------------------------	-------	-----	-------	-------	-----	-------

Figure 7: GA Individual encoding.

## 7 Training and Test Setup

Tests are carried on both on the GA as standalone algorithm against benchmark problems and on the FIS-GA algorithm against the REC energy management problem at hand. The setup of the aforementioned tests is discussed in this Section.

### 7.1 GA Preliminary Tests

The GA is preliminary tested on the most common benchmark OFs according to literature. Optimization is performed against two variables OFs *Spherical*, *Rastrigin*, *Rosenbrock*, *Swhefel* and *Griewank*. Solutions and optimal OF values are averaged between 10 GA executions and Standard Deviation is calculated complying with the Evolutionary Computation stochastic nature.

### 7.2 FIS-GA Training and Test

The FIS-GA is trained on a half day timeslots. That choice is in agreement with literature, according to which efforts are made towards a training based on a small set of historical data Alahyari, Pozo, and Sadri 2020. Moreover, a FIS-based model like the one at hand implies a Rule Base building process so that training on a half day, which involves different configurations (no PV production and peak PV production) leads to satisfying results. Training results are averaged between 10 executions, due to the stochastic nature of the GA optimizer. For the same reason, also the model computational costs are averaged between executions. The best trained model among the aforesaid ten is then tested as explained in the following.

Conforming to literature Alahyari, Pozo, and Sadri 2020, two different test setups are contemplated:

- **Offline test:** the FIS-GA optimizes the REC energy flows for the next 24 h by taking as an input the overall next-day power predictions at once;
- **Online tests:** the FIS-GA optimizes the REC energy flows for the next timeslot  $k + 1$  by taking as an input the next-timeslot power predictions one by one, i.e. timeslot-by-timeslot.

In the first case, a perfect knowledge about future PV generation is taken for granted. That is a far-fetched statement because the HEMS relies on power forecasts (an estimation of actual values) and also because that forecasts, without an Open-Loop timeslot-based approach, would be less accurate timeslot after timeslot. Nevertheless, that setup is aimed at assaying the optimizer precision against a complex problem even though, as just discussed, the optimization problem to solve is not realistic. A proper benchmark algorithm is chosen for evaluating the offline solution. It consists of a first-step optimization performed by the MathWorks<sup>®</sup> Matlab *ga* solver and a second-step optimization performed by the MathWorks<sup>®</sup> Matlab *fmincon* solver. Such a procedure is made for facing the problem complexity by narrowing the OF domain (first-step) and then delegating an exact algorithm for finding the benchmark solution (second-step). The best trained model over the 10 executions is applied on the test set. As concerns the *Online tests*, they can be considered as simulation of the real HEMS application. Like in the previous case, there is a similar assumption about the power predictions measurement but it is limited to the timeslots the tests are carried on rather than the overall next-day timeslots. For both of the two setup, the auto-consumption solutions on the test set are also achieved and reported. That is a very important benchmark for the *HEMS*, since the solution of the latter must be better than the auto-consumption one in order to justify its usefulness. Moreover, training is performed 10 times, due to the stochastic nature of the GA, so that results are averaged and standard deviations are achieved. In order to achieve generic results, i.e. not focused on a specific REC configuration, an initial *SoE* value of 0.5 is set for each node.

The GA meta-parameters and operators adopted for the tests above are reported in Tab. 8:

Table 8: GA meta-parameters and operators.

Figure	Value
Population	100
Cross. Fract.	0.7
Mut. Prob.	0.5
Crossover	<i>convex</i>
Mutation	<i>uniform</i>
Stop. Cond.	<i>maxgen.</i>
Max Gen.	50

Table 9: FIS-GA online test results.

Task	Auto-cons. OF [€]	Offline OF [€]	Online OF [€]	$\epsilon'$ [%]	$\epsilon''$ [%]	$z$ [%]
<i>Online test</i>	42.02	32.67	33.71	3.18	5.11	-19.77

## 8 Results

Preliminary GA tests results are reported in Tab. 10. Being the mean percentage error both for solution an OF ( $err_{sol}$  and  $err_{OF}$ ) are under the 5% for all the benchmark problems, the GA is reliable, at the best of our knowledge. In addition, given that the standard deviation both on the solution and the optimal OF value is very low, the GA is considered robust, at least for the presented benchmark problems.

Table 10: GA solutions against benchmark OFs, averaged between 20 executions.

Benchmark	OF bench.	OF test GA (std. dev.)
<i>Spherical</i>	0.000	2.034E-07 (3.125E-13)
<i>Rastrigin</i>	0.000	8.063E-09 (8.131E-16)
<i>Rosenbrock</i>	0.000	0.000 (8.086E-06)
<i>Schwefel</i>	0.000	2.546E-05 (8.714E-16)
<i>Rastrigin</i>	0.000	8.063E-09 (8.131E-16)
<i>Griewank</i>	0.000	0.006 (3.479E-05)

The FIS-GA training and offline test results are laid out in Tab. 11.

With  $\epsilon$  being the percentage error made by the FIS-GA if compared to the benchmark. In addition, the local auto-consumption optimal OF, returned by the benchmark algorithm, is 42.02€. The online FIS-GA performance are displayed in Tab. 9, compared to the offline and the auto-consumption OFs. The quantity  $\epsilon'$  is the error of the online optimal OF compared to offline optimal OF, while  $\epsilon''$  is the error of the online optimal OF compared to the benchmark optimal OF (shown in Tab. 11). Moreover,  $z$  represents the percentage savings of the online approach compared to the auto-consumption. The model computational costs are reported in Tab. 12.

Table 11: FIS-GA training offline test results.

Task	OF b. [€]	OF F. [€] ( $\sigma$ )	$\epsilon$ [%]
<i>Train.</i>	12.23	12.54 (0.18)	2.50
<i>Off. test</i>	32.07	32.67	1.87

Table 12: Model computational costs.

Cost type	Value
Training	46 min
Offline test	0.45 s
Online test	5 ms

The online test computational cost is referred to the single timeslot, i.e. the model takes 5 ms (on average) to decide the optimal power flows for  $k + 1$ . By way of example, the GA best-mean plot for a randomly chosen execution (among the overall 10) of the model training is presented in Fig. 8.




Figure 8: GA best-mean plot.

Comparisons between the online and the offline approaches about optimal power flows, and  $SoE$  are proposed in Tab. 13.

The optimal  $\hat{\alpha}$  distribution over time, both for the offline and the online approaches, are depicted in Fig. 9.

In addition, in Fig. 10, the optimal OF values over time are shown both for the auto-consumption approach and the online approaches, (not for the offline one because an online optimization is the required task for the model).




Table 13: Comparison about optimal power flows and SoE over time between the offline and the online approaches.




Figure 9: Optimal decisions both for the offline and the online approaches.




Figure 10: Optimal OF values comparison.

## 8.1 Results discussion

The auto-consumption optimal OF is worse than the benchmark, being the cost higher (Tab. 11). It means that a hierarchical optimal flow optimization leads to better results than a local auto-consumption energy management, legitimizing the use of an HEMS for the application at hand. Furthermore, the offline HEMS optimal OF is also better than in the auto-consumption optimization with an error less than 2% compared to the benchmark. Therefore, it can be reasonably stated that the HEMS approach is reliable in principle. The online HEMS makes an error of about 3% compared to the offline procedure and of roughly 5% compared to the benchmark (Tab. 9), confirming the model validity. Furthermore, savings of roughly 20% compared to the auto-consumption approach are achieved, proving that,

like for the offline approach, the online HEMS plenty outperforms auto-consumption. Comparing the two approaches by analyzing optimal power flows and  $SoE$  values over time, as shown in Tab. 13, some further considerations rise. First of all, the most relevant gap occurs at the middle of the day, when the PV production is about to reach its peak. The online HEMS exchanges more power with the Main Grid N than the offline HEMS, both in energy purchasing and in energy selling. As a consequence, power flows involving the batteries are more frequent in the online HEMS and the  $SoE$  is varies more compared to the offline one. A reasonable interpretation is that the offline solution is (obviously) sub-optimal because it belongs more to the auto-consumption than in the offline case. That conclusion is strengthened by the optimal decision variables distribution in Fig. 9. Indeed, online HEMS decisions are distributed almost in the middle of the domain while offline HEMS decisions are quite sharply distributed close to the bounds but mainly to the lower one (0 represents no auto-consumption).

That said, it could be interesting to know why the HEMS outperforms auto-consumption. By observing Fig. 10, it can be stated that the OF is better for the HEMS in the middle of the day, when the REC can even get profit (the OF is negative) unlike the auto-consumption case. It could be asserted that, through auto-consumption, the REC is too forced to rely on batteries for satisfying its energy demand, resulting in high wear costs. Rather, a better equilibrium between battery wear costs, energy purchasing costs, energy selling revenues and incentives is reached by removing the auto-consumption constraint as much as necessary for taking advantage of the PV excess energy in the middle of the day. That conclusion is corroborated by the fact that in Fig. 9 the optimal  $\hat{\alpha}$  tend to 0 in the middle of the day.

## 8.2 Model Explainability

The optimal output Term Set for the online optimization task is shown in Fig. 11




Figure 11: Optimal output Term Set.

The optimal Rule Set for the online optimization task is presented below:

- If  $SoE$  is *VeryLow* then  $\alpha$  is *VeryHigh* (0.17)
- If  $SoE$  is *Low* then  $\alpha$  is *Medium* (0.64)
- If  $SoE$  is *Medium* then  $\alpha$  is *Medium* (0.83)
- If  $SoE$  is *High* then  $\alpha$  is *Low* (0.83)
- If  $SoE$  is *VeryHigh* then  $\alpha$  is *Low* (0.22)

Firs of all, it can be observed that the areas under the MFs in the middle of the output Term Set are larger than the same for MFs at the edge. That is in line with the Rule Set, since the most weighted Rules present *Medium* and *Low* Consequents for the output  $\alpha$ . Such a result could mean that the online HEMS tends to prefer a middle way between complete local self-consumption and the opposite behaviour, as confirmed by Fig. 9. Moreover, the more the  $SoE$  is high the more  $\alpha$  is low (which implies no self-consumption), reasonably meaning that the HEMS considers to be more

convenient to sell excess energy that has a high probability to be a non zero value, since batteries tend to be full of energy from the last timeslot.

## 9 Conclusions

In this work, an online HEMS is synthesized for a REC costs minimization, with each participant equipped with a local EMS that maximized its self-consumption while the global decider, aware of the nodes state, overwrites the local optimal decisions about power flows. That design choice comes from the need of exploring more in deep which objective could be more proper for a REC. Thanks to the realism level given by the slavish reference to the EU technical legislation framework, (as inherited by Italy) as well as a proper ESS wear cost model. Since economical details and a REC business model are not included, the final electricity bill costs for each participant are not evaluated. Indeed, a comparison between the self-consumption and the costs minimization approaches is aimed. The XAI FIS-GA optimizer, supported by Neural LSTM PV power predictions, shows that the hierarchical costs minimization strategy outperforms local self-consumption leading to roughly 20 % more savings, with a good precision and computational times in the millisecond range.

The proposed algorithm could reach an higher realism level if a REC business model was included in the problem formulation, so that electricity bill savings could be accurately estimated. Since the model is properly parametrized, other Countries technical legislation frameworks would be adopted very easily. To finish, the XAI characterization could lead to a new interesting knowledge about hierarchical strategies like that while new enriched versions are synthesized.

## References

- Alahyari, Arman, David Pozo, and Mohammad Ali Sadri (2020). “Online Energy Management of Electric Vehicle Parking-Lots”. In: *2020 International Conference on Smart Energy Systems and Technologies (SEST)*, pp. 1–6. DOI: 10.1109/SEST48500.2020.9203421.
- Aslam, Muhammad et al. (2021). “Two-Stage Attention Over LSTM With Bayesian Optimization for Day-Ahead Solar Power Forecasting”. In: *IEEE Access* 9, pp. 107387–107398. DOI: 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3100105.
- Autorità di Regolazione per Energia Reti e Ambiente (ARERA) (2020). *Resolution 4th August 2020 318/2020/R/EEL*. – (2022). *Resolution 27th December 2022 727/2022/R/EEL*.
- (n.d.). *Trova offerte*. <https://www.arera.it/it/trovaofferte.htm>. Accessed: 2023-09-04.
- Barberi, A. et al. (2022). “Assessing the Economic Benefit due to BESS Management in a Renewable Energy Community of a Small Island”. In: *2022 IEEE 21st Mediterranean Electrotechnical Conference (MELECON)*, pp. 543–548. DOI: 10.1109/MELECON53508.2022.9843052.
- Berg, Kjersti, Rubi Rana, and Hossein Farahmand (2023). “Quantifying the benefits of shared battery in a DSO-energy community cooperation”. In: *Applied Energy* 343, p. 121105. ISSN: 0306-2619. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2023.121105>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0306261923004695>.
- Capillo., Antonino et al. (2022). “Synthesis of an Evolutionary Fuzzy Multi-objective Energy Management System for an Electric Boat”. In: *Proceedings of the 14th International Joint Conference on Computational Intelligence (IJCCI 2022) - FCTA*. INSTICC. SciTePress, pp. 199–208. ISBN: 978-989-758-611-8. DOI: 10.5220/0011527800003332.
- Chamola, Vinay et al. (2023). “A Review of Trustworthy and Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI)”. In: *IEEE Access* 11, pp. 78994–79015. DOI: 10.1109/ACCESS.2023.3294569.
- Cielo, A. et al. (2021). “Renewable Energy Communities business models under the 2020 Italian regulation”. In: *Journal of Cleaner Production* 316, p. 128217. ISSN: 0959-6526. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.128217>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959652621024343>.
- Cosic, Armin et al. (2021). “Mixed-integer linear programming based optimization strategies for renewable energy communities”. In: *Energy* 237, p. 121559. ISSN: 0360-5442. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2021.121559>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360544221018077>.
- Cutore, Emanuele et al. (2023a). “Energy management and sustainability assessment of renewable energy communities: The Italian context”. In: *Energy Conversion and Management* 278, p. 116713. ISSN: 0196-8904. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2023.116713>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0196890423000596>.
- (2023b). “Energy management and sustainability assessment of renewable energy communities: The Italian context”. In: *Energy Conversion and Management* 278, p. 116713. ISSN: 0196-8904. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2023.116713>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0196890423000596>.

- D’Alterio, Pasquale, Jonathan M. Garibaldi, and Robert I. John (2020). “Constrained Interval Type-2 Fuzzy Classification Systems for Explainable AI (XAI)”. In: *2020 IEEE International Conference on Fuzzy Systems (FUZZ-IEEE)*, pp. 1–8. DOI: 10.1109/FUZZ48607.2020.9177671.
- De Santis, Enrico, Antonino Capillo, et al. (2023). “An Information Granulation Approach Through m-Grams for Text Classification”. In: *Computational Intelligence*. Ed. by Jonathan Garibaldi et al. Cham: Springer International Publishing, pp. 73–89. ISBN: 978-3-031-46221-4.
- De Santis, Enrico, Antonello Rizzi, et al. (2013). “Genetic optimization of a fuzzy control system for energy flow management in micro-grids”. In: *2013 Joint IFSA World Congress and NAFIPS Annual Meeting (IFSA/NAFIPS)*, pp. 418–423. DOI: 10.1109/IFSA-NAFIPS.2013.6608437.
- de São José, Débora, Pedro Faria, and Zita Vale (2021). “Smart energy community: A systematic review with metanalysis”. In: *Energy Strategy Reviews* 36, p. 100678. ISSN: 2211-467X. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esr.2021.100678>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2211467X2100064X>.
- Deng, Youjun et al. (2023). “An efficient energy management framework for residential communities based on demand pattern clustering”. In: *Applied Energy* 347, p. 121408. ISSN: 0306-2619. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2023.121408>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0306261923007729>.
- Dolanyi, Mihaly et al. (2022). “Risk-Based Constraints for the Optimal Operation of an Energy Community”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid* 13.6, pp. 4551–4561. DOI: 10.1109/TSG.2022.3185310.
- ENEL X Italia S.p.A. (n.d.[a]). *Enel X store - ESS*. <https://www.enelxstore.com/it/it/prodotti/energia-solare/generazione-stoccaggio-energia/storage/sistema-di-accumulo-da-4-8-kwh>. Accessed: 2023-09-04.
- (n.d.[b]). *Enel X store - PV - 3 kWp*. <https://www.enelxstore.com/it/it/prodotti/energia-solare/generazione-stoccaggio-energia/fotovoltaico/fv-da-3-kw-enel-x-edition>. Accessed: 2023-09-04.
- (n.d.[c]). *Enel X store - PV - 4 kWp*. <https://www.enelxstore.com/it/it/prodotti/energia-solare/generazione-stoccaggio-energia/fotovoltaico/fv-da-4-kw-enel-x-edition>. Accessed: 2023-09-04.
- Eroe, Katuscia and Tommaso Polci (2022). *Energy Communities*.
- European Union (2018). *Directive (EU) 2018/2001 (RED II)*.
- (2019). *Directive (EU) 2019/944 (IEM)*.
- Fang, Xia et al. (2022). “A Novel Reinforced Deep RNN–LSTM Algorithm: Energy Management Forecasting Case Study”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics* 18.8, pp. 5698–5704. DOI: 10.1109/TII.2021.3136562.
- Feng, Changsen et al. (2020). “Coalitional Game-Based Transactive Energy Management in Local Energy Communities”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems* 35.3, pp. 1729–1740. DOI: 10.1109/TPWRS.2019.2957537.
- Gestore dei Servizi Energetici (GSE S.p.A) (2022). *Technical rules for accessing the service exploitation and incentives for shared electricity*.
- (n.d.). *Ritiro dedicato*. <https://www.gse.it/servizi-per-te/fotovoltaico/ritiro-dedicato>. Accessed: 2023-09-04.
- Ghiani, Emilio et al. (2019). “Planning of a Smart Local Energy Community: The Case of Berchidda Municipality (Italy)”. In: *Energies* 12.24. ISSN: 1996-1073. DOI: 10.3390/en12244629. URL: <https://www.mdpi.com/1996-1073/12/24/4629>.
- Good, Nicholas and Pierluigi Mancarella (2019). “Flexibility in Multi-Energy Communities With Electrical and Thermal Storage: A Stochastic, Robust Approach for Multi-Service Demand Response”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid* 10.1, pp. 503–513. DOI: 10.1109/TSG.2017.2745559.
- Guiducci, Leonardo et al. (2023). “A Reinforcement Learning approach to the management of Renewable Energy Communities”. In: *2023 12th Mediterranean Conference on Embedded Computing (MECO)*, pp. 1–8. DOI: 10.1109/MECO58584.2023.10154979.
- Han, Sekyung, Soohye Han, and Hirohisa Aki (2014). “A practical battery wear model for electric vehicle charging applications”. In: *Applied Energy* 113, pp. 1100–1108. ISSN: 0306-2619. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2013.08.062>.
- Houben, Nikolaus et al. (2023). “Optimal dispatch of a multi-energy system microgrid under uncertainty: A renewable energy community in Austria”. In: *Applied Energy* 337, p. 120913. ISSN: 0306-2619. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2023.120913>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0306261923002775>.
- Italian Government (2019). *Piano Nazionale Integrato per l’Energia e il Clima*.
- (2020a). *Decree MISE 16th September 2020*.
- (2020b). *Law 28th February 2020 n°8*.
- (2021a). *Decree 19th November 2021, n°200*.
- (2021b). *Legislative Decree 8th November 2021, n°199*.

- Italian Government (2021c). *Piano Nazionale di Ripresa e Resilienza (PNRR) - Mission 2*.
- Jo, Hyung-Chul et al. (2021). “Optimal Scheduling for a Zero Net Energy Community Microgrid With Customer-Owned Energy Storage Systems”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems* 36.3, pp. 2273–2280. DOI: 10.1109/TPWRS.2020.3036077.
- Ju, Chengquan et al. (2018). “A Two-Layer Energy Management System for Microgrids With Hybrid Energy Storage Considering Degradation Costs”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid* 9.6, pp. 6047–6057. DOI: 10.1109/TSG.2017.2703126.
- Kim, Jangkyum et al. (2019). “Battery-Wear-Model-Based Energy Trading in Electric Vehicles: A Naive Auction Model and a Market Analysis”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics* 15.7, pp. 4140–4151. DOI: 10.1109/TII.2018.2883655.
- Kurukuru, Varaha Satya Bharath et al. (2022). “Rule-Based Inferential System for Microgrid Energy Management System”. In: *IEEE Systems Journal* 16.1, pp. 1582–1591.
- Lazzari, Florencia et al. (2023). “Optimizing planning and operation of renewable energy communities with genetic algorithms”. In: *Applied Energy* 338, p. 120906. ISSN: 0306-2619. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2023.120906>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0306261923002702>.
- Lilla, Stefano et al. (2020). “Day-Ahead Scheduling of a Local Energy Community: An Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers Approach”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems* 35.2, pp. 1132–1142. DOI: 10.1109/TPWRS.2019.2944541.
- Liu, Zhijian, Guangyao Fan, et al. (2022). “A novel distributed energy system combining hybrid energy storage and a multi-objective optimization method for nearly zero-energy communities and buildings”. In: *Energy* 239, p. 122577. ISSN: 0360-5442. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2021.122577>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360544221028267>.
- Liu, Zhijian, Ying Li, et al. (2022). “Co-optimization of a novel distributed energy system integrated with hybrid energy storage in different nearly zero energy community scenarios”. In: *Energy* 247, p. 123553. ISSN: 0360-5442. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2022.123553>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S036054422200456X>.
- Martirano, Luigi et al. (2021). “Power Sharing Model for Energy Communities of Buildings”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Industry Applications* 57.1, pp. 170–178. DOI: 10.1109/TIA.2020.3036015.
- Mellit, A., A. Massi Pavan, and V. Lughi (2021). “Deep learning neural networks for short-term photovoltaic power forecasting”. In: *Renewable Energy* 172, pp. 276–288. ISSN: 0960-1481. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2021.02.166>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0960148121003475>.
- Mendel, Jerry M. and Piero P. Bonissone (2021). “Critical Thinking About Explainable AI (XAI) for Rule-Based Fuzzy Systems”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Fuzzy Systems* 29.12, pp. 3579–3593. DOI: 10.1109/TFUZZ.2021.3079503.
- Mustika, Alyssa Diva et al. (2022). “A two-stage management strategy for the optimal operation and billing in an energy community with collective self-consumption”. In: *Applied Energy* 310, p. 118484. ISSN: 0306-2619. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2021.118484>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0306261921017050>.
- Nagpal, Himanshu et al. (2022). “Local Energy Communities in Service of Sustainability and Grid Flexibility Provision: Hierarchical Management of Shared Energy Storage”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Sustainable Energy* 13.3, pp. 1523–1535. DOI: 10.1109/TSTE.2022.3157193.
- Proietti, Massimiliano et al. (2023). “Energy community management system based on real-time measurements and genetic algorithms”. In: *2023 IEEE International Workshop on Metrology for Living Environment (MetroLivEnv)*, pp. 23–28. DOI: 10.1109/MetroLivEnv56897.2023.10163999.
- Putratama, Muhammad A. et al. (2023). “A Three-Stage Strategy With Settlement for an Energy Community Management Under Grid Constraints”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid* 14.2, pp. 1505–1514. DOI: 10.1109/TSG.2022.3167862.
- Rajabi, Roozbeh and Abouzar Estebarsari (2019). “Deep Learning Based Forecasting of Individual Residential Loads Using Recurrence Plots”. In: *2019 IEEE Milan PowerTech*, pp. 1–5. DOI: 10.1109/PTC.2019.8810899.
- Razghandi, Mina and Damla Turgut (2020). “Residential Appliance-Level Load Forecasting with Deep Learning”. In: *GLOBECOM 2020 - 2020 IEEE Global Communications Conference*, pp. 1–6. DOI: 10.1109/GLOBECOM42002.2020.9348197.
- Sharma, Abhishek and Sachin Kumar Jain (2022). “A novel seasonal segmentation approach for day-ahead load forecasting”. In: *Energy* 257, p. 124752. ISSN: 0360-5442. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2022.124752>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360544222016553>.
- Srithapon, Chitchai and Daniel Månsson (2023). “Predictive control and coordination for energy community flexibility with electric vehicles, heat pumps and thermal energy storage”. In: *Applied Energy* 347, p. 121500. ISSN: 0306-2619. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2023.121500>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0306261923008644>.

- Stentati, Marta, Simone Paoletti, and Antonio Vicino (2022). “Optimization of energy communities in the Italian incentive system”. In: *2022 IEEE PES Innovative Smart Grid Technologies Conference Europe (ISGT-Europe)*, pp. 1–5. DOI: 10.1109/ISGT-Europe54678.2022.9960513.
- Tao, Jianrong et al. (2023). “Explainable AI for Cheating Detection and Churn Prediction in Online Games”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Games* 15.2, pp. 242–251. DOI: 10.1109/TG.2022.3173399.
- Terna - Rete Elettrica Nazionale S.p.A. (n.d.). *Statistical Publications*. <https://www.terna.it/it/sistema-elettrico/statistiche/pubblicazioni-statistiche>. Accessed: 2023-09-04.
- Tomin, Nikita et al. (2022). “Design and optimal energy management of community microgrids with flexible renewable energy sources”. In: *Renewable Energy* 183, pp. 903–921. ISSN: 0960-1481. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2021.11.024>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0960148121015937>.
- Tostado-Véliz, Marcos et al. (2023). “A two-stage IGDT-stochastic model for optimal scheduling of energy communities with intelligent parking lots”. In: *Energy* 263, p. 126018. ISSN: 0360-5442. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2022.126018>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360544222029048>.
- Uremović, Niko et al. (2023). “A New Framework for Multivariate Time Series Forecasting in Energy Management System”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid* 14.4, pp. 2934–2947. DOI: 10.1109/TSG.2022.3224559.
- van Zyl, Corne, Xianming Ye, and Raj Naidoo (2024). “Harnessing eXplainable artificial intelligence for feature selection in time series energy forecasting: A comparative analysis of Grad-CAM and SHAP”. In: *Applied Energy* 353, p. 122079. ISSN: 0306-2619. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2023.122079>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0306261923014435>.
- Wen, Lulu et al. (2019). “Optimal load dispatch of community microgrid with deep learning based solar power and load forecasting”. In: *Energy* 171, pp. 1053–1065. ISSN: 0360-5442. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2019.01.075>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0360544219300775>.
- Ye, Yujian et al. (2023). “Safe Deep Reinforcement Learning for Microgrid Energy Management in Distribution Networks With Leveraged Spatial–Temporal Perception”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid* 14.5, pp. 3759–3775. DOI: 10.1109/TSG.2023.3243170.
- Zatti, Matteo et al. (2021). “Energy Communities Design Optimization in the Italian Framework”. In: *Applied Sciences* 11.11. ISSN: 2076-3417. DOI: 10.3390/app11115218. URL: <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/11/11/5218>.