

Electrical Consumption Flexibility in the Cement Industry

Sebastián Rojas-Innocenti^a, Enrique Baeyens^b, Alejandro Martín-Crespo^c, Sergio Saludes-Rodil^c, Fernando Frechoso-Escudero^d

^aFortia Energía, Gregorio Benítez 3-B, Planta 1, 28043, Madrid, Spain

^bInstituto de las Tecnologías Avanzadas de la producción. Universidad de Valladolid, Paseo Prado de la Magdalena, 3-5, 47011, Valladolid, Spain

^cCARTIF, Parque Tecnológico de Boecillo. Parcela 205, 47151, Boecillo, Spain

^dDepartamento de Ingeniería Eléctrica. Universidad de Valladolid, Paseo Prado de la Magdalena, 3-5, 47011, Valladolid, Spain

Abstract

A method for identifying and quantifying the flexibility of the electricity demand in a production plant is reported. The plant is equipped with electric machines, product storage silos, distributed generation, and electrical storage systems. The method aims to minimize production costs. To achieve this, the plant is mathematically modeled, and an economic optimization problem is formulated by managing these plant's equipment. From this optimal schedule (base schedule), the feasibility of modifying it to sell or buy energy in the electricity balancing regulation markets is evaluated, thus obtaining the so-called flexibility schedule. Finally, this method was successfully applied to a real case using data from a Spanish cement production plant.

Keywords: Cement industry, Energy, Flexibility, Mixed integer linear programming, Demand response.

Nomenclature

$\epsilon_{\max}$	Maximum tolerance bound established to limit the deviation in energy procurement [0 to 1].
$\epsilon_{\min}$	Minimum tolerance bound established to limit the deviation in energy procurement [0 to 1].
DoD	Battery depth of discharge, is the fraction of the battery's rated capacity that can be discharged. It is a parameter given by the battery manufacturer [0 to 1].
SoC ₀	Initial battery state of charge at the beginning of a given time planning horizon [MW h].
π_U	The battery cost per unit of energy. Is the same for charging and discharging, and is a constant value defined by the battery's technical characteristics [€/MWh].
$C_{\max}$	Battery rated capacity [MW h].
M_k^{OFF}	Minimum number of periods the k -th machine must remain turned off once is switched off for technical or quality reasons given by the plant.
M_k^{ON}	Minimum number of periods the k -th machine must operate once turned on for technical or quality reasons given by the plant.
P_k	Average power consumption of the k -th machine [MW].
I_{0i}	Initial weight of material in the i -th silo at the start of the planning horizon [t].
$I_{\max i}$	Maximum weight of material allowed in the i -th silo [t].
$I_{\min i}$	Minimum weight of material allowed in the i -th silo [t].
$P_{b\max}$	Maximum power purchase limit [MW].

$P_{C\max}$	Battery maximum charge power [MW].
$P_{D\max}$	Battery maximum discharge power [MW].
$\mathcal{K}$	Total number of electrical machines involved in the plant.
$\mathcal{N}$	Total number of silos involved in the plant.
$\mathcal{T}$	Number of periods on a given time horizon the model is optimizing.
t	The time horizon is divided into equal-length time periods t , which should be aligned with the electrical markets.
P_{PVt}	Power generated by the PV system in the period t [MW].
D_t	Average product mass flow demand needed for the next process at the period t [t/h].
S_t^+	Spread for Power up in the period t [€/MWh].
S_t^-	Spread for Power down in the period t [€/MWh].
Y_{kt}	Binary variable that represents the ON/OFF state of the k -th machine in the time t .
π_{bt}	Day-ahead energy price forecast for period t [€/MWh].
Π_{kt}	Average production of the k -th machine in the period t [t/h].
π_{st}^+	Tertiary market price to power up in the period t [€/MWh].
π_{st}^-	Tertiary market price to power down in the period t [€/MWh].
π_{st}	Electrical energy sell price signal in period t [€/MWh].
$\pi_{S_{it}}$	Cost of storing material in the i -th silo from one period to the next [€/th].
I_{it}	Mass weight of the material stored in the i -th silo in the period t [t].
P_{bt}	Power purchased from the grid in the period t [MW].
P_{Ct}	Power used to charge the battery in the period t [MW].
P_{Dt}	Power obtained from discharging the battery in the period t [MW].
P_{st}	Power sold to grid in period t [MW].

Email addresses: sebastian.rojas@fortiaenergia.es (Sebastián Rojas-Innocenti), enrique.baeyens@uva.es (Enrique Baeyens), alemar@cartif.es (Alejandro Martín-Crespo), sersal@cartif.es (Sergio Saludes-Rodil), frechoso@eii.uva.es (Fernando Frechoso-Escudero)

1. Introduction

The cement industry is a major contributor to global carbon emissions, responsible for approximately 7% [26, 9] to 8% [24, 19] of all CO₂ emissions. Besides its high carbon emissions, the cement industry is the world's third-largest energy consumer, using 7% of all industrial energy [9]. Consequently, is under increasing pressure to reduce its environmental impact [18].

One strategy to reduce the environmental footprint of the cement industry is through the implementation of demand response (DR) programs. These programs aim to improve energy efficiency and balance supply and demand by incentivizing consumers to decrease their electricity usage during peak demand periods. This can be achieved through various mechanisms, such as time-of-use pricing, demand bidding, or direct load control [31].

One type of DR program particularly suited to the cement industry is flexible load management. Certain loads can be adjusted in response to price signals or other incentives. This allows cement plants to shift production to off-peak hours and integrate more renewables energies, resulting in significant reductions in electricity costs and carbon emissions [15]. In this regard, important research has been conducted to assess the potential of DR in the cement industry [20, 14, 25, 33].

Moreover, several investigations studied methods to reduce electricity costs in various electro-intensive industries by optimally scheduling tasks and developing mathematical models considering time-varying electricity prices and production targets [27, 22, 2, 1, 11].

In the cement industry, [21] developed a genetic algorithm to reduce electricity costs by shifting the use of high electricity-consuming machinery to periods with lower electricity prices. Meanwhile, [30] identified all energy-intensive components of the cement production process, then modeled and optimized them to minimize operational costs while meeting production targets. Additionally, [32] proposed a model predictive control (MPC) approach for daily operation management.

While there has been significant research on optimizing electricity costs in production scheduling based on fluctuating electricity prices, limited research has investigated ways to deliberately modify this optimized production to identify economically beneficial transactions in other markets, such as balancing regulation markets. The main contribution of this work is a methodology for identifying and quantifying the flexibility of energy consumption in a manufacturing plant with the primary goal of maintaining efficient production. This is accomplished by optimizing the scheduling of electrical production machines, silos levels, distributed generation, and electrical storage systems in response to electricity price signals and then assessing if the optimal production plan can be modified (flexible load identification). It is intended that productive industries with high electricity consumption use this methodology to identify their flexibility and participate in energy balance markets with minimal impact on their production planning.

The remaining of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 formulates the problem to be solved. The cement production process and the operation of the electricity markets are

explained. The production optimization problem is established and the baseline schedule is obtained. Section 3 proposes a procedure to obtain flexibility by modifying the base schedule and evaluates the economic feasibility of energy purchase/sale operations in the electricity regulation market. Section 4 applies the method to a case study on Portland cement production. Finally, section 5 concludes the paper.

2. Problem statement

This work addresses the challenge of developing a methodology to identify and quantify the flexibility of electricity consumption in cement manufacturing, while maintaining the industry's primary goal of efficient production. The aim is to minimize costs associated with the electrical consumption of certain machines, such as cement and raw meal mills, through optimal production scheduling.

This optimization can be achieved through various strategies: purchasing energy from the grid when electricity price signals are lower, managing machine operation based on electricity prices, effectively handling the solar energy produced by the photovoltaic system and battery storage levels, and managing product storage in silos in the most economically convenient way for the plant.

Production planning is carried out by proposing a plant model and formulating a cost minimization problem, considering all the factors indicated above.

Once the optimal production plan is obtained (baseline schedule model), a flexibility model evaluates whether it is feasible to modify this production plan, thereby identifying the presence of flexibility.

The proposed method is highly versatile and has application to industries other than cement production. The objective is that industries can use this information to participate in the electricity balancing markets.

Finally, the method will be used to solve a real industrial case problem using historical data provided by a Spanish cement company and prices observed in the Tertiary Regulation Balancing Market.

2.1. Cement manufacturing process

Portland Cement manufacturing [5, 6] can be divided into two sub-processes, clinker production, and cement grinding, see Figure 1. In the first stage, the raw materials (mainly limestone and clay) are quarried, crushed, grounded, and mixed to obtain a homogeneous blend and then stored in the raw mill silo (in this plant, this stage occurs in a dry process). Afterward, the raw materials are preheated and fed to the kiln system where the temperature is typically increased to 1,400–1,500°C by firing pulverized pet coke (utilizing an electrical coke grinder) providing the necessary heat in the kiln to form the clinker [12], which is then cooled and stored in the clinker silos.

In the second stage, the clinker is grounded with gypsum and other mineral additions in a grinding mill to obtain a Portland cement with desirable performance characteristics [6], finishing the process when the final product is stored in the cement silos.

After analyzing the sub-processes with real data provided by a cement plant, it has been found that the sub-process corresponding to the production of the rawmill (enclosed in a dashed squared in Figure 1) is the one that offers the greatest potential for flexibility to provide it in the electricity balancing markets, due to the lower production and quality restrictions than the rest of the sub-processes. Unlike the kiln system, which must operate seven days a week and twenty-four hours a day, it offers almost no flexibility in its production. Moreover, in the cement grinding phase, production is limited by the inaccurate prediction of final product demand and the low capacity of the cement silos, which significantly reduces flexibility.




Figure 1: Schematic representation of the Portland cement manufacturing.

2.2. The electricity market system

The Spanish electricity production market comprises all commercial transactions for the purchase and sale of energy and other services related to the supply of electricity. It is composed by forward markets, the daily market, the intra-day market, non-organized markets, and system balancing services. The system balancing service markets are used to ensure that the supply and demand of electricity are balanced in real time. They include services such as regulation and reserve, which in turn, are made up of three types: Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Regulation [23].

Primary regulation¹ is an immediate-response system that automatically corrects instantaneous imbalances between generation and consumption, and it is provided by all generators reacting to frequency variations. Secondary regulation² is a slower-response (20 seconds to 15 minutes) system that corrects more gradual imbalances between generation and demand, and is compensated through market mechanisms for two concepts: availability (regulation band) and utilization (energy) [23]. Tertiary regulation³ is a longer-response (maximum power variation time of 15 minutes, and maintained for at least 2 hours) system that is used to restore the secondary regulation reserve to its normal operating state. It is provided by a variety of generators and consumers, and it is managed and compensated by market mechanisms [23, 7].

¹European equivalent: Frequency Containment Reserves (FCR)

²Automatic Frequency Restoration Reserves (aFRR)

³Manual Frequency Restoration Reserves (mFRR)

The tertiary market was chosen to manage the flexibility of the cement production process, as it offers sufficient time to meet the power once the offer is accepted. This is crucial, as the plant needs to quickly ramp up or down its production to match the power accepted in the market, while satisfying all the technical constraints of the electrical machines.

2.3. The production plant model

The production sub-process of the raw mill can be represented as a model composed of a set of production machines and a set of product storage elements. This model is quite general and has application to other industrial processes besides cement production.

Let us consider a production plant consisting of a set of N_K processing machines indexed by $k \in \mathcal{K} = \{1, 2, \dots, N_K\}$ and a set of N_S storage silos indexed by $i \in \mathcal{S} = \{1, 2, \dots, N_S\}$. The machines are driven by electric motors that receive power either from the grid or from the plant's self-consumption system consisting of a photovoltaic panel system and an electrical storage system. A schematic representation of this production plant is shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2: The production plant model.

We are interested in planning the plant production by minimizing the energy cost to produce the demanded product in a time horizon of duration T . To do so, we divide the planning time horizon T into a set of N_T time slots indexed by $t \in \mathcal{T} = \{1, 2, \dots, N_T\}$. Each time slot has a duration $\Delta t = T/N_T$.

The state of machine $k \in \mathcal{K}$ at time interval $t \in \mathcal{T}$ is represented by the binary variable Y_{kt} . If the machine is on then $Y_{kt}=1$ and if it is off then $Y_{kt} = 0$. The average production of machine $k \in \mathcal{K}$ when is on in time interval $t \in \mathcal{T}$ is Π_{kt} and its energy consumption is $P_k \Delta t$, where P_k is the rated electrical power of the machine, otherwise the production and the energy consumption are zero.

Each silo $i \in \mathcal{S}$ is characterized by a variable I_{it} representing the mass of product stored in the time interval $t \in \mathcal{T}$, which must always be between a minimum and maximum allowed values.

Mass balance. The mass balance in the production plant is given by

$$\sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \Pi_{kt} \cdot Y_{kt} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} I_{it-1} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} I_{it}, \quad t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (1)$$

The production machines can operate with energy from the electrical grid or from the plant's self-consumption system. The self-consumption system consists of a generation system based on photovoltaic solar panels and an electrical storage system.

The power purchased from the grid at time interval $t \in \mathcal{T}$ is given by P_{bt} , while the power sold to the grid at the same time interval is P_{st} .

The power generated by the photovoltaic solar panels at time interval $t \in \mathcal{T}$ is P_{PVt} . Its value is unknown in advance, but can be estimated from weather forecasts and data analysis techniques [29].

The electric battery has a maximum rated capacity $C_{\max}$. The power it delivers (resp. stores) during the time interval $t \in \mathcal{T}$ is P_{Dt} (resp. P_{Ct}), which is considered constant during the entire duration of the time interval Δt . Therefore, the energy delivered by (resp. stored in) the battery is $P_{Dt}\Delta t$ (resp. $P_{Ct}\Delta t$).

Power balance. The power balance in the production process is as follows,

$$P_{bt} + P_{Dt} + P_{PVt} = P_{st} + P_{Ct} + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} Y_{kt} \cdot P_k, \quad t \in \mathcal{T}. \quad (2)$$

In addition to mass and energy balances, a set of operating constraints must be satisfied during the production process.

Silos constraints. Let $I_{\min}$, $I_{\max}$, the minimum and maximum allowed limits of silo $i \in \mathcal{N}$. The mass stored in each silo cannot exceed this limits. This is guaranteed by the following condition,

$$I_{it} \in [I_{\min}, I_{\max}]. \quad (3)$$

In addition, the mass contained in the silo in each time slot must be greater than the product demand to ensure the continuity of the production process. This is achieved by the following condition,

$$\sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} I_{it} \geq D_t \quad (4)$$

where D_t is the product demand at time slot $t \in \mathcal{T}$.

Machine operation constraints. To prevent deterioration and maintain operating conditions that ensure product quality, a production machine cannot be switched on and off as often as desired. If the machine changes its state from off to on, it cannot be switched off again until a certain time has elapsed. Similarly, if the machine changes its state from on to off, it cannot be turned on again until a certain time has elapsed.

Let M_k^{ON} be the number of time intervals that the machine k must remain on once it has changed its state from off to on. The difference $Y_{k(t+1)} - Y_{kt}$ can only takes values 0, 1 or -1, and it takes value 1 if and only if the machine $k \in \mathcal{K}$ changes its state from off to on. Then, the inequality

$$(Y_{k(t+1)} - Y_{kt}) \cdot M_k^{\text{ON}} \leq \sum_{j=1}^{M_k^{\text{ON}}} Y_{k(t+j)}, \quad (5)$$

$$k \in \mathcal{K}, \quad t \in \{1, \dots, N_T - M_k^{\text{ON}}\}.$$

ensures that when the state of the machine changes from off to on, the machine remains on for M_k^{ON} time intervals. For any other value of the difference $Y_{k(t+1)} - Y_{kt}$, inequality (5) is always satisfied and does not impose any constraint on the future state of the machine.

Similarly, let M_k^{OFF} be the number of time intervals that the machine $k \in \mathcal{K}$ must remain off once it has changed its state from on to off. The inequality

$$\sum_{j=1}^{M_k^{\text{OFF}}} Y_{k(t+j)} \leq (1 + Y_{k(t+1)} - Y_{kt}) \cdot M_k^{\text{OFF}}, \quad (6)$$

$$k \in \mathcal{K}, \quad t \in \{1, \dots, N_T - M_k^{\text{OFF}}\}.$$

ensures that when the state of the machine changes from on to off, the machine remains on for M_k^{OFF} time intervals. Inequality (5) is active only when the difference $Y_{k(t+1)} - Y_{kt} = -1$ corresponding to the machine change from on to off. For any other possible value (0 or 1) it does not impose any constraint on the future state of the machine.

Battery constraints. The state of charge (SoC) represents the level of charge of a battery relative to its capacity, while depth of discharge (DoD) indicates the proportion of the battery that has been discharged relative to the total battery capacity. Here, both are expressed per unit.

The energy charged or discharged in the battery can never exceed the overall rated capacity $C_{\max}$ during the entire planning horizon, taking into account the allowed depth of discharge and the initial state of the battery at the beginning of the time horizon.

Considering that energy is the integral of power over time, and taking into account Δt is the duration of the time slot during which power remains constant, we state the following inequalities

$$\sum_{t=1}^j P_{Ct} \cdot \Delta t - \sum_{t=1}^j P_{Dt} \cdot \Delta t \leq C_{\max} \cdot \text{DoD} - \text{SoC}_0, \quad j \in \mathcal{T} \quad (7)$$

$$C_{\max} \cdot (1 - \text{DoD}) - \text{SoC}_0 \leq \sum_{t=1}^j P_{Ct} \cdot \Delta t - \sum_{t=1}^j P_{Dt} \cdot \Delta t, \quad j \in \mathcal{T} \quad (8)$$

Inequality (7) ensures that the battery charge never exceeds its rated capacity, while inequality (8) ensures that the battery is never fully discharged.

In addition, to preserve the health of the battery, the charge and discharge power cannot exceed a certain maximum value. This is ensured by the following conditions

$$P_{Ct} \leq P_{C\max}, \quad t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (9)$$

$$P_{Dt} \leq P_{D\max}, \quad t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (10)$$

Finally, a maximum value of electrical power $P_{b\max}$ is allowed to buy from the grid for each period in the given planning horizon.

$$P_{bt} \leq P_{b\max}, \quad t \in \mathcal{T}. \quad (11)$$

2.4. Optimal production planning

The production plan that minimizes costs is obtained by solving an optimization program. Let π_{bt} denote the day-ahead energy price for period t , π_U the battery cost per unit of energy and $\pi_{S_{it}}$ the cost per unit of mass and time for storing product in the silo i .

The production cost is defined as follows:

$$\text{Cost: } \Phi = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} (P_{bt} \cdot \pi_{bt} + (P_{Ct} + P_{Dt})\pi_U + I_{it} \cdot \pi_{S_{it}}) \cdot \Delta t. \quad (12)$$

Remark 1. *The price signals of the electrical day-ahead market are unknown in advance. However, we assume that they are deterministic and known because they are estimated beforehand with an external price forecast model [28], which is outside of the scope of this study. Besides, the manufacturing company is considered as a price-taker.*

The baseline schedule. It is the production plan that minimizes production costs while meeting the expected product demand for a given time horizon (typically one week ahead), as well as all technical and product quality constraints and is obtained by solving the following optimization program:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Minimize: } \Phi, \\ &\text{subject to: constraints (1) – (11),} \\ &\text{and: non negativity for all variables.} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The *baseline schedule* is denoted as

$$(P_{bt}^*, P_{Ct}^*, P_{Dt}^*, Y_{kt}^*, I_{it}^*), \quad i \in \mathcal{S}, k \in \mathcal{K}, t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (14)$$

and the optimal cost is Φ^* .

The optimization problem (13) is a mixed integer linear programming (MILP) problem [3]. Although MILP problems are NP-complete, efficient algorithms exist that can be used to obtain solutions in problems of small and moderate size [16].

3. Flexibility in the production plan

The analysis of the flexibility of the manufacturing plant to provide ancillary services to the electricity system is performed by perturbing the baseline schedule. The perturbation of the baseline schedule corresponds to the electricity to be traded in the balancing market. The perturbed production schedule is called *flexibility schedule* and its production costs are always higher than those of the baseline schedule. The increase in the cost of production is called the flexibility cost and is used to determine the balancing market price of electricity that makes transactions economically profitable.

The manufacturing plant operator does not want the production schedule to change significantly, so only one energy transaction is allowed in the balancing market in a given time slot during the time horizon.

3.1. The flexibility schedule

Let $\mathcal{T}_1 = \{1, 2, \dots, N_{T_1}\}$ with $N_{T_1} < N_T$ be a subset containing the first N_{T_1} time slots of the production time horizon $\mathcal{T}$.

The *flexible schedule* is a perturbed production schedule of the baseline schedule where the perturbation is generated by a change in the power $P_{b\tau}^*$ at time slot $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_1$. It is obtained by solving a new optimization program that has the same cost function but some of the constraints change, since some of the decision variables keep the value of the baseline production plan.

Power purchased from the grid constraints. The electric power purchased from the grid in the flexibility model (P_{bt}) will take the same value as the baseline schedule (P_{bt}^*) for all the time slots prior to τ where selling or buying energy is allowed. The resulting constraint is

$$P_{bt} = P_{bt}^*, \quad t < \tau, \tau \in \mathcal{T}_1 \quad (15)$$

$$P_{b\tau} = P_{b\tau}^* + h, \quad \tau \in \mathcal{T}_1 \quad (16)$$

where h is a given perturbation in the power of the electricity purchased in the day-ahead market and it corresponds to the available power to be transacted in the balancing market at time slot τ . The energy traded in the balancing market can be positive or negative depending on whether energy is purchased or sold.

Deviation in energy procurement. The deviation of energy procurement during the production horizon must not exceed certain limits with respect to the baseline production plan. For this purpose, a band of admissible deviation characterized by tolerance bounds $\epsilon_{\min}$ and $\epsilon_{\max}$ is introduced where $\epsilon_{\min}, \epsilon_{\max} \in [0, 1]$. The resulting constraint is

$$(1 - \epsilon_{\min}) \cdot \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} P_{bt}^* \leq \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} P_{bt} \leq (1 + \epsilon_{\max}) \cdot \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} P_{bt}^* \quad (17)$$

Machine related constraints. Two constraints are imposed on the operation of the machines so that the flexibility schedule does not deviate too much from the base schedule. The first constraint stipulates that the state of the machines prior to the time slot in which energy transactions will be allowed in the balancing market must be the same as in the base schedule.

$$Y_{kt} = Y_{kt}^*, \quad k \in \mathcal{K}, t < \tau, \tau \in \mathcal{T}_1 \quad (18)$$

The second constraint, which is optional, states that each machine must operate a number of time slots equal to the base schedule.

$$\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} Y_{kt} = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} Y_{kt}^*, \quad k \in \mathcal{K} \quad (19)$$

The flexible schedule. It is obtained by solving the following MILP optimization program

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Minimize: } \Phi, \\ &\text{subject to: constraints (1) – (11), (15) – (18), [(19)]} \\ &\text{and: non negativity for all variables.} \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

The square brackets in constraint (19) mean that this constraint is optional.

The flexibility schedule is denoted as

$$(P_{bt}^\dagger, P_{Ct}^\dagger, P_{Dt}^\dagger, Y_{kt}^\dagger, I_{it}^\dagger), i \in \mathcal{S}, k \in \mathcal{K}, t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (21)$$

and the cost is $\Phi^\dagger$.

The flexibility schedule is obtained by perturbing the base schedule, so its cost is higher than the cost of the baseline schedule, i.e. $\Phi^\dagger > \Phi^*$. The cost of flexibility is defined as the difference between the cost of the flexible schedule and the cost of the baseline schedule. The cost of flexibility is $\Delta\Phi^\dagger = \Phi^\dagger - \Phi^*$ and is always positive.

Price of energy in balancing markets for profitability. Flexible scheduling allows a certain amount of energy $h \cdot \Delta t$ to be available for trading in the balancing market. This energy can be traded in this market at the time interval τ . Trading is profitable depending on the sign of h and the market energy price. Two cases are considered.

- a) If h is positive, the amount of energy $h \cdot \Delta t$ is available for purchase in the balancing market at price $\pi_{s\tau}^-$. The saving of the purchase is $h \cdot \Delta t \cdot S_\tau^-$ where $S_\tau^- = \pi_{b\tau} - \pi_{s\tau}^-$. If this energy had been purchased in the day-ahead market, its cost would have been the cost of flexibility $\Delta\Phi^\dagger$. The transaction is profitable for the manufacturing plant if the saving of the purchase in the balancing market is higher than the cost of flexibility, i.e.

$$h \cdot \Delta t \cdot S_\tau^- > \Delta\Phi^\dagger. \quad (22)$$

If the purchase price in the balancing market at time slot τ satisfies

$$S_\tau^- > \frac{\Delta\Phi^\dagger}{h \cdot \Delta t}$$

then the transaction is profitable and the saving is

$$R = h \cdot \Delta t \cdot S_\tau^- - \Delta\Phi^\dagger.$$

- b) If h is negative, the amount energy $h \cdot \Delta t$ is available for sale in the balancing market at price $\pi_{s\tau}^+$. The income of the sale is $(-h) \cdot \Delta t \cdot S_\tau^+$ where $S_\tau^+ = \pi_{s\tau}^+ - \pi_{b\tau}$. If this energy was purchased in the day-ahead market, its cost would have been the cost of flexibility $\Phi^\dagger - \Phi^*$. The transaction is profitable for the manufacturing plant if the income for sale in the balancing market is greater than the cost of flexibility, i.e.

$$(-h) \cdot \Delta t \cdot S_\tau^+ > \Delta\Phi^\dagger \quad (23)$$

If the sale price in the balancing market at time slot τ satisfies

$$S_\tau^+ > \frac{\Delta\Phi^\dagger}{(-h) \cdot \Delta t}$$

then the transaction is profitable and the revenue is

$$R = (-h) \cdot \Delta t \cdot S_\tau^+ - \Delta\Phi^\dagger.$$

Remark 2. The flexible production schedule can be calculated for any time interval $t \in \mathcal{T}_1$ and any value of the power h . However, the values of h of greatest interest for the study of flexibility are given by the sums of the nominal power consumptions corresponding to the different combinations of the production machines that can be on or off in the time interval under study. Besides, since the calculation of the flexibility program is very fast, the plant operator may have precalculated the baseline schedule for the time horizon $\mathcal{T}$ and flexibility schedules for any $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_1$ and any value of interest of h , along with the energy price of purchase/sale prices that provides profit to each transaction.

4. Industrial case study

The proposed method to study flexibility in electricity consumption will be used to solve a real case problem applied to the cement industry.

This research has been promoted by Fortia, within the framework of the BrainEN project. Fortia is a Spanish company based in Madrid, founded in 2002 and specialized in providing energy consulting and contracting services to commercial and industrial customers [8].

The study was conducted using real data from a Portland cement manufacturing company located in Spain and customer of Fortia.

The cement plant has a single mill and a silo in its raw milling process and is interested in acquiring a photovoltaic and an electric generation system to make its production more flexible and contribute to its carbon reduction goals. In addition, it intends to use the flexibility to reduce its production costs and amortize the installation of these systems.

Nineteen configurations have been studied for different combinations of capacities of both the solar generation system and the electric battery. These configurations include the current one. The model of each configuration is denoted by MXY where X denotes PV power capacity in MW and Y denotes battery rated capacity in MW h. The nineteen configurations are:

$$\text{Models} := \{\text{M00}, \text{M0X}, \text{MX0}, \text{MXX} \mid X \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}\} \quad (24)$$

where M00 denotes the current one.

The cement plant defines its production plan using the forecast of day ahead electricity market prices. Therefore, these prices will be used as input in the optimization program (13). Any changes to this plan will be evaluated by the flexibility optimization program (20) and the prices of the balancing market for each hour of the first day.

The cement plant buys electricity at a given price at time t in the day-ahead market. If the tertiary regulation market price to power up were higher at that time, the company would make a profit by bidding in this market to reduce its consumption. Conversely, if the tertiary regulation market price to power down were lower at that time, it would make a saving by bidding to increase its consumption at that time.

The spreads of tertiary regulation markets establish the opportunities for flexibility. They are obtained as follows:

$$S_t^+ = \pi_{s_t}^+ - \pi_{b_t}$$

$$S_t^- = \pi_{b_t} - \pi_{s_t}^-$$

The months of April and June 2023 have been selected for this study. The reason for this selection becomes clear after a visual analysis of Figure 3. In June, there is a large difference in the need for power down compared to power up, while the spreads are not so different each other. In April, this behavior is the opposite, *i.e.*, there is not much difference in the needs for power down and power up, but the spreads are significantly different. Thus, the study will cover both scenarios for each selected month.



Figure 3: Upper: Percentages of hours with transactions per month in tertiary regulation 2023, representing the needs of the market for power up/down. Bottom: Average spread €/MWh in tertiary regulation 2023, representing the earnings or savings for selling or buying power in the market for power up/down, respectively.

4.1. Description of the model

The parameters of the raw milling process and their values are detailed below.

Time parameters.

- Δt : The time period selected for this analysis is $\Delta t = 1$ h.
- $\mathcal{T}$: The planning time horizon used was four weeks with seven cycles each week. Each cycle ranges from one week ($\mathcal{T} = \{1, \dots, 168\}$) until one day ($\mathcal{T} = \{1, \dots, 24\}$), by constructing rolling windows with different planning

time-frames starting from Monday to Sunday, then Tuesday to Sunday, Wednesday to Sunday consecutively until Sunday to Sunday. The reason behind the definition of these cycles is twofold. On the one hand, it tries to minimize changes in production planning. On the other, it makes use of a forecast of the day-ahead electricity market price, so the model uses the best possible forecast for each day.

Electricity markets parameters.

- π_{b_t} : The day-ahead market prices are provided by Fortia's forecast algorithm [28].
- π_{s_t} : The tertiary regulation balancing market prices to trade electrical energy are obtained from REE, the independent system operator of the Spanish electrical system.
- $P_{b_{\max}}$: The maximum power purchase limit for period t is 21 MW, according to the plant requirement.

Machines and silos parameters.

Machine and silos parameters are obtained from actual historical process data. As there is only one raw mill and one silo, no subscripts are used.

- P_t : The average electric power consumption of the raw mill is 6 MW per unit time t .
- Π_t : The average production of the raw mill is 360 t h^{-1} .
- M^{ON} : The raw mill must operate for at least 6 time slots of 1 h once switched on.
- M^{OFF} : The raw mill must remain turned off for at least 3 time slots of 1 h once switched off.
- $I_{\max}$: The maximum weight of material allowed in the raw mill silo is the physical maximum, $I_{\max} = 15.000 \text{ t}$.
- $I_{\min}$: The minimum weight of material allowed in the silo is 60% of the maximum, $I_{\min} = 9.000 \text{ t}$.
- I_0 : The initial mass of material in the silo at the beginning of the week is 12.000 t, which is 80% of the silo's maximum capacity.
- D_t : The product demand for this stage is the same as the raw material mass flow rate required by the next stage, the kiln system, which requires an average of 240 t h^{-1} .
- π_{s_t} : The cost of storing material in the silos is effectively zero, so it is neglected in the objective function.

Battery and PV system parameters.

- π_U : The battery charging and discharging cost is 1 €/MWh .
- P_{PV_t} : The power generated by the PV system is calculated by multiplying the PVGIS [10] solar radiation data for April and June at the analyzed plant location by the installed PV system capacity, *i.e.* for the configuration model MXy is $X \text{ MW}$.

- $C_{\max}$: The battery rated capacity for the configuration model MXY is Y MW h.
- DoD: The Depth of Discharge of the battery used was 80%, *i.e.* the minimum charge level was always at least 20% of the battery’s rated capacity.
- SoC: The battery started at its minimum charge level at the beginning of each time planning horizon.
- $P_{\max}$: The battery maximum charging and discharging power rate used was equal to $1 C_{\max}/h$, which means that it can be charged or discharged at a rate equal to its rated capacity per hour.

Several simulations of the raw mill production sub-process have been carried out. All of them have used actual data provided by the cement company, as well as price values observed in the Spanish market for tertiary regulation adjustments. The prices of electricity in the day-ahead market electricity are estimated by Fortia for the months of April and June 2023.

The raw mill consumption is 6 MWh, so only the possibility of buying or selling energy for 6 MWh in the tertiary regulation market is considered for each of the 24 time slots of the first day of the base program. However, in order to influence the baseline schedule as little as possible, only the operations that produces the greatest benefit or savings will be selected.

Four sets of simulations were performed. One set to sell 6 MWh of energy, one set to buy the same amount of energy, and each set evaluated for the month of April and for the month of June of year 2023. For each month, four calendar weeks (Monday through Sunday) were selected.

In addition, each set of simulations was iterated for 19 different combinations of nominal battery capacities and PV system capacities that could be installed at the plant.

Over 4,256 simulations⁴ were ran, consuming a total CPU time of 3 hours and 19 minutes. All the simulations were executed using PYSCIOPT and entirely modeled in Python 3.11.5. PYSCIOPT serves as a Python interface to the SCIP Optimization Suite [17]. SCIP is a high performance, noncommercial solver that can handle a wide range of mathematical optimization problems, including mixed integer programming (MIP) [4].

Finally, simple payback periods for different battery and PV system capacities that could be installed in the plant were calculated. For the estimation, the total marginal capital cost from the LCOE 2023 study [13] was used. This value was multiplied by each iterated value capacity of the battery and PV installed in the plant. For the PV system, it was taken the average of the “Low case” and the “High case” of the Total Capital Costs for a Utility-Scale Solar PV [13] (934,500 €/MW). For the battery based storage system it was taken the sum of the “Initial Capital Cost—DC”, plus “Initial Capital Cost—AC”, plus “Electronic Power Control (EPC) Costs” and averaging the “Low case” and the “High case” for a “Standalone Industry” [13] (530,885 €/MWh), as shown in Table 1.

Element	Low Case	High Case	Average	Units
Utility-Scale Solar PV	623,000	1,246,000	934,500	€/MW
Industrial standalone storage	478,820	582,950	530,885	€/MWh

Table 1: Total Marginal capital costs for a Solar PV and for the battery storage system [13]. The exchange rate used to convert prices from dollars to euros was 0.85 EUR/USD on July 18, 2023.

4.2. Examples of selected transactions in the balancing markets

An example of flexible transactions for selling and buying energy derived from the model is illustrated in the Figure 4.




Figure 4: Upper: Example of selling energy in the balancing market obtained from the model, for April 3, 2023. Bottom: Instance of purchasing energy in the same market, for June 5, 2023.

The top plots display the price forecast for the day-ahead market over two different weeks. The middle graphs present the optimal schedule of the raw mill obtained from the baseline schedule model, depicted in green.

The flexibility schedule model recommends two transactions, denoted as $s1$ for selling and $b1$ for buying energy, in time-slots 19 and 20 respectively. To fulfill demand, the model suggests a re-scheduling across multiple periods when selling energy, and a re-sell ($rs1$) in period 72 when buying, as shown in blue.

Given the constraints of having to switch off the machine for at least 3 hours and operate it for a minimum of 6 consecutive hours, it is generally more advantageous to sell or buy an hour at the ends of the column’s operating plan rather than in the middle or during a non-operational period.

⁴7 days a week for 8 weeks, selling and buying for an average of 2 flexible hours per day, with 19 different iterations, totaling more than 4,256 simulations.

The bottom plots represent the accumulated material stored in the silo. When the machine is operational, the silo begins to accumulate all production surplus from the demand, resulting in an increase in the curve. Conversely, when the machine is off, the demand is met entirely from the silo, causing the curve to decline, while never exceeding the upper limit or falling below the lower limit of the silo.

Table 2 explains why the 19th time-slot was identified as the optimal for selling, while Table 3 shows the 20th hour as the most beneficial for buying energy.

The feasibility of selling energy from the 1st to the 24th hour on April 3rd and purchasing energy for the same hours on June 5th was evaluated, based on the optimal schedule determined by the baseline schedule model for both cases. The flexibility schedule model identified four flexible hours (τ) available for both selling and buying.

Based on the day-ahead energy price forecast ($\pi_{b\tau}$) and the Tertiary market prices for power up ($\pi_{s\tau}^+$) for sales and power down ($\pi_{s\tau}^-$) for purchases, we calculate the spread for each time slot as $S_{\tau}^+ = \pi_{s\tau}^+ - \pi_{b\tau}$ and $S_{\tau}^- = \pi_{b\tau} - \pi_{s\tau}^-$ respectively. This spread is then multiplied by the power to be traded ($h = 6$ MW, negative for sales and positive for purchases) and the time interval ($\Delta t = 1$ h) to determine the potential income generated by selling energy in the balancing market at a higher price than the day-ahead market or savings realized by purchasing energy at a lower price than the day-ahead market.

Except for $\tau = 11$, where no transaction occurred, any option on April 3rd yielded an income exceeding the minimum profit margin ($\Delta\Phi^{\dagger} = \Phi^{\dagger} - \Phi^*$), making them all economically viable for selling energy. The transaction with the highest profitability, $\tau = 19$, was selected due to the highest profit (€99.40), as shown in Table 2.

Similarly, all options on June 5th are economically feasible for buying energy, with the exception of when $\tau = 4$. The transaction with the highest savings, $\tau = 20$, with a profit of €363.96, was chosen, displayed in Table 3.

In both scenarios, the new schedule was established as the new baseline. The remaining hours of the day, specifically from 20 to 24 for selling and from 21 to 24 for buying, were evaluated to identify any additional profitable opportunities. But the model did not identify any other feasible hours for flexible transactions in either case.

4.3. Results and Discussion

Total profit for selling or buying energy. The total revenue obtained by selling 6 MWh of energy and the total savings for buying the same amount of energy in the tertiary regulation market in the best available hours for the months of April and June 2023 is depicted in Figure 5.

The results show that buying energy in these markets is significantly more beneficial than selling it for both months, ranging between €3,000 and €10,000 per month versus €1,000 and €3,000 respectively. In addition, April offers the best economic results for buying and selling energy.

The economic advantage of installing a PV system remains constant from a flexibility point of view (from M10 to M60).



Figure 5: Revenues and savings for selling or buying energy respectively in the tertiary regulation market in the selected months.

On average, better results are obtained with a combination of PV system and battery (from M11 to M66). However, it is not clear that increasing solar generation capacity and battery storage will lead to increased profits.

Available flexibility and successful transactions. The average number of flexible hours available for the next twenty-four periods evaluated for the entire planning horizon in each month is plotted in Figure 6.

On average, there is more flexibility to buy power than to sell it, i.e., between 2 and 2.7 hours per day to buy, compared to between 0.7 and 2.5 to sell.

Another observation is that adding capacity to the PV system does not necessarily increase the availability of flexible hours. In fact, it remains nearly constant (from M10 to M60).

In Figure 7 are observed more buying than selling successful operations. Between 15 and 26 versus 10 and 15 buying and selling operations per month, respectively. The main reason is the combination of a higher availability of flexible hours for buying than for selling energy, and a higher average spread for buying than for selling. These factors increase the probability of finding a successful transaction during the hours identified as flexible.

Savings for further optimizing the initial planning production. By incorporating variable photovoltaic and battery generation capacities, the model is able to further improve the initial baseline planning, i.e. when no photovoltaic system or battery elements are installed.

Flexible hour to sale (τ) h	Day-ahead energy price forecast ($\pi_{b\tau}$) €/MWh	Tertiary market price to power up ($\pi_{s\tau}^+$) €/MWh	Spread for Power up (S_{τ}^+) €/MWh	Power to sale (h) MW	Income for sale ($((-h) \cdot \Delta t \cdot S_{\tau}^+)$) €	Benefit margin ($\Delta\Phi^{\dagger} = \Phi^{\dagger} - \Phi^*$) €	Transaction profitability ($((-h) \cdot \Delta t \cdot S_{\tau}^+ - \Delta\Phi^{\dagger})$) €
1	68.97	84.35	15.38	-6	92.25	45.00	47.25
7	70.48	92.80	22.32	-6	133.90	35.90	98.00
11	55.89	-	-	-6	-	123.50	-
19	64.10	97.28	33.18	-6	199.01	74.20	124.87

Table 2: Identified feasible selling hours from the flexibility schedule model for April 3, 2023, and their revenues.

Flexible hour to purchase (τ) h	Day-ahead energy price forecast ($\pi_{b\tau}$) €/MWh	Tertiary market price to power down ($\pi_{s\tau}^-$) €/MWh	Spread for Power down (S_{τ}^-) €/MWh	Power to buy (h) MW	Saving for purchase ($((h) \cdot \Delta t \cdot S_{\tau}^-)$) €	Benefit margin ($\Delta\Phi^{\dagger} = \Phi^{\dagger} - \Phi^*$) €	Transaction profitability ($((h) \cdot \Delta t \cdot S_{\tau}^- - \Delta\Phi^{\dagger})$) €
4	114.99	-	-	6	-	23.50	-
8	117.89	61.99	59.00	6	354.02	59.50	294.52
20	115.77	45.56	70.21	6	421.24	28.10	393.14
23	117.63	60.77	56.86	6	341.16	39.30	301.86

Table 3: Identified feasible purchasing hours from the flexibility schedule model for June 5, 2023, and their savings.




Figure 6: Flexible available hours on average for selling or buying energy in the tertiary regulation market in the selected months.

Figure 8 presents the total savings achieved by further optimizing the initial planning output with the new PV generation and battery storage elements added to the model, compared to the initial baseline scenario without PV generation and battery storage (M00). It can be seen that the standalone element contributing the largest savings is PV generation (from M10 to M60) compared to battery storage. This effect is greater with the combination of both, although not directly proportional. These results are expected because photovoltaic generation significantly reduces the amount of energy purchased directly from the grid,




Figure 7: Total number of successful transactions for selling or buying energy in the tertiary regulation market for the selected months.

but the battery only provides savings by allowing the purchase of electricity when the price is lower.

Total simple payback period for flexibility and savings for optimizing initial production. The Total simple payback takes into account both the flexibility revenue (FR) from the sale/purchase of power in the tertiary regulation market and the production savings (PS) from further optimizing the initial base program (M00) by adding battery storage or PV generation.

Is calculated as the sum of the total marginal capital costs




Figure 8: Total savings by further optimizing the initial planning production when adding battery storage or PV generation compared to the initial baseline scenario (M00).

to install the PV generation system, $MC(PV)$ (€/MW) and batteries, $MC(B)$ (€/MWh) multiplied by the total capacity of the PV system, $C(PV)$ (MW) and batteries, $C(B)$ (MW h) for each iteration, divided by twelve times the FR plus PS for the month evaluated:

$$\#years = \frac{MC(PV) \cdot C(PV) + MC(B) \cdot C(B)}{12 \cdot (FR + PS)} \quad (25)$$

The result is interpreted as the number of years it would take to recover the initial investment in the PV generation system, batteries, or both, if the entire year were to operate as the month evaluated.

Figure 9 shows that the total payback period is slightly shorter on average when buying energy than when selling in the tertiary regulation market, ranging from 5 to over 40 years for both buying and selling, but with greater variability for selling. April brings a shorter amortization period for both types of transactions.

On average, the best payback periods are found when investing in a PV system or with a combination of both, rather than just battery storage. Besides, the economic impact of flexibility is less significant than the potential savings achieved by further optimizing the initial production plan.

5. Conclusions

This paper proposes a methodology to identify and quantify the flexibility of electricity consumption in a production plant with photovoltaic generation and electrical storage. The objective is to minimize production costs through optimal production scheduling. This involves the joint strategic management of the schedule of the electrical production machines, product levels in intermediate storage silos, PV generation systems, and battery-based energy storage systems. After modeling the production system, a baseline schedule is obtained and the feasibility of modifying this optimal production schedule to exploit the flexibility (flexibility schedule) to sell or buy energy in the tertiary regulation market has been evaluated.





Figure 9: Total simple payback period considering both the flexibility revenues/savings for selling/buying electricity in the tertiary regulation market for the selected months and the savings for further optimizing the initial production when adding PV generation system capacity and/or battery storage rated capacity.

The methodology was tested in a real case, using actual data from a Portland cement plant in Spain. The raw mill production sub-process, which offers the greatest potential for flexibility, was selected for testing. The optimal production schedule was modeled using the latest electricity price forecasts from the day-ahead market. Sales revenues or savings from energy purchases were obtained using prices observed in the Tertiary Regulation market for April and June 2023. The entire process was iterated with 19 different combinations of PV and electric battery system capacities.

The findings indicate an advantage in purchasing energy from these markets over selling it. Batteries, on average, offer more flexibility, while PV systems excel in energy savings. This is because PV systems decrease the need for direct grid energy purchases, while batteries contribute by facilitating electricity purchases when prices are at their lowest.

Finally, the economic impact of flexibility alone is less significant than the potential savings achieved by optimizing the initial production plan.

Acknowledgments

This research has been founded by grant MIG-20211033 from Centro para el Desarrollo Tecnológico Industrial (CDTI)

under the Ministry of Science, Innovation and Universities of the Spanish Government.

References

- [1] Basán, N.P., Cóccola, M.E., Dondo, R.G., Guarnaschelli, A., Schweickardt, G.A., Méndez, C.A., 2020. A reactive-iterative optimization algorithm for scheduling of air separation units under uncertainty in electricity prices. *Computers & Chemical Engineering* 142, 107050. doi:10.1016/j.compchemeng.2020.107050.
- [2] Basán, N.P., Grossmann, I.E., Gopalakrishnan, A., Lotero, I., Méndez, C.A., 2018. Novel MILP scheduling model for power-intensive processes under time-sensitive electricity prices. *Industrial & Engineering Chemistry Research* 57, 1581–1592. doi:10.1021/acs.iecr.7b04435.
- [3] Bertsimas, D., Tsitsiklis, J., 1997. *Introduction to Linear Optimization*. Athena Scientific.
- [4] Bestuzheva, K., Besançon, M., Chen, W.K., Chmiela, A., Donkiewicz, T., van Doornmalen, J., Eifler, L., Gaul, O., Gamrath, G., Gleixner, A., Gottwald, L., Graczyk, C., Halbig, K., Hoen, A., Hojny, C., van der Hulst, R., Koch, T., Lübbecke, M., Maher, S.J., Matter, F., Mühmer, E., Müller, B., Pfetsch, M.E., Rehfeldt, D., Schlein, S., Schlösser, F., Serano, F., Shinano, Y., Sohranac, B., Turner, M., Vigerske, S., Wegscheider, F., Wellner, P., Weninger, D., Witzig, J., 2021. The SCIP Optimization Suite 8.0. ZIB-Report 21-41. Zuse Institute Berlin. URL: <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0297-zib-85309>.
- [5] Bye, G., Livesey, P., Struble, L., 2011. *Portland Cement*. 3rd ed., ICE Publishing. URL: <https://www.icevirtualibrary.com/doi/abs/10.1680/pc.36116>, doi:10.1680/pc.36116.
- [6] Cochez, E., Nijs, W., 2010. *Cement Production*. Technical Report Technology Brief I03. IEA ETSAP. https://iea-etsap.org/E-TechDS/PDF/I03_cement_June_2010_GS-gct.pdf.
- [7] Comisión Nacional de los Mercados y la Competencia, 2023. Resolución de 17 de marzo de 2022, de la Comisión Nacional de los Mercados y la Competencia, por la que se aprueban los procedimientos de operación adaptados a la programación cuarto-horaria de la operación del sistema eléctrico peninsular español. <https://www.boe.es/buscar/doc.php?id=B0E-A-2022-4969>.
- [8] Fortia Energía S.L., 2023. Web page. <https://www.fortiaenergia.es/en/>. Accessed: 2024-02-01.
- [9] IEA, 2018. Cement technology roadmap plots path to cutting co2 emissions 24% by 2050. <https://www.iea.org/news/cement-technology-roadmap-plots-path-to-cutting-co2-emissions-24-by-2050>. Accessed: 2024-02-01.
- [10] Joint Research Centre (JRC), 2023. Photovoltaic geographical information system. https://re.jrc.ec.europa.eu/pvg_tools/en/. Accessed: 2024-02-01.
- [11] Kelley, M.T., Pattison, R.C., Baldick, R., Baldea, M., . An MILP framework for optimizing demand response operation of air separation units. *Applied Energy* 222, 951–966. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.12.127.
- [12] Kumar, Y., Mazumdar, B., Ghosh, P., 2020. Thermal energy consumption and its conservation for a cement production unit. *Environmental Engineering Research* 26, doi:10.4491/eer.2020.111.
- [13] Lazard, 2023. 2023 leveled cost of energy. <https://www.lazard.com/research-insights/2023-leveled-cost-of-energyplus/>. Accessed: 2024-02-01.
- [14] Lee, E., Baek, K., Kim, J., . Evaluation of demand response potential flexibility in the industry based on a data-driven approach. *Energies* 13, 6355. doi:10.3390/en13236355.
- [15] Lee, E., Baek, K., Kim, J., 2020. Evaluation of demand response potential flexibility in the industry based on a data-driven approach. *Energies* 13, 6355. doi:10.3390/en13236355.
- [16] Linderoth, J.T., Lodi, A., et al., 2010. MILP software. *Wiley encyclopedia of operations research and management science* 5, 3239–3248.
- [17] Maher, S., Miltenberger, M., Pedroso, J.P., Rehfeldt, D., Schwarz, R., Serano, F., 2016. PySCIPOpt: Mathematical programming in python with the SCIP optimization suite, in: *Mathematical Software – ICMS 2016*. Springer International Publishing, pp. 301–307. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-42432-3_37.
- [18] McKinsey & Company, 2020. The 21st-century cement plant: Greener and more connected. <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/chemicals/our-insights/the-21st-century-cement-plant-greener-and-more-connected>. Accessed: 2024-02-01.
- [19] Niranjana, A., 2022. Fixing concrete's carbon footprint. <https://www.dw.com/en/concrete-cement-climate-carbon-footprint/a-60588204>. Accessed: 2024-02-01.
- [20] Olsen, D., . Opportunities for Energy Efficiency and Demand Response in the California Cement Industry. Technical Report. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. Accessed: 2024-02-01.
- [21] Parejo Guzmán, M., Navarrete Rubia, B., Mora Peris, P., Alfalla-Luque, R., 2022. Methodological development for the optimisation of electricity cost in cement factories: the use of artificial intelligence in process variables. *Electrical Engineering* 104, 1681–1696. doi:10.1007/s00202-021-01409-z.
- [22] Paz Ochoa, M., Jiang, H., Gopalakrishnan, A., Lotero, I., Grossmann, I.E., 2018. Optimal production scheduling of industrial gases under uncertainty with flexibility constraints, in: Eden, M.R., Ierapetritou, M.G., Towler, G.P. (Eds.), *Computer Aided Chemical Engineering*. Elsevier. volume 44 of *13 International Symposium on Process Systems Engineering (PSE 2018)*, pp. 1513–1518. doi:10.1016/B978-0-444-64241-7.50247-0.
- [23] Red Eléctrica de España, 2023. Operation of the electricity system. <https://www.ree.es/en/activities/operation-of-the-electricity-system>. Accessed: 2024-02-01.
- [24] Rodgers, L., 2018. Climate change: The massive CO2 emitter you may not know about. <https://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-46455844>. Accessed: 2024-02-01.
- [25] Rombouts, M., 2021. Flexible electricity use in the cement industry: Laying the foundation for a not so concrete future. MSc Thesis. Utrecht University. <https://studenttheses.uu.nl/handle/20.500.12932/39926>.
- [26] RTE, 2021. Concrete: the world's third largest co2 emitter. <https://www.rte.ie/news/world/2021/1031/1256726-concrete-co2-emitter/>. Accessed: 2024-02-01.
- [27] Röben, F.T., Liu, D., Reuter, M.A., Dahmen, M., Bardow, A., 2022. The demand response potential in copper production. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 362, 132221. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.132221.
- [28] Sebastián, C., González-Guillén, C.E., Juan, J., 2023. An adaptive standardisation model for day-ahead electricity price forecasting. *arXiv:2311.02610*.
- [29] Shouman, E.R.M., 2024. Solar power prediction with artificial intelligence, in: Abdelaziz, A.Y., Mossa, M.A., Ouanjli, N.E. (Eds.), *Advances in Solar Photovoltaic Energy Systems*. IntechOpen, Rijeka. chapter 2. URL: <https://doi.org/10.5772/intechopen.1002726>, doi:10.5772/intechopen.1002726.
- [30] Swanepoel, J.A., Mathews, E.H., Vosloo, J., Liebenberg, L., 2014. Integrated energy optimisation for the cement industry: A case study perspective. *Energy Conversion and Management* 78, 765–775. doi:10.1016/j.enconman.2013.11.033.
- [31] Ye, X.Y., Liu, Z.W., Chi, M., Ge, M.F., Xi, Z., 2023. Demand response optimization of cement manufacturing industry based on reinforcement learning algorithm, in: *2022 IEEE International Conference on Cyborg and Bionic Systems (CBS)*, pp. 402–406. doi:10.1109/CBS55922.2023.10115387.
- [32] Zhang, X., Hug, G., Kolter, J.Z., Harjunkoski, I., 2018. Demand response of ancillary service from industrial loads coordinated with energy storage. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems* 33, 951–961. doi:10.1109/TPWRS.2017.2704524.
- [33] Zhao, X., He, B., Xu, F.Y., Lai, L.L., Yang, C., Lu, S., Li, D., 2014. A model of demand response scheduling for cement plant, in: *2014 IEEE International Conference on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics (SMC)*, pp. 3042–3047. doi:10.1109/SMC.2014.6974393.