ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH
LETTERS

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT • OPEN ACCESS

Towards a future-proof climate database for European energy system studies

To cite this article before publication: Laurent Dubus *et al* 2022 *Environ. Res. Lett.* in press https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aca1d3

Manuscript version: Accepted Manuscript

Accepted Manuscript is “the version of the article accepted for publication including all changes made as a result of the peer review process, and which may also include the addition to the article by IOP Publishing of a header, an article ID, a cover sheet and/or an ‘Accepted Manuscript’ watermark, but excluding any other editing, typesetting or other changes made by IOP Publishing and/or its licensors”

This Accepted Manuscript is **© 2022 The Author(s). Published by IOP Publishing Ltd**.

As the Version of Record of this article is going to be / has been published on a gold open access basis under a CC BY 3.0 licence, this Accepted Manuscript is available for reuse under a CC BY 3.0 licence immediately.

Everyone is permitted to use all or part of the original content in this article, provided that they adhere to all the terms of the licence https://creativecommons.org/licences/by/3.0

Although reasonable endeavours have been taken to obtain all necessary permissions from third parties to include their copyrighted content within this article, their full citation and copyright line may not be present in this Accepted Manuscript version. Before using any content from this article, please refer to the Version of Record on IOPscience once published for full citation and copyright details, as permissions may be required. All third party content is fully copyright protected and is not published on a gold open access basis under a CC BY licence, unless that is specifically stated in the figure caption in the Version of Record.

View the article online for updates and enhancements.

This content was downloaded from IP address 131.211.37.110 on 15/11/2022 at 10:45

Towards a future-proof climate database for European energy system studies

Authors
Laurent Dubus, *RTE, Paris, France*
David J. Brayshaw, *Department of Meteorology, University of Reading, UK*
Daniel Huertas-Hernando, *Elia Transmission Belgium, Brussels, Belgium*
David Radu, *ENTSO-E, Brussels, Belgium*
Justin Sharp, *Sharply Focused LLC, Portland, OR, USA*
William Zappa, *TenneT TSO B.V., Arnhem, The Netherlands*
Laurens P. Stoop, *Information and Computing Science, and Copernicus Institute of Sustainable Development, Utrecht University, The Netherlands, Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute, De Bilt, The Netherlands, TenneT TSO B.V., Arnhem, The Netherlands*

Corresponding author: laurent.dubus@rte-france.com

ABSTRACT

In 2013, the European Network of Transmission System Operators (TSOs) for Electricity (ENTSO-E) created the Pan-European Climate Database (PECD), a tool that has underpinned most studies conducted by TSOs ever since. So far, the different versions of the PECD have used so-called modern-era "reanalysis" products that represent a gridded amalgamation of historical conditions from observations. However, scientific evidence suggests, and recent European regulation requires, that power system adequacy studies should take climate change into account when estimating the future potential of variable renewable resources, such as wind, solar and hydro, and the impact of temperature on electricity demand. This paper explains the need for future climate data in energy systems studies and provides high-level recommendations for building a future-proof reference climate dataset for TSOs, not just in Europe, but also globally.

1. Introduction

The Earth's climate is changing due to sustained emissions of anthropogenic greenhouse gases (GHG) (IPCC 2021). Each successive report published by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has highlighted the need for accelerated decarbonization of energy systems, which are responsible for approximately two-thirds of global GHG emissions (IEA 2021; IPCC 2021). Plans to tackle this issue and aim for economy-wide carbon neutrality in the coming decades have recently been put forward by many countries. The recent European Green Deal (European Commission 2019) highlights the expected efforts required to transform Europe to carbon-neutrality by 2050. The 'Fit for 55' package (European Commission 2020) targets a 55% reduction in EU's net emissions by 2030 compared to 1990. It puts variable renewable energy sources (RES), such as wind and solar photovoltaics, at the forefront of the fight against climate change. In response to the recent conflict in Ukraine, the European Commission presented the REPowerEU Plan, that proposes to increase the 'Fit for 55' 2030 target for renewables from 40% to a 45% target.

The continuous integration of RES in electricity systems creates challenges for all actors in the sector, including TSOs. Many of these challenges stem from the variable nature of the underlying resource, i.e., wind speed or solar irradiation (Craig et al. 2018; Yalew et al. 2020), compounded by the effects of a changing and variable climate (Bloomfield et al. 2021a; Gernaat et al. 2021; Pryor et al. 2020; Tobin et al. 2018; Wohland et al. 2017). Climate change also effects the severity and frequency of extreme events impacting on energy system assets (EPRI 2022; Novacheck et al. 2021; Schaeffer et al. 2012), patterns of electricity demand (Auffhammer et al. 2017; Bloomfield et al. 2021; van Ruijven et al. 2019) and thermal generation (Miara et al. 2017; Petkov et al. 2016). Therefore, leveraging climate-related information that can represent both historical and future conditions of power system operation with sufficient accuracy is essential for TSOs, policymakers and other stakeholders as they plan the electricity grid for a future carbon-neutral energy system (Bloomfield et al. 2021b; Craig et al. 2022).

The use of climate databases for energy systems analysis has picked up its pace over the last few years with the advent of reanalysis data. These databases are based on the underlying climate parameters from reanalysis data (e.g., wind speed, solar radiation, and temperature), from which the energy-related parameters required for energy system modelling (e.g., capacity factors for solar PV and wind farms), are derived. Reanalysis datasets represent a gridded amalgamation of historical conditions from observation stations. Most studies investigating various facets of RES-dominated energy systems, across Europe (Brown et al. 2018; Grams et al. 2017; IEA 2021; Zappa et al. 2019), the United States (Jenkins et al. 2021; Novacheck et al. 2021) and Africa (Lee and Callaway 2018) have leveraged comprehensive reanalysis datasets in their associated modeling and analysis. While these allow for the analysis of energy systems within the covered historical period (e.g., on the impact of weather patterns on day-to-day operation of RES assets), they do not enable such analysis under future climate conditions. Though several recent power system studies have considered the impact of climate change (Harang et al. 2020; van Zuijlen et al. 2019), the representation of climate change was simplified and limited.

In the current Pan-European Climate Database (PECD), impact of climate change is fairly limited. A trend correction was applied to temperature data to consider historical climate change in version 3.1, but no projected future impacts were considered (Troccoli and Almond 2021). Yet, this dataset is used to assess the long-term energy supply and demand trends, policy ambitions and technological developments, notably in the European Resource Adequacy Assessments[1]. To provide a robust assessment of current and future energy systems under climate change, it should consider data from climate projections (Craig et al. 2022; Mays et al. 2022). An update of the PECD is thus required.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 presents the type of studies that use climate databases and the requirements that they impose; Section 3 provides a list of recommendations to consider climate change and Section 4 concludes with the solution chosen by ENTSO-E for the upcoming version 4.0 release of the PECD.

2. Target studies and their needs

In the European context, TSOs perform several types of studies at both national and regional levels, requiring high-quality climate datasets[2]:

- (Regional) Adequacy studies, aimed at assessing the security of electricity supply for consumers;

---

[1] https://www.acer.europa.eu/electricity/security-of-supply/european-resource-adequacy-assessment

[2] While these are given for the European context, similar types of studies are conducted around the world either by TSOs, national policymakers, and regulators.

- Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) studies, aimed at identifying capacity expansion needs and where additional investments in cross-border transmission capacity could deliver the most benefits for European consumers and producers;
- Operational security analyses, which assess the extent to which the grid can transport electricity from producers to consumers, even in the case of unplanned outages in network elements;
- Market design studies, which are used to evaluate if reforms to the European electricity market design could improve market functioning.

The adequacy studies are the most demanding in terms of the granularity of the climate data required. These studies evaluate resource adequacy risks in the short- to the mid-term horizon (up to ten years ahead). Examples of these studies include (a) national resource adequacy assessments (NRAA) performed by TSOs or other national authorities (ELIA 2019, 2021; RTE 2021; TenneT 2021; Terna 2021), (b) regional adequacy studies, such as those conducted within the Pentalateral Energy Forum (Penta SG2)[3] or (c) continental studies, such as the European Resource Adequacy Assessment (ENTSO-E 2019, 2021). These studies aim to assess whether the expected supply-side (e.g., power plants and/or storage) and demand-side (e.g., demand-side response) resources available in the system are sufficient to meet the expected electricity demand over the considered time horizon.

To quantify the impact of climate variability, which introduces both supply- and demand-side uncertainties, such studies usually consider multiple weather years. Currently, to get a relevant long-term view of the adequacy situation, Monte Carlo scenarios are built by sampling weather years and forced outage pattern associated with the thermal units. Traditionally, when enough scenarios are run, the adequacy of the system is evaluated via metrics such as energy not served and loss of load expectation.

Adequacy studies should consider extreme weather events that drive the design of the system, and studies have shown that climate change could increase both the frequency and severity of such events (IPCC 2021). Therefore, robust datasets that represent both the historical and future expected climate conditions are of growing importance for system adequacy studies even when considering only thermal resources. These become absolutely crucial within an energy transition that will likely entail a higher dependence on weather-dependent RES for electricity supply, in particular for studies looking several decades ahead.

The current release of the PECD (version 3.1) contains thirty-five historical climate years based on the ERA5 reanalysis (Hersbach et al. 2020). While this dataset provides a reasonable description of the current climate and its year-to-year variations, its limited temporal coverage creates challenges for capturing the extreme events that strongly shape the design of RES-dominated power systems, nor is the spatial resolution sufficient to capture mesoscale processes or complex topography. Furthermore, considering the growing evidence of changes in climate due to anthropogenic activities (Craig et al. 2018; Cronin et al. 2018; Yalew et al. 2020), the current release is not the most appropriate to accurately represent what the climate and its variability will be in the next few decades.

With a high penetration of RES for electric supply, if adequacy studies are to remain useful, they must also evaluate the full range of weather-driven supply outcomes, while at the same time considering the impact of weather on demand. Therefore, it is necessary to keep the physical, spatial, and temporal correlations between the different climate variables once

---

[3] The PENTA countries include Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and Switzerland.

transformed into power consumption and generation (Craig et al. 2022) especially as compounding effects can lead to more extreme events (van der Wiel et al. 2019; Zscheischler et al. 2018). More details on the consideration in the representation of climate are listed in the supplementary material.

3. Recommendation towards a Climate Database incorporating the effects of Climate Change

Considering the observed and foreseen evolution of the climate, EU policies, and the available data from the climate community, several recommendations can be made to consider climate change in long-term energy systems studies.

1. Climate projections should be included in the reference datasets for energy studies

Current energy systems and future investments will operate under changing climate conditions. Energy assets have a technical lifetime ranging from 20 years for wind turbines and solar panels to more than 50 years for hydropower plants, nuclear power plants, and certain transmission infrastructure. Complementarity between the different kinds of studies (see Section 2) should be improved when designing future energy systems. For example, asset investments and systems' operation studies should coherently and clearly define their assumptions regarding climate, starting from common well-defined and documented climate datasets. Furthermore, wherever possible, they should engage with climate science expertise to ensure that the climate data being used is interpreted appropriately. Defining a full taxonomy of how climate parameters interact with and propagate through energy system assets is an important aspect. It is outside the scope of the present paper but has been covered by several publications (see for instance Craig et al. 2022; Troccoli 2018; Troccoli, Dubus, and Haupt 2014; WMO 2022a, 2022b)

2. Assessing long-term climate change may require different approaches to near-future climate

For relatively short temporal horizons (e.g., one to ten years) the “forced response” to increasing atmospheric GHG concentrations is likely to be modest compared to the magnitude of pre-existing natural year-to-year variations in many geographic regions (including Europe). Thus, historical data, such as reanalysis, are likely to provide a reasonable baseline estimate for the range of near-future climate conditions which may be faced, provided that the temporal coverage is long enough and appropriate detrending strategies are applied (particularly for near-surface temperature). Still, methodological issues persist, as multivariate detrending methods are challenging to handle and the patterns of meteorological situations, particularly of extremes, might be different under a changing climate. If trend correction is not considered, then the historical data may not accurately represent near-future conditions.

Over longer time horizons more attention is required. Past trends can be difficult to estimate (e.g., for extreme events or compound hazards) and the complexity of the climate system means that the potential for some level of circulation change cannot be ignored. Thus, while there is no singular “perfect” (or even “best”) method to produce detailed climate data representing the distant future, the use of data incorporated appropriately from climate-model output seems essential. Where such data is used, however, it must be carefully benchmarked against historic datasets.

3. Flexible climate-to-energy modelling solutions need to be developed

The power sector is evolving at a quick pace. Changing regulations, new targets, and fast-evolving technologies make it necessary to develop flexible modelling tools that can be easily adapted with minimal user effort. This applies especially to energy conversion models that, coupled with technical specifications, transform the climate information into demand and generation data. Therefore, significant improvements are needed in the way energy conversion models are designed and provided. These should offer the user a standard version, based on transparent methodology and open-access code, and the possibility to easily modify the code for improvements or specific needs. These conversion models should be, at least partially, based on physical models that explicitly specify the physics of the climate-to-energy conversion process.

4. *Balance is needed between scientific accuracy and operational constraints*

Not all users and applications have the same capabilities to account for multiple climate projections. Therefore, the use of climate projections will be challenging for some applications, and different options must be proposed to account for various constraints, needs and resources. The development of new climate projection-based datasets needs to come together with clear methodological recommendations for those applications that cannot run multiple scenarios in a Monte Carlo-like set-up. The provision of climate projections and the corresponding energy information must be accompanied by clear guidance and related tools to select the most relevant sub-ensemble of data from the entire dataset, depending on the technical constraints and the expected target of each study.

5. *Co-design, user training and ongoing dialog are crucial components for assessing climate risk in energy systems*

The use of any climate dataset requires careful consideration in the handling of the data within. Climate projection datasets are more complex than reanalysis data and will bring about a significant shift for users. However, the change can be managed with proper training and communication. It must be seen as a long-term investment towards more robust approaches that will be easier to update in the future when new projections become available. In line with the climate services' development over the recent years, a co-design approach must be used to develop the new datasets (Goodess et al. 2019).

6. *Databases of climate and energy parameters should be open source as far as possible*

Providing open access to the climate and energy parameter database allows other stakeholders from industry, academia, and the broader energy community to work together, spot errors, and ultimately improve the datasets and tools.

4. Conclusions & implementation into the PECD v4.0

Climate is changing on average and through changes in the amplitude, frequency, and impact of extreme events. Therefore, climate information from past decades is becoming less relevant for long-term planning of future energy systems. EU targets for decarbonization require standard inputs and transparent assumptions about the considered scenarios, including climate and the conversion to energy variables. Thus, climate data and standardized energy conversion models should come from recognized, open access, authoritative sources.

Based on the recommendations listed above, the choice has been made by ENTSO-E to extend the reanalysis-based PECD with future projections derived from climate models in the next release. This will allow historical variability to continue to be better quantified while at the same time providing a means to estimate the impact of climate change on future conditions.

The new database, including climate data and related energy data, will be implemented by the European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) under the Copernicus Climate Change Service (C3S) for the energy sector. This will provide various stakeholders with open-access to a common reference and state-of-the-art database. In addition, the availability of open and standardized energy conversion models will allow the running of studies based on the same assumptions. Furthermore, it will enable a large community to contribute to further developing the models, which will benefit the whole sector.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Several authors of this paper are members of the PECD Task Force within ENTSO-E (LD, DHH, DR, WZ and LS). We thank other colleagues from the Task Force, from ENTSO-E secretariat and national TSOs for the fruitful discussions. Laurens P Stoop received funding from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) under grant number 647.003.005. Laurens P Stoop acknowledges the support of the Copernicus institute of sustainable development, Utrecht University, TenneT TSO B.V., and KNMI in his research.

REFERENCES

Auffhammer, M., P. Baylis, and C. H. Hausman. 2017. “Climate Change Is Projected to Have Severe Impacts on the Frequency and Intensity of Peak Electricity Demand across the United States.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 114(8): 1886–91.

Bloomfield, H. C., D. J. Brayshaw, et al. 2021. “Quantifying the Sensitivity of European Power Systems to Energy Scenarios and Climate Change Projections.” *Renewable Energy* 164: 1062–75.

Bloomfield, H. C., P. L.M. Gonzalez, et al. 2021a. “The Importance of Weather and Climate to Energy Systems: A Workshop on next Generation Challenges in Energy–Climate Modeling.” *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 102(1): E159–67.

———. 2021b. “The Importance of Weather and Climate to Energy Systems: A Workshop on next Generation Challenges in Energy–Climate Modeling.” *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society* 102(1): E159–67. https://doi.org/10.1175/BAMS-D-20-0256.1 (June 25, 2021).

Brown, T. et al. 2018. “Synergies of Sector Coupling and Transmission Reinforcement in a Cost-Optimised, Highly Renewable European Energy System.” *Energy* 160: 720–39.

Craig, M.T. et al. 2018. “A Review of the Potential Impacts of Climate Change on Bulk Power System Planning and Operations in the United States.” *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 98: 255–67.

———. 2022. “Overcoming the Disconnect between Energy System and Climate Modeling.” *Joule*: 1–13. http://arxiv.org/abs/2205.15636%0Ahttp://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.joule.2022.05.010.

Cronin, J., G. Anandarajah, and O. Dessens. 2018. "Climate Change Impacts on the Energy System: A Review of Trends and Gaps." *Climatic Change* 151(2): 79–93.

ELIA. 2019. *Adequacy and Flexibility Study for Belgium 2020-2030*. Brussels. https://www.elia.be/nl/nieuws/persberichten/2019/06/20190628_press-release-adequacy-and-flexibility-study-for-belgium-2020-2030 (July 11, 2022).

———. 2021. *Adequacy and Flexibility Study for Belgium 2022-20320*. Brussels, Belgium. https://www.elia.be/nl/nieuws/persberichten/2021/06/20210625_elia-publishes-its-adequacy-and-flexibility-study-for-the-period-2022-2032 (July 11, 2022).

ENTSO-E. 2019. *Mid-Term Adequacy Forecast Executive Summary, 2019 Edition*. Brussels.

———. 2021. *European Resource Adequacy Assessment, 2021 Edition*. Brussels.

EPRI. 2022. *A Starting Point for Physical Climate Risk Assessment and Mitigation: Future Resilience and Adaptation Planning*. https://www.epri.com/research/products/000000003002024895 (June 29, 2022).

European Commission. 2019. *The European Green Deal*. Online: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:b828d165-1c22-11ea-8c1f-01aa75ed71a1.0002.02/DOC_1&format=PDF

———. 2020. "Stepping up Europe's 2030 Climate Ambition. Investing in a Climate-Neutral Future for the Benefit of Our People". Brussels.

Gernaat, D.E.H.J. et al. 2021. "Climate Change Impacts on Renewable Energy Supply." *Nature Climate Change* 11(2): 119–25.

Goodess, C.M. et al. 2019. "Advancing Climate Services for the European Renewable Energy Sector through Capacity Building and User Engagement." *Climate Services* 16.

Grams, C.M. et al. 2017. "Balancing Europe's Wind-Power Output through Spatial Deployment Informed by Weather Regimes." *Nature Climate Change 2017 7:8* 7(8): 557–62.

Harang, I., F. Heymann, and L.P. Stoop. 2020. "Incorporating Climate Change Effects into the European Power System Adequacy Assessment Using a Post-Processing Method." *Sustainable Energy, Grids and Networks* 24.

Hersbach, H. et al. 2020. "The ERA5 Global Reanalysis." *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society* 146(730).

IEA. 2021. *World Energy Outlook 2021*. Paris.

IPCC. 2021. "Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Masson-Delmotte, V., P. Zhai, A. Pirani, S. L. Connors, C. Péan, S. Berger, N. Caud, Y. Chen,." *Cambridge University Press* (In Press): 3949.

Jenkins, J.D. et al. 2021. "Mission Net-Zero America: The Nation-Building Path to a Prosperous, Net-Zero Emissions Economy." *Joule* 5(11): 2755–61.

Lee, J.T., and D.S. Callaway. 2018. “The Cost of Reliability in Decentralized Solar Power Systems in Sub-Saharan Africa.” *Nature Energy 2018 3:11* 3(11): 960–68.

Mays, J. et al. 2022. “Private Risk and Social Resilience in Liberalized Electricity Markets.” *Joule* 6(2): 369–80.

Miara, A. et al. 2017. “Climate and Water Resource Change Impacts and Adaptation Potential for US Power Supply.” *Nature Climate Change 2017 7:11* 7(11): 793–98.

Novacheck, J. et al. 2021. “The Evolving Role of Extreme Weather Events in the U.S. Power System with High Levels of Variable Renewable Energy”. https://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy22osti/78394.pdf.

Petkov, I. et al. 2016. “Marginal Costs of Water Savings from Cooling System Retrofits: A Case Study for Texas Power Plants.” *Environmental Research Letters* 11(10): 104004.

Pryor, S.C. et al. 2020. “Climate Change Impacts on Wind Power Generation.” *Nature Reviews Earth & Environment* 1(12).

RTE. 2021. *Energy Pathways to 2050, Key Results. Executive Summary*. https://www.rte-france.com/analyses-tendances-et-prospectives/bilan-previsionnel-2050-futurs-energetiques (July 11, 2022).

van Ruijven, B.J., E. de Cian, and I.S. Wing. 2019. “Amplification of Future Energy Demand Growth Due to Climate Change.” *Nature Communications* 10(1): 1–12. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-10399-3.

Schaeffer, R. et al. 2012. “Energy Sector Vulnerability to Climate Change: A Review.” *Energy* 38(1): 1–12.

TenneT. 2021. *Monitoring Leveringszekerheid*. https://www.tennet.eu/fileadmin/user_upload/Company/Publications/Technical_Publications/Dutch/20200117_Rapport_Monitoring_Leveringszekerheid_2019.pdf.

Terna. 2021. *Terna Rapporto Adeguatezza Italia 2021*. https://download.terna.it/terna/Terna_Rapporto_Adeguatezza_Italia_2021_8d9a51d27ad741c.pdf.

Tobin, I. et al. 2018. “Vulnerabilities and Resilience of European Power Generation to 1.5 °c, 2 °c and 3 °c Warming”. *Environmental Research Letters* 13(4).

Troccoli A, Dubus L and Haupt S E. 2014. *Weather matters for energy*. *Springer*. DOI 10.1007/978-1-4614-9221-4

Troccoli A. 2018. *Weather and climate services for the energy industry. Palgrave Macmillan Cham,* DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-68418-5

Troccoli, A., and S. Almond. 2021. “ENTSO-E Use of Pan European Climate Database (PECD)- Issues and Solution”.

van der Wiel, K. et al. 2019. “Meteorological Conditions Leading to Extreme Low Variable Renewable Energy Production and Extreme High Energy Shortfall”. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 111: 261–75.

WMO. 2022a. *2022 State of Climate Services: Energy (WMO-No. 1301)* (Geneva: WMO)

WMO. 2022b. *WMO Best Practices for Integrated Weather and Climate Services in support of net zero energy transition*. To be published.

Wohland, J., M. Reyers, J. Weber, and D. Witthaut. 2017. “More Homogeneous Wind Conditions Under Strong Climate Change Decrease the Potential for Inter-State Balancing of Electricity in Europe.” (May).

Yalew, S.G. et al. 2020. “Impacts of Climate Change on Energy Systems in Global and Regional Scenarios.” *Nature Energy* 5(10): 794–802.

Zappa, W., M. Junginger, and M. van den Broek. 2019. “Is a 100% Renewable European Power System Feasible by 2050?” *Applied Energy* 233–234: 1027–50.

Zscheischler, J. et al. 2018. “Future Climate Risk from Compound Events.” *Nature Climate Change* 8(6): 469–77. http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0156-3.

van Zuijlen, B. et al. 2019. “Cost-Optimal Reliable Power Generation in a Deep Decarbonisation Future.” *Applied Energy* 253(July): 113587. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.113587.