

Screening Curve Method for Economic Analysis of Household Solar Energy Self-Consumption

Hikaru Hoshino, *Member*, Yosuke Irie, Eiko Furutani, *Member*

Abstract—The profitability of **solar energy self-consumption in households, the so-called photovoltaic (PV) self-consumption**, is expected to boost the deployment of PV and battery storage systems. This paper develops a novel method for economic analysis of PV self-consumption using battery storage based on an extension of the Screening Curve Method (SCM). The SCM enables quick and intuitive estimation of the least-cost generation mix for a target load curve and has been used for generation planning for bulk power systems. In this paper, we generalize the framework of existing SCM to take into account the intermittent nature of renewable energy sources and apply it to the problem of optimal sizing of PV and battery storage systems for a household. Numerical studies are provided to verify the estimation accuracy of the proposed SCM and to illustrate its effectiveness in a sensitivity analysis, owing to its ability to show intuitive plots of cost curves for researchers or policy-makers to understand the reasons behind the optimization results.

Index Terms—Solar PV, battery storage, screening curve method, feed-in tariffs.

I. INTRODUCTION

THE installation capacity of solar photovoltaics (PV) in the world has increased over the past decades owing to the use of support policies such as feed-in tariffs [1], [2]. Recently, the price of PV has declined dramatically, and the grid parity has been reached in several countries [3], which means that PV can produce electricity at a price below the price of electricity purchased from the grid. **In these regions or countries, not only selling electricity to the grid but also self-consumption of PV-produced electricity can bring economic benefit to the consumer. Because of this, the deployment of PV based on household solar energy self-consumption, which is called as PV self-consumption [4], has attracted great interest.** As one of the policies based on the concept of PV self-consumption, many countries introduced net-metering or net-billing mechanisms [5], where the surplus electricity fed into the grid is rewarded with credits that can be applied to offset consumption. However, there have been intense debates on net-metering policies regarding recovery of network costs and equity of cost allocation [6], [7], and several setbacks and cancellations in the application of these policies have occurred [3]. Furthermore, various new self-consumption schemes, such as collective or distributed self-consumption [8], [9], are proposed or implemented in several countries, and

thus appropriate regulatory frameworks based on the concept of self-consumption remain to be discussed.

To contribute to such discussions, economic analysis for evaluating the profitability of PV self-consumption has been extensively studied. Existing methods can be categorized into optimization and simulation methods, depending on whether the capacities of PV and battery storage are optimization variables or simulated as exogenous parameters [10]. Since simulation-based methods might underestimate the economic value of the investment [11], it is important to correctly determine the sizes of the PV and battery storage according to the customers' load profiles, and thus optimization methods are often used [12], [13], [14]. While these methods can incorporate constraints to describe various situations, it takes hours or days to obtain optimization results. Therefore, only a limited number of scenarios (input data and parameters) are likely to be analyzed to provide inadequate information to infer a trend for inputs. Besides, these methods give the optimization results like a “black box”, and limited intuition can be gained from the obtained results. **Since there is a high uncertainty in the estimates of parameters such as prices and costs, the above two issues of computational time and the interpretability of the results make it difficult for policy-makers and regulators to learn from these optimization studies.**

The Screening Curve Method (SCM) is an intuitive and quick method for estimating the least-cost generation mix, and it is a good tool to provide answers to the above issues. SCM was first proposed in the 1960s [15], [16]. It compares the summations of annualized upfront investment costs (fixed costs) and production costs (variable costs) of multiple technologies to determine the optimal mix when no technical constraints are considered. In recent years, much effort has been made to develop enhanced versions of SCM to estimate the optimal mix considering technical details. The start-up cost, thermal cycling, and other miscellaneous short-term operations of thermal generation are modeled in [17], [18]. Furthermore, ancillary services are considered in [19], hydro scheduling is modeled in [20], existing capacities are considered in [21], [22], and planned outages are considered in [23]. All of these SCMs have been developed for estimating the optimal capacity mix in a bulk power system.

The purpose of this paper is to develop an SCM for economic analysis of photovoltaic self-consumption to estimate optimal sizes of PV and battery storage systems at the demand side. It has been known that the framework of SCM can be applied to the optimal sizing of various sources to satisfy load demands [24], [25]. However, there has been no existing

This work was supported in part by JST, ACT-X Grant Number JPM-JAX210M, Japan.

The authors are with the Department of Electrical Materials and Engineering, University of Hyogo, 2167 Shosha, Himeji, Hyogo, 671-2280, Japan (email: hoshino@eng.u-hyogo.ac.jp).

SCM that can take into account the intermittent nature of renewable energy sources. In this paper, to consider the fact that the amount of electricity generated by PV depends on the solar irradiation at each time, we newly adopt a time-varying scheme to decompose the load curve, whereas time-invariant load slices have been used in existing SCMs to decompose the original optimization problem into sub-problems. It is shown that the proposed SCM can be used to estimate the optimal solution of a Linear Programming (LP) problem. While an estimation algorithm has been proposed in [26] for the upper bound of the battery size, estimation of the optimal value of the battery size as well as the PV size has not been achieved.

A preliminary version of the proposed SCM was presented in [27], but periodicity in the input data was assumed on a time scale of 24 hours. The proposed SCM that can handle arbitrary shapes and lengths of data has been partly presented in the conference publication [28]. This paper adds the following important contributions: the proposed algorithm is refined, and an analytical expression for estimating the economic benefit of battery is newly introduced; a systematic verification study is presented by comparing the results with LP optimal solutions under various settings of parameters; and the effectiveness of the proposed SCM is examined in terms of computational time.

This paper is structured as follows. Section II introduces the optimal sizing problem for PV and battery storage systems studied in this paper. The proposed SCM is presented in Section III after a brief review of the existing SCMs. Section IV provides a verification study for the estimation accuracy of the proposed SCM under various settings of parameters. Section V discusses the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed SCM, and Section VI concludes this paper.

II. OPTIMAL SIZING PROBLEM

The proposed SCM is intended to estimate the optimal solution of the LP problem introduced in this section. The problem formulation follows from [7] and is based on the following assumptions:

- The sizes of PV and battery storage systems are continuous decision variables, while several discrete sizes would be the options in practice.
- The electricity generated by a unit capacity of PV is proportional to the solar irradiation, and the effect of inverter clipping due to oversizing of a solar array is neglected.
- The profiles of load demand and solar irradiation are completely known a priori to optimize the operation of the battery storage system.
- The electricity retail price per unit of energy consumed is fixed, and other practical tariff structures such as three-part tariff are not considered.

The optimal sizes of PV and battery are determined with the aim of minimizing the annualized electricity-related costs of a household while satisfying the load demand at each time. This problem can be viewed as a multi-scale decision-making problem, where the decision variables include both the long-term decisions on the installation capacities v_{pv} of PV (in kW) and v_{bat} of battery (in kWh) and the short-term operational




Fig. 1: Optimal PV and battery sizing problem

TABLE I: Parameters of the optimization problem

Symbol	Meaning	Value
C_{pv}	Annual fixed cost of PV	12 000 yen/(kW · yr) ^a
C_{bat}	Annual fixed cost of battery	4400 yen/(kWh · yr) ^b
P_{buy}	Price for buying from the grid	26.0 yen/kWh
P_{sell}	Price for selling to the grid	6.0 yen/kWh
E_{chg}	Efficiency of charging	0.9
E_{dis}	Efficiency of discharging	0.9
E_{pv}	Performance ratio of PV system	0.78
G_{stc}	STC reference irradiance intensity	1000 W/m ²
S_k	Solar irradiation at time k	Given as input data
D_k	Electricity consumption at time k	Given as input data
M_{pv}	Maximum capacity of PV	10 kW
F_{anu}	Scaling factor for annualization	365/# of days analyzed

^aIt represents annualized cost and corresponds to, e.g., the case where the PV unit price of 200 000 yen/kW with the lifetime of 25 years, the discount rate of 0%, and the maintenance and operation cost of 4000 yen/(kW · yr).

^bIt corresponds to, e.g., the case where the unit price of the battery is 66 000 yen/kWh, the lifetime of 15 years, and the discount rate of 0%.

decisions on the amounts of electricity purchased from and sold to the grid at each time step k , denoted by $u_{buy,k}$ and $u_{sell,k}$ (for $k = 1, 2, \dots, N_t$), and the amounts of charging and discharging of battery, denoted by $u_{bin,k}$ and $u_{bout,k}$, respectively, where N_t stands for the number of time steps. Figure 1 shows the overview of the PV and battery sizing problem considered in this paper. The meaning of parameters and these typical values are listed in Table I.

The objective function L to be minimized is given as follows:

$$L = F_{anu} \sum_{k=1}^{N_t} (P_{buy} u_{buy,k} - P_{sell} u_{sell,k}) + C_{pv} v_{pv} + C_{bat} v_{bat} \quad (1)$$

where the parameters P_{buy} and P_{sell} stand for the prices of electricity purchased from and sold to the grid, respectively, and the electricity trading costs are annualized using a scaling factor F_{anu} . The parameters C_{pv} and C_{bat} stand for the fixed costs (mainly installation costs) of PV and battery per unit installation amount per year, respectively.

The operation of the battery storage system is subject to the following state equation:

$$x_{soc,k+1} = x_{soc,k} + E_{chg} u_{bin,k} - \frac{1}{E_{dis}} u_{bout,k}, \quad \forall k \quad (2)$$

where $x_{soc,k}$ stands for the state of charge (SOC) of the battery storage at the time step k , and the parameters E_{chg} and E_{dis} for the efficiencies of charging and discharging of battery,

respectively. In addition, the following constraints need to be addressed:

$$x_{\text{soc},k} \leq v_{\text{bat}}, \quad \forall k, \quad (3)$$

$$x_{\text{soc},N_t+1} = x_{\text{soc},1} \quad (4)$$

where (3) imposes an upper bound of SOC being subject to the long-term decision v_{bat} , and (4) is the boundary condition. Besides, the electricity demand should be equal to supply at each time step, and the following equation holds:

$$u_{\text{buy},k} - u_{\text{sell},k} - u_{\text{bin},k} + u_{\text{bout},k} = D_k - \frac{S_k E_{\text{pv}} v_{\text{pv}}}{G_{\text{stc}}}, \quad \forall k \quad (5)$$

where D_k stands for the electricity demand at the time step k in kWh, and S_k for the solar radiation in kWh/m². The parameter G_{stc} stands for the reference irradiance intensity of the Standard Test Conditions (STC) [29], which is equal to 1000 W/m², and E_{pv} stands for the performance ratio of PV system [30], which depends on the efficiencies of the PV panel and the power conditioning system and so on. An upper bound is imposed on the size of PV:

$$v_{\text{pv}} \leq M_{\text{pv}}. \quad (6)$$

This condition is needed to prevent the LP problem becomes unbounded when the PV price C_{pv} is lower than a certain value. Finally, the following condition forces all the decision variables to be non-negative:

$$v_{\text{pv}}, v_{\text{bat}}, u_{\text{buy},k}, u_{\text{sell},k}, u_{\text{bin},k}, u_{\text{bout},k}, x_{\text{soc},k} \geq 0, \quad \forall k. \quad (7)$$

Note that the dimension of the above LP problem increases with the increase in the length of data analyzed. For an analysis over 1 year with a temporal resolution of 1 hour, the resultant LP problem becomes $2 + 8760 \times 5 = 43,802$ dimensional optimization problem, and may take hours or days to obtain the result by a general-purpose optimization solver.

III. SCREENING CURVE METHOD

In this section, we introduce the framework of SCM with a brief review of existing SCMs in Section III-A. The proposed SCM for economic analysis of PV self-consumption is presented in Section III-B.

A. Review of Existing SCMs

The classical SCM [15], [16] requires two sets of input data: costs and a load curve for a target year. Cost data includes the annualized upfront investment cost C_{fix} per unit capacity (in kW or MW) and the variable production costs C_{var} per unit production (in kWh or MWh). The total annualized cost of a unit capacity of generation technology is represented as follows:

$$c = C_{\text{fix}} + C_{\text{var}}T \quad (8)$$

where T stands for the firing hours of the considered thermal generation technology. The cost representation in (8) is used to draw the so-called *screening curve* for each generation technology as shown in the upper part of Fig. 2, where the




Fig. 2: The classical SCM to determine the optimal thermal generation mix when no technical constraints are considered.

horizontal axis is taken as the capacity factor f defined as the ratio of the firing hours T to the total hours in a year ($f = T/8760$ h). Figure 2 illustrates examples of the screening curves for three candidate technologies: base-load (such as coal and nuclear), combined-cycle gas turbine (CCGT) and simple-cycle combustion turbine (GT). Then, the intersections of these screening curves separate the regions of f in which the different generation technologies become optimal. The least-cost generation mix for a given load curve can be obtained by combining them with the load-duration curve as shown in the lower part of Fig. 2, where the load-duration curve is obtained by sorting a chronological load curve in descending order of the load level. Since the load-duration curve maps a load level on the vertical axis to a capacity factor on the horizontal axis, and the screening curves map the capacity factor to the annual costs of generation alternatives, the optimal generation capacity mix can be read from the vertical axis of the lower graph as shown in Fig. 2. This analysis gives the optimal solution to the least-cost problem with no technical constraints [24].

In recent years, enhanced versions of SCM have been developed to estimate the optimal generation mix considering more detailed situations. For this purpose, it was proposed in [17] to relate the load level directly to the generation cost. With this scheme, a chronological load curve is discretized into multiple load slices as shown in Fig. 3a. For example, if the width of a load slice is set to be 0.1 MW, then a load curve with a peak of 80 MW will be divided into 800 load slices. Then, the original least-cost problem will be decomposed into sub-problems corresponding to these slices, and a heuristic optimization is performed to determine which generation technology is used in each slice. This is done by calculating the annualized total cost to balance the demand in each load slice with a production by each generation technology to draw screening




Fig. 3: The framework of enhanced SCMs to estimate the optimal generation mix when technical constraints are considered.

curves (cost curves) as shown in Fig. 3b. The estimated optimal generation mix can be derived by simply choosing the least-cost technology for each slice. With this approach, in addition to the fixed and variable costs in (8), a simple representation of the start-up costs can be obtained by counting the number of segments in each load slice and summing up the cost for each start up. In the example shown in Fig. 3a, the costs for three re-starts will be added. Furthermore, the start-up can be separated into hot starts and cold starts depending on the shut-down duration before the restart, which is evaluated from the distance between adjacent segments [17], [18]. With the above framework of enhanced SCM, other technical details such as thermal cycling [18], ancillary services [19], hydro scheduling [20], existing capacities [21], [22], and planned outages [23] have been taken into account.

B. Proposed SCM for PV and battery

Based on the framework of enhanced SCM introduced above, here we develop the proposed SCM for economic analysis of PV self-consumption.

1) *Overview*: The existing SCMs have been developed mainly for thermal generation technologies and are not able to take into account intermittent nature of renewable energy sources. To consider the fact that the amount of electricity generated by PV depends on the solar irradiation at each time, we newly adopt a time-varying scheme for load slicing. Specifically, as shown in Fig. 4, the load curve is discretized into multiple load slices using the generation profile of a unit capacity of PV, which corresponds to the width of the load slice. As shown in the lower part of the figure, the PV generation shaded in red will be directly consumed and the area shaded in blue becomes surplus electricity, which will




Fig. 4: Time-varying scheme of load slicing in the proposed SCM

TABLE II: Parameters and variables used for SCM

Symbol	Meaning
ΔP	Unit capacity of PV corresponding to the width of a slice
N_t	Total number of time steps of analyzed data
N_d	Total number of days of analyzed data
i	Index of load slices
k	Index of time steps in chronological order
j	Index of days in ascending order w.r.t. surplus electricity
$q_{load,i,k}$	Electricity demand at the time step k in the slice i
$q_{sur,i,k}$	Surplus electricity at the time step k in the slice i
$q_{chg,i,k}$	Charged electricity at the time step k in the slice i
$q_{bat,i}$	Amount of battery required for the slice i
$Q_{bat,i,j}$	Amount of battery required for the j -th day in the slice i
$\Delta Q_{bat,i,j}$	Incremental battery amount for the j -th day in the slice i

be sold to the grid or charged to the battery to increase self-consumption. Note that the load demand during nighttime is not directly considered in this method, since there is no power generation by PV at night.

With this modified approach of load slicing, the overall procedure of the analysis is followed from the framework of enhanced SCM and is given as follows:

- (i) Discretize the chronological load curve into time-varying load slices by using the generation profile of a unit capacity of PV, denoted by ΔP , corresponding to the width of a load slice.
- (ii) Draw screening curves by calculating the annualized cost to satisfy the demand in each slice by each of the following three technology options: a) buying electricity from the grid, b) installing PV without battery, and c) installing PV with battery.
- (iii) Estimate the optimal PV size by counting the number of slices where the option b) or c) becomes the least-cost technology.
- (iv) Estimate the optimal battery size by summing up the required amount of battery calculated for each slice where the option c) becomes the least-cost technology.

The detailed calculations of the screening curves and required amount of battery are presented in the rest of this section. Parameters and variables used for calculations are summarized in Table II.

2) *Calculation of Screening Curves:* For the technology option a), the annualized cost $c_{\text{grid},i}$ of purchasing electricity from the grid for the slice level i can be calculated as follows:

$$c_{\text{grid},i} = F_{\text{anu}} \sum_{k=1}^{N_t} P_{\text{buy}} q_{\text{load},i,k} \quad (9)$$

where $q_{\text{load},i,k}$ stands for the amount of load demand of the slice i at the time step k . The total amount of electricity $\sum_k q_{\text{load},i,k}$ corresponds to the area shaded in red in Fig. 4. The parameters P_{buy} and F_{anu} are the same with those defined in Section II and stand for the electricity retail price and the annualization factor, respectively.

For the technology option b), the annualized cost $c_{\text{pv},i}$ of installing PV without battery for the slice i is given as follows:

$$c_{\text{pv},i} = C_{\text{pv}} \Delta P - F_{\text{anu}} \sum_{k=1}^{N_t} P_{\text{sell}} q_{\text{sur},i,k} \quad (10)$$

where $q_{\text{sur},i,k}$ stands for the amount of surplus electricity for the slice i at the time step k . The first term of the right-hand side of (10) represents the investment cost for PV, and the second term the revenue by selling surplus electricity to the grid. The total amount of electricity $\sum_k q_{\text{sur},i,k}$ corresponds to the area shaded in blue in Fig. 4. The parameters C_{pv} and P_{sell} stand for the annualized fixed cost of PV and the price of selling electricity to the grid, respectively.

For the technology option c), the cost $c_{\text{pv/bat},i}$ of installing PV and using battery for increasing self-consumption is given by

$$\begin{aligned} c_{\text{pv/bat},i} = & C_{\text{pv}} \Delta P + C_{\text{bat}} q_{\text{bat},i} \\ & - F_{\text{anu}} \sum_{k=1}^{N_t} P_{\text{sell}} (q_{\text{sur},i,k} - q_{\text{chg},i,k}) \\ & - F_{\text{anu}} \sum_{k=1}^{N_t} P_{\text{buy}} E_{\text{dis}} E_{\text{chg}} q_{\text{chg},i,k} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $q_{\text{bat},i}$ stands for the required amount of battery for the slice i , and $q_{\text{chg},i,k}$ stands for the amount of charged electricity for the slice i at the time k . The procedure of estimation of these values will be presented later. The second term of the right-hand side of (11) represents the investment cost for battery. The third term represents the revenue by selling surplus electricity. The fourth term represents the economic benefit due to the increase in self-consumption by charging surplus electricity and using it in e.g. nighttime. While the profile of charging is modeled in the proposed method, the discharging will not be explicitly considered.

3) Estimation of Battery Capacity and Charging Profile:

To estimate the values of $q_{\text{bat},i}$ and $q_{\text{chg},i,k}$, we will consider the economic benefit of battery in a sequential manner. To this end, let us define an index j that indicates the ascending order of the days with respect to the total amount of surplus PV generation in each day. That is, as shown in Fig. 5a, the day with the index $j = 1$ has the smallest amount of surplus electricity, and the day with $j = N_d$ has the largest amount, where N_d stands for the number of days analyzed. This order may vary depending on the slice i , but we do not explicitly




Fig. 5: Examples of charging profile of electricity for each value of $j = 1, 2,$ and 3 .

show it in the notation. Then, the amount of battery required to store all the surplus electricity of the j -th day can be given as

$$Q_{\text{bat},i,j} := E_{\text{chg}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_j} q_{\text{sur},i,k} \quad (12)$$

where the symbol \mathcal{K}_j stands for the set of indices of the time step k belonging to the j -th day. Note that this assumes that there is no discharging of battery during day time, otherwise the required amount of battery could be smaller.

Now the economic benefit of the battery can be sequentially estimated for each slice. First, consider to install a battery storage system of the amount of $Q_{\text{bat},i,1}$ for the slice $\#i$. Then, the surplus electricity can be charged up to this amount every day (see Fig. 5b), and the economic benefit B_1 associated to this use of battery can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 = & F_{\text{anu}} N_d P_{\text{buy}} E_{\text{dis}} Q_{\text{bat},i,1} \\ & - C_{\text{bat}} Q_{\text{bat},i,1} - F_{\text{anu}} N_d P_{\text{sell}} Q_{\text{bat},i,1} / E_{\text{chg}} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where the first term represents the amount of payment of electricity that can be avoided, the second term the installation cost of the battery, and the third term the lost revenue that could have been earned by selling this electricity. Next, for $2 \leq j \leq N_d$, if the amount of battery is increased to $Q_{\text{bat},i,j}$, the marginal economic benefit B_j due to the incremental amount of battery defined by $\Delta Q_{\text{bat},i,j} := Q_{\text{bat},i,j} - Q_{\text{bat},i,j-1}$ can be given by

$$\begin{aligned} B_j = & F_{\text{anu}} (N_d - j + 1) P_{\text{buy}} E_{\text{dis}} \Delta Q_{\text{bat},i,j} \\ & - C_{\text{bat}} \Delta Q_{\text{bat},i,j} \\ & - F_{\text{anu}} (N_d - j + 1) P_{\text{sell}} \Delta Q_{\text{bat},i,j} / E_{\text{chg}}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Figure 5c shows examples for the cases of $j = 2$ and $j = 3$. Note that the economic benefit of the incremental battery capacity $\Delta Q_{\text{bat},i,j}$ can occur only for $N_d - j + 1$ days because the surplus electricity over the first to $(j-1)$ -th days is already accounted in B_1, \dots, B_{j-1} . By rewriting Eq. (14), we have

$$B_j = \{F_{\text{anu}}(N_d - j + 1)(P_{\text{buy}}E_{\text{dis}} - P_{\text{sell}}/E_{\text{chg}}) - C_{\text{bat}}\} \Delta Q_{\text{bat},i,j}. \quad (15)$$

Thus, the value of $B_j/\Delta Q_{\text{bat},i,j}$ decreases as the increase in j when $P_{\text{buy}} > P_{\text{sell}}/(E_{\text{chg}}E_{\text{dis}})$ holds¹. Since the economic benefit of the incremental amount of battery $\Delta Q_{\text{bat},i,j}$ occurs when $B_j > 0$, the installation capacity of battery $q_{\text{bat},i}$ in (11) can be given by

$$q_{\text{bat},i} := Q_{\text{bat},i,J} = E_{\text{chg}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_J} q_{\text{sur},i,k} \quad (16)$$

with

$$J := \max\{j \in \mathbb{Z}_{[0, N_d]} \mid B_j \geq 0\} \quad (17)$$

where $\mathbb{Z}_{[0, N_d]}$ stands for the set of integers ranging from 0 to N_d , and for $j = 0$, we define $B_0 := 0$ and $Q_{\text{bat},i,0} := 0$. From the observation that the value of $B_j/\Delta Q_{\text{bat},i,j}$ decreases with j , the value of J can be analytically described as

$$J = \max \left(0, \left\lfloor N_d + 1 - \frac{C_{\text{bat}}E_{\text{chg}}}{F_{\text{anu}}(P_{\text{buy}}E_{\text{dis}}E_{\text{chg}} - P_{\text{sell}})} \right\rfloor \right) \quad (18)$$

where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ stands for the floor function.

Given J and $q_{\text{bat},i}$ above, we can arbitrarily determine the charging profile $\{q_{\text{chg},i,k}\}_{k=1}^{N_t}$ used in (11) as long as the total charged amount of electricity at each day does not exceed the upper limit given by $q_{\text{bat},i}/E_{\text{chg}}$. Furthermore, by defining the total amount of electricity $Q_{\text{chg},i}$ charged to the battery as

$$Q_{\text{chg},i} = \sum_{j=1}^J \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_j} q_{\text{sur},i,k} + (N_d - J) \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_J} q_{\text{sur},i,k}, \quad (19)$$

the cost (11) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} c_{\text{pv/bat},i} &= C_{\text{pv}}\Delta P + C_{\text{bat}}E_{\text{chg}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_J} q_{\text{sur},i,k} \\ &\quad - F_{\text{anu}} \sum_{k=1}^{N_t} P_{\text{sell}}q_{\text{sur},i,k} \\ &\quad - F_{\text{anu}}(P_{\text{buy}}E_{\text{dis}}E_{\text{chg}} - P_{\text{sell}})Q_{\text{chg},i}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Thus, the screening curve of $c_{\text{bv/bat},i}$ can be directly calculated from the profile $\{q_{\text{sur},i,k}\}_{k=1}^{N_t}$ by using (18), (19), and (20) without calculating the values of B_j .

IV. VERIFICATION STUDY

This section examines the estimation accuracy of the proposed SCM by comparing the results with the LP problem presented in Section II. The python source code for the implementation of the proposed SCM is available upon request.

¹Note that this condition holds for the setting in Table I and is necessary for a self-consumption policy to work. Otherwise $B_j < 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, N_d$.




Fig. 6: Daily profiles of the input PV and demand data for February (1–28th days), June (29–58th days), and August (59–89th days).

A. Base-Case Analysis

The base-case analysis is performed with the setting of parameters shown in Table I. A synthetic hourly load profile was generated from real measurement data of a household in Japan [31] by concatenating data for February (Winter), June (Rainy season), and August (Summer) to construct a three-month data including different seasons in a year. A generation profile for a unit capacity of PV was generated by using solar irradiation data of METPV20 [32] for corresponding days and the location of the load profile. The daily profiles of these input data are shown in Fig. 6. It can be seen that the solar irradiation is generally low in winter, and there are many days with low solar irradiation in the rainy season. On the other hand, demand is higher during winter than other seasons. Although we use demand and solar irradiation data from Japan, it contains wide spectrum of situation of weather and seasons, and we aim to verify that the proposed method works also for other regions or countries.

The screening curves (cost curves) obtained by the proposed SCM is shown in Fig. 7a. The green and blue lines in the figure show the cost curves for using PV with and without battery storage calculated by (20) and (10), respectively, and the purple line the cost curve for buying electricity from the grid calculated by (9). The cost curve of “PV+battery” (green line) takes least value from $l = 0$ to 5.19 kW and has an intersection with the cost curve of “Grid” (purple line) at the point shown by the cross symbol (\times) in the figure. Thus, the installation capacity of PV can be estimated as 5.19 kW. The amount of battery is calculated for each slice by using (16). Figure 7b shows the cumulative amount of battery $\sum_i q_{\text{bat},i}$ until corresponding slice level. The total amount of battery can be derived by considering the level of $l = 5.19$ kW, and is given as 4.01 kWh. The optimal PV and battery capacities obtained by solving the LP problem are 5.15 kW and 4.06 kWh, respectively, and the proposed SCM




Fig. 7: Base-case result of the proposed SCM

approximates these optimal values appropriately.

In Fig. 7a, the screening curves of PV and PV+battery start at the same point (same annualized cost at 0kW slice level). This is because at 0kW slice level, the surplus electricity $q_{sur,0,k}$ is zero for all $k = 1, \dots, N_t$ (see Fig. 4), and thus only the first terms of Eqs. (10) and (20) become nonzero. When the screening curves are plotted in Fig. 7a, the annualized costs are scaled by dividing by ΔP , and the above two screening curves start with $C_{pv} = 12\,000 \text{ yen}/(\text{kW} \cdot \text{yr})$. Further, the option of PV+battery is always cheaper than the option of just using PV, since the amount of battery is determined such that the economic benefit B_j becomes non-negative. The difference between these two screening curves represents the amount of economic benefit owing to the battery.

Figure 8 shows the daily profiles of (a) electricity sold to the grid and (b) electricity charged to the battery. The profiles obtained by the SCM (shown by blue) capture the optimal profiles by the LP problem (shown by orange). It can be seen that, in many days, the amount of charged electricity takes its maximum value ($4.06 \text{ kWh}/E_{\text{chg}} = 4.51 \text{ kWh}$) meaning that the battery is fully charged. Although the SCM does not consider the profile of discharging, the ratio of the amount of sold electricity and the amount of charged electricity is properly reproduced throughout the analysis period, including the days when the amount of charge is low as typically seen in winter or rainy season.

B. Estimation Accuracy under Various Settings

Next, the estimation accuracy of the proposed SCM is examined under various settings of parameters. To reduce the computational time for obtaining the optimal solutions




Fig. 8: Amounts of electricity soled and charged for each day.

of the LP problem, the load demand and PV generation profiles were shortened by taking the first ten days of each month in the three-month data used above to construct a one-month long data. Among the parameters shown in Table I, the four parameters C_{pv} , C_{bat} , P_{buy} , and P_{sell} , which are directly relevant to the regulatory discussion of the PV self-consumption, are changed from the setting of the base-case analysis.

Figure 9 shows the comparison between the estimated and optimal solutions under varying prices of PV and battery storage systems. Figure 9a shows the results of changing the setting of the parameter C_{pv} . The blue circles show the PV capacities estimated by the proposed SCM, and they are close to the results of the LP problem shown by the dotted line. Similarly, the estimated battery capacities shown by the orange triangles are close to the optimal capacities over the entire range of C_{pv} . Next, Fig. 9b shows the result of changing the setting of the battery fixed cost C_{bat} . While the estimated capacity of PV is close to the optimal value over the entire range of C_{bat} , the installation capacity of battery is overestimated for the region where C_{bat} is lower than $4000 \text{ yen}/\text{kWh}/\text{yr}$. A plausible reason for this is that, while the proposed SCM does not take into account the profile of discharging, the battery is not sufficiently discharged each day, and there is no room for charging as much as calculated by the SCM. Thus, the solution derived by the SCM becomes suboptimal for the household. Nevertheless, the proposed SCM capture the overall trend of the changes in the optimal battery size.

Figure 10 shows the comparison of the estimated and optimal capacities under various setting of electricity prices. Figure 10a shows the results where the retail price P_{buy} is changed. It can be seen that the proposed SCM captures the overall trend of the changes in the optimal values of PV and battery, while the estimation accuracy of the battery capacity deteriorates in the region where the price P_{buy} is higher than $27 \text{ yen}/\text{kWh}$. As in the case of Fig. 9b, it starts to overestimate




Fig. 9: Results with various setting of PV and battery prices.




Fig. 10: Results with various setting of electricity prices.

the economic benefit of the battery when the battery capacity becomes greater than 15 kWh. Finally, Fig. 10b shows the results where the price P_{sell} is changed. The estimated and optimal values are closed to each other for both PV and battery capacities.

To summarize, the proposed SCM can estimate the optimal installation capacities of PV and battery for a wide range of parameter settings of C_{pv} , C_{bat} , P_{buy} , and P_{sell} , except for a region where the battery size becomes larger than a certain level. While it was assumed that there is no discharging of battery during day time, it did not largely affect the estimation accuracy. However, it should be noted that this assumption may become a limitation when the prices of buying and selling electricity do not remain the same during the day and at night.

V. DISCUSSION

In this section, we sort out advantages and disadvantages of the proposed SCM and discuss its effectiveness.

A. Economic Analysis Using Screening Curves

Here we illustrate how the cost curves obtained by the proposed SCM can be used for understanding and predicting the changes in the optimal capacities of PV and battery storage systems. Although similar examples have been presented in [27], we provide recalculated results using the SCM proposed in Section III to show its effectiveness in a self-consistent way.

Figure 11 shows the screening curves calculated under the three settings of the price of PV: $C_{pv} = 18000$ yen/(kW·yr), 15000 yen/(kW·yr), and 12000 yen/(kW·yr). Since the cost curve of $c_{grid,i}$ is independent of C_{pv} , it is common for all the above settings and shown by the *black* line. The cost curves of $c_{pv,i}$ and $c_{pv/bat,i}$ are shown by *broken* and *solid* lines, respectively, and they move down as C_{pv} increases without changing their shapes. This is because the parameter C_{pv} only affects the first term of (10) or (20), and they do not depend on the slice level i . It can be seen that the intersection of the cost curves of $c_{pv,i}$ and $c_{grid,i}$ moves to the right as C_{pv} decreases, implying the increase in the installation capacities of PV and battery. Especially, when C_{pv} takes a value near 12000 yen/kW/yr, the slope of the cost curve $c_{grid,i}$ at the intersection becomes small, and thus the optimal capacities of PV and battery drastically changes as also can be seen in Fig. 9a.

Next, Fig. 12 shows the cost curves calculated under the settings of $C_{bat} = 5500$ yen/(kWh·yr), 5000 yen/(kWh·yr), and 4500 yen/(kWh·yr). The cost curves of $c_{grid,i}$ and $c_{pv,i}$ are invariant and shown by *solid* and *broken black* lines, respectively. The cost curve of $c_{pv/bat,i}$ goes down as C_{bat} decreases. The difference between $c_{pv,i}$ and $c_{pv/bat,i}$ describes the economic benefit of the self-consumption owing to battery storage, and it can be explained from this figure that the capacity of the battery storage begins to increase from zero at a point around 5000 yen/(kWh·yr) as can be seen in Fig. 9b.

As shown in these examples, the effect of changes in a parameter on each cost curve can be easily predicted from their definitions in (9), (10), and (20), and similar implications can




Fig. 11: Cost curves with different values of C_{pv}




Fig. 12: Cost curves with different values of C_{bat}

TABLE III: Computational times

Data length	Comp. Time (SCM)	Comp. Time (LP)
1 months	1.29 s	57.73 s
2 months	2.46 s	276.15 s
3 months	2.93 s	784.18 s
4 months	3.49 s	1439.31 s
5 months	3.96 s	3289.80 s
6 months	4.56 s	6089.13 s

also be obtained when other parameters change. By considering the behavior of each cost curve separately, the changes in the resultant optimal capacities in PV and battery storage systems can be understood in an intuitive and consistent way.

B. Computational Time

Since the computations of cost curves in the proposed SCM only requires numerical operations on arrays, it is faster than solving a least-cost problem using a general-purpose optimization solver. Table III and Fig. 13 show the comparison of the computational times between the proposed SCM and the LP problem. These results have been obtained in simulations with a Core i9-10850K based desktop computer. The proposed SCM is much faster than solving the LP problem. The LP problem has been solved by using an interior-point method provided by `linprog` in the python package `SciPy`, and the computational time could be reduced by using much more




Fig. 13: Computational times with SCM and LP

powerful commercial solvers. However, when the length of data is increased, the rapid increase in the computational time cannot be avoided due to the increase in the dimension of the problem. The proposed SCM enables quick estimation of the optimization results without any special commercial solver and its computational time increases only linearly to the length of the data. The short computational time is useful to perform sensitivity analysis or other studies that require multiple simulations with different settings of parameters or input data.

C. Advantages and Disadvantages

The proposed SCM estimates the economic benefit of the photovoltaic self-consumption using battery storage. It does not consider other types of battery usage, such as energy arbitrage in response to variations in electricity prices [33], [34] or provision of ancillary services for voltage regulation or congestion relief of distribution grid [35]. There are also limitations to the proposed SCM. For example, it cannot describe discrete installation capacities, existing capacities, or a common three-part tariff, while some of these issues including ancillary services and existing capacities may be resolved by further modifications as performed with the SCM for thermal generation [18], [21].

One advantage of the proposed SCM is that it can provide intuitive plots of cost curves to understand the reasons behind the results of optimal installation capacities. In addition, the computational time of the SCM is short (few seconds) compared to optimization models (usually more than hours). These facts are useful to explore cost sensitivity or other studies that require multiple simulations. Thus, the proposed SCM is more useful for researchers or policy makers studying incentive policy for supporting PV or tariff regulations, who want to draw policy implications from an intuitive and quick trend analysis, rather than residential or commercial consumers who want to derive an optimal energy systems design with detailed specifications taken into account. Nevertheless, the SCM can be used to derive an initial estimate prior to the detailed design or to screen out cases where there is no economic benefit of installing PV or battery storage systems.

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper developed a method of economic analysis of PV self-consumption with and without battery storage. The

development is based on a generalization of the framework of Screening Curve Method (SCM), which has been utilized for generation expansion problem of a bulk power system. The proposed SCM enables quick and intuitive estimation of the installation capacities of PV and battery storage systems. The estimation accuracy has been validated through numerical simulations, and high accuracy has been achieved when the battery installation capacity is not large. The method is useful to explore cost sensitivity or other studies that require multiple simulations.

Future directions of this study include further improvements of the method to consider, e.g., the usage of battery storage for ancillary services or the effect of existing capacities. Another one is to perform practical economic analyses by using the proposed SCM.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to thank K. Okada and K. Furusawa (Central Research Institute of Electric Power Industry; CRIEPI) for feedback during the course of this work.

REFERENCES

- [1] G. R. Timilsina, L. Kurdgelashvili, and P. A. Narbel, "Solar energy: Markets, economics and policies," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 449–465, 2012.
- [2] L. Poruschi, C. L. Ambrey, and J. C. Smart, "Revisiting feed-in tariffs in australia: A review," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 82, pp. 260–270, 2018.
- [3] International Energy Agency, "Trends in photovoltaic applications 2022," https://iea-pvps.org/trends_reports/trends-2022/ (accessed 6/11/2023).
- [4] R. Luthander, J. Widén, D. Nilsson, and J. Palm, "Photovoltaic self-consumption in buildings: A review," *Applied Energy*, vol. 142, pp. 80–94, 2015.
- [5] A. Ordóñez, E. Sánchez, L. Rozas, R. García, and J. Parra-Domínguez, "Net-metering and net-billing in photovoltaic self-consumption: The cases of ecuador and spain," *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, vol. 53, p. 102434, 2022.
- [6] F. A. Felder and R. Athawale, "The life and death of the utility death spiral," *The Electricity Journal*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 9–16, 2014.
- [7] T. Schittekatte, I. Momber, and L. Meeus, "Future-proof tariff design: Recovering sunk grid costs in a world where consumers are pushing back," *Energy Economics*, vol. 70, pp. 484–498, 2018.
- [8] C. Inês, P. L. Guilherme, M.-G. Esther, G. Swantje, H. Stephen, and H. Lars, "Regulatory challenges and opportunities for collective renewable energy prosumers in the eu," *Energy Policy*, vol. 138, p. 111212, 2020.
- [9] I. D'Adamo, M. Gastaldi, and P. Morone, "Solar collective self-consumption: Economic analysis of a policy mix," *Ecological Economics*, vol. 199, p. 107480, 2022.
- [10] X. Han, J. Garrison, and G. Hug, "Techno-economic analysis of pv-battery systems in switzerland," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 158, p. 112028, 2022.
- [11] Y. Zhang, P. E. Campana, A. Lundblad, and J. Yan, "Comparative study of hydrogen storage and battery storage in grid connected photovoltaic system: Storage sizing and rule-based operation," *Applied Energy*, vol. 201, pp. 397–411, 2017.
- [12] E. Nyholm, J. Goop, M. Odenberger, and F. Johnsson, "Solar photovoltaic-battery systems in swedish households – self-consumption and self-sufficiency," *Applied Energy*, vol. 183, pp. 148–159, 2016.
- [13] S. Schopfer, V. Tiefenbeck, and T. Staake, "Economic assessment of photovoltaic battery systems based on household load profiles," *Applied Energy*, vol. 223, pp. 229–248, 2018.
- [14] J. Cervantes and F. Choobineh, "Optimal sizing of a nonutility-scale solar power system and its battery storage," *Applied Energy*, vol. 216, pp. 105–115, 2018.
- [15] D. Phillips, F. P. Jenkin, J. A. T. Pritchard, and K. Rybicki, "A mathematical model for determining generating plant mix," in *3rd IEEE Power Systems Computations Conference*, 1969.
- [16] S. T. Lee and C. Dechamps, "Mathematical model for economic evaluation of tidal power in the bay of fundy," *IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems*, vol. PAS-97, no. 5, pp. 1769–1778, 1978.
- [17] C. Batlle and P. Rodilla, "An enhanced screening curves method for considering thermal cycling operation costs in generation expansion planning," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 3683–3691, 2013.
- [18] T. Zhang, R. Baldick, and T. Deetjen, "Optimized generation capacity expansion using a further improved screening curve method," *Electric Power Systems Research*, vol. 124, pp. 47–54, 2015.
- [19] T. Zhang and R. Baldick, "Consideration of ancillary services in screening curve method," in *2015 IEEE Power & Energy Society General Meeting*, 2015, pp. 1–5.
- [20] I. Staffell and R. Green, "Is there still merit in the merit order stack? the impact of dynamic constraints on optimal plant mix," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 43–53, 2016.
- [21] T. Zhang and R. Baldick, "Consideration of existing capacity in screening curve method," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 3038–3048, 2017.
- [22] Y. E. Güner, "The improved screening curve method regarding existing units," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 264, no. 1, pp. 310–326, 2018.
- [23] T. Zhang and R. Baldick, "Generation planning using a modified screening curve method to account for planned outage," in *2019 IEEE Power & Energy Society General Meeting (PESGM)*, 2019, pp. 1–5.
- [24] S. Stoft, *Power System Economics: Designing Markets for Electricity*. Wiley-IEEE Press, 2002.
- [25] G. Krishna Priya and S. Bandyopadhyay, "Screening curve method for optimum source sizing to satisfy time varying demand," *Computer Aided Chemical Engineering*, vol. 33, pp. 1573–1578, 2014.
- [26] Y. Ru, J. Kleissl, and S. Martinez, "Exact sizing of battery capacity for photovoltaic systems," *European Journal of Control*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 24–37, 2014.
- [27] H. Hoshino, "Economic benefits of solar photovoltaics and battery systems at customer side studied via screening curve method," *IEEJ Transactions on Power and Energy*, vol. 141, no. 3, pp. 247–254, 2021, (in Japanese).
- [28] —, "Screening curve method for optimal sizing of photovoltaic and battery storage systems for a household," in *2022 International Symposium on Nonlinear Theory and Its Applications (NOLTA2022)*, 2022, pp. 462–465.
- [29] International Electrotechnical Commission, "Standard IEC 61724-1:2021: Photovoltaic system performance - part 1: Monitoring," <https://webstore.iec.ch/publication/65561>.
- [30] N. Pearsall, "Introduction to photovoltaic system performance," in *The Performance of Photovoltaic (PV) Systems*, N. Pearsall, Ed. Woodhead Publishing, 2017, pp. 1–19.
- [31] National Research Panel on Energy Consumption in Households, "Household energy consumption database," <http://tkkankyo.eng.niigata-u.ac.jp/HP/HP/database/index.htm> (accessed 6/3/2023).
- [32] NEDO, "Solar radiation database," <https://www.pvsyst.com/help/nedo-solarradiationdb.htm> (accessed 6/3/2023).
- [33] E. Telaretti, M. Ippolito, and L. Dusonchet, "A simple operating strategy of small-scale battery energy storages for energy arbitrage under dynamic pricing tariffs," *Energies*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 12–1–20, 2016.
- [34] A. Zurfi, G. Albayati, and J. Zhang, "Economic feasibility of residential behind-the-meter battery energy storage under energy time-of-use and demand charge rates," in *2017 IEEE 6th International Conference on Renewable Energy Research and Applications (ICRERA)*, 2017, pp. 842–849.
- [35] L. Maeyaert, L. Vandeveldel, and T. Doring, "Battery storage for ancillary services in smart distribution grids," *Journal of Energy Storage*, vol. 30, p. 101524, 2020.