ANNUAL REVIEWS Further
Click here to view this article's online features:
- Download figures as PPT slides
- Navigate linked references
- Download citations
- Explore related articles
- Search keywords

Grid Integration of Renewable Energy: Flexibility, Innovation, and Experience

Eric Martinot

Beijing Institute of Technology, School of Management and Economics, Beijing 100081, China; email: contact@martinot.info

Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour. 2016. 41:223–51

The *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* is online at environ.annualreviews.org

This article's doi: 10.1146/annurev-environ-110615-085725

Copyright © 2016 by Annual Reviews. All rights reserved

Keywords

power systems, energy transitions, distributed generation, demand response, electricity markets

Abstract

The electric power sector around the world is undergoing long-term technical, economic, and market transformations. Part of these transformations is the challenge of integrating high shares of renewable energy, particularly variable wind and solar. The concept of flexibility of a power system is key in terms of balancing these variable sources while keeping the lights on. On the supply side, flexibility arises from innovations in flexible coal and gas power plants, energy storage, and renewables. On the demand side, many distributed resources—generation, flexible demand, storage, and electric vehicles—can also contribute, and likewise transmission and distribution networks, grid operations, and market designs. Experience with measures and innovations for grid integration in all these categories is given, from several jurisdictions like Germany, Denmark, and California, where renewables already provide 20–40% shares of electricity and plans to reach 50% exist. Questions point to areas of technology, economics, planning, operations, business, and policy that need further understanding and learning from experience.

Contents

1. INTRODUCTION 224
2. GRID INTEGRATION GLOBALLY: PRESENT AND FUTURE 226
3. FLEXIBILITY OF POWER SYSTEMS 227
   3.1. Flexibility Needs and Assessment 228
   3.2. Cost of Flexibility and Integration Costs 229
   3.3. Flexibility Measures and Innovations 230
4. SUPPLY-SIDE FLEXIBILITY INNOVATIONS FOR GRID INTEGRATION 231
   4.1. Flexible Coal, Natural Gas, and Nuclear Plants 231
   4.2. Flexible Combined-Heat-and-Power Plants with Heat Storage 232
   4.3. Electricity and Heat Storage 233
   4.4. Firm Renewable Energy Plants 234
5. FLEXIBILITY FROM DISTRIBUTED ENERGY RESOURCES 234
   5.1. Responsive Load and Demand Response 235
   5.2. Distributed Generation and Distributed Energy Storage 236
6. CURTAILMENT OF RENEWABLE GENERATORS 237
7. TRANSMISSION STRENGTHENING AND GRID BALANCING AREAS 238
8. DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS 239
9. POWER SYSTEM OPERATIONAL MEASURES 239
10. ELECTRICITY MARKET DESIGN FOR GRID INTEGRATION 241
11. CONCLUSION: RESEARCH, POLICY, AND LONG-TERM PLANNING 242

1. INTRODUCTION

The electric power sector around the world is being transformed in fundamental ways, not just technically, but also in terms of policy, markets, finance, and institutions. Electric power companies face some of the greatest challenges in planning, operations, and investment they have ever faced, as well as a paradigm shift in many of the fundamental tenets that have guided electric power systems for the past several decades (1–6). And along with new technologies, a range of new market and business models are emerging, open to a broader array of energy service companies, energy traders, and other market participants (7–12).

Renewable energy is an integral part of this transformation. Over the past 20 years, a diverse range of renewable energy support policies have been adopted in 145 countries globally, technology costs have declined dramatically, and annual investment in renewable energy reached $270 billion in 2015 (13, 14). The "global energy transition" is a phrase heard increasingly, not just in countries that have committed to it explicitly, such as Germany, which targets 80% of its electricity from renewable energy by 2050, or Denmark, which targets 100% by 2035. Many subnational jurisdictions have ambitious targets for renewables as well, such as California (50% by 2030), Scotland (100% by 2020), and South Australia (33% by 2020). More than 160 countries globally have future targets for renewable energy (13). In addition to these policy targets, many future energy scenarios show high shares of renewable energy globally and for specific regions, with many projections showing 40–80% share of electricity by 2050 (15–22). A central challenge of the power sector now and in the future is how to integrate higher shares of renewable energy. This is often referred to as the grid integration challenge. Although there is no commonly cited

definition of grid integration, the California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) (23, p. vi) offers the following definition:

> The process to achieve grid integration is to solve a set of three interlinked challenges, and to harness the opportunities created by these challenges: (*a*) to integrate wind and solar resources, in increasing amounts, onto the grid, particularly at the bulk or transmission level; (*b*) to respond to the changes in system-wide customer load due to increased rooftop solar installations and connected electric vehicles; and (*c*) to bring about, in concert: changes to the characteristics of traditional resources, changes to the functionality and role of distributed energy resources, changes to operational and planning practices at both transmission and distribution levels, and changes to wholesale and retail markets and tariffs.

Transmission and distribution: transmission networks interconnect large power plants with centers of power demand; distribution networks serve power to local areas and neighborhoods

Resources: sources of electricity, storage, responsive load, and other elements that combine to instantaneously serve the demand on a grid

Electricity market: the buying and selling of wholesale electricity on the grid by generators, retailers, and wholesale consumers, in advance or in real time, through a stock-market-like exchange

The grid integration challenge encompasses many elements. Key among them is the concept of flexibility of a power system, in terms of balancing variable wind and solar resources in particular, and more generally in terms of how all elements of a power system, on both supply and demand sides, can work together to ensure reliability ("keep the lights on") while minimizing cost (24). Another key element is the design of electricity markets themselves, in ways that aid grid integration, while ensuring the most economically efficient operation. A further element is the planning and strengthening of transmission grids to balance geographical patterns of renewable energy resources and power demand. One final element is how distribution-level systems can be transformed in their planning and operation, to support grid integration and flexibility. This article reviews all of these elements.

There is a large and fast-growing literature on many aspects of renewable energy integration into the power sector. A vast amount has been published in just the past few years, at an accelerating rate. A lot of the literature is technical or engineering in nature, but a growing share concerns the planning, markets, institutions, regulation, economics, and business models that accompany the transition to higher shares of renewables (2–12, 23–46). This article looks at a key aspect of this literature: the flexibility or balancing challenge of ensuring that "the lights stay on" in the face of high shares of variable renewable energy sources, particularly wind and solar. In 2015, wind and solar power made up more than 90% of total global investment in all forms of renewable energy, and in the future these two sources will almost certainly continue to dominate power grid transformations (13).

Because the subject of grid integration encompasses such a wide range of literature, the inclusion of primary peer-reviewed literature for all subjects is impractical for an article of this size. For example, Chapter 8—on grid integration—of the IPCC's *Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation Special Report* (30) includes more than 500 references. And the present article moderates technical detail to be understandable to nontechnical readers. Therefore, this article, in addition to sampling primary literature, refers to many high-level summary or synthesis sources, which themselves point to several thousand items of primary literature. Readers looking for more extensive primary literature may take this article as a topical roadmap to those other sources.

Furthermore, research and literature on the grid integration challenge is disparate and complex, and often grounded in a specific geographical scope delineated by the technical reach of the power grid itself, and/or by the jurisdictional boundaries of electricity markets, institutions, and regulation. Each element of the grid integration challenge mentioned above is the subject of literature of multijurisdictional or global scope, but is also commonly found in works addressing the challenge for a particular power system or jurisdiction. Achieving grid integration in the most economic way depends very much on the configuration and characteristics of an individual power system and electricity market. No two jurisdictions have the same characteristics, so research and literature are most commonly jurisdiction specific.

2. GRID INTEGRATION GLOBALLY: PRESENT AND FUTURE

Pumped hydro: hydropower with a lower and upper reservoir that acts as a battery when water is pumped uphill to the upper reservoir

Variable renewables: renewables such as wind and solar whose output is autonomously determined by the strength of wind and sun; usually not controllable by power grid

Grid operator: keeps the lights on, operates transmission, and may run the electricity market; usually called independent system operator or transmission system operator

Combined-heat-and-power plants (CHPs): power plants that produce both heat and power simultaneously, providing heat as hot water or steam to nearby buildings or industries

Ancillary service: an operational process, usually market-based, in which generators respond to grid operator signals to keep the grid operating within required technical parameters of power, voltage, and frequency; also referred to as grid service or ancillary market

In discussing grid integration, it must be recognized that the prevailing wisdom of 20 years ago among most electric power companies and power engineers was that going above 5–15% shares of variable or intermittent renewables such as wind and solar would spell doom for the reliability of the power grid, and "the lights would go out." Going above that limit would only be possible with large amounts of expensive energy storage. Such prevailing wisdom of the past is clearly wrong, given the high levels of renewable energy penetration already seen today in many jurisdictions, while the lights remain on and little energy storage has yet to be employed beyond pumped hydro. Several jurisdictions are already near or above 20% shares of variable renewables. And targets for higher shares in many jurisdictions are leading to planning for grid integration that involves only modest amounts of energy storage, coupled with many other grid integration measures considered to be cheaper and more practical.

California is a good example. In 2015, California received more than 20% of its electricity from renewable energy (not counting large hydro). By 2020, California's Renewable Portfolio Standard policy will require a 33% share of renewables (also not counting large hydro). A large portion of California's renewables are expected to be solar power by 2020, as solar has been growing rapidly due to continuing state and federal incentives. California's power companies, regulatory authorities, and power grid operators are addressing the grid integration challenge successfully and anticipate little difficulty through 2020. According to an analysis by the CPUC, the characteristics of California's existing grid infrastructure have allowed for successful integration of variable wind and solar generation with only minor changes to grid operations (24). Beyond 2020, new state legislation enacted in 2015 targets 50% renewables for California by 2030, putting the state on a clear path to addressing grid integration in new ways through 2030 (47). Several recent studies have looked at California's grid integration challenge (23, 48–54).

Along with California, Germany is also a global leader in adopting high shares of renewable energy. Renewables already provide close to 30% of Germany's power on an average basis (55). On some peak days in 2014, solar and wind alone supplied close to 80% of peak power demand at specific times of the day. Germany is targeting a 50% share of renewables by 2030 and 80% by 2050. Germany has thus far not faced major difficulties with grid integration, successfully balancing its variable renewables with power imports and exports to neighboring countries, a well-functioning electricity market that allows economic-based curtailment of wind power (with market prices that can go negative; see Section 6), technically strong grids, an oversupply of generation capacity, and higher degrees of operational flexibility of its coal and nuclear plants (32, 40, 54–56). Germany is beginning to comprehensively confront the grid integration issues that will arise in the future. For example, the German government recently issued a white paper that proposed changes to Germany's basic electricity law and market, including measures that could assist with grid integration (57). The organization Agora Energiewende publishes a comprehensive literature on Germany's future grid integration challenges (58).

Denmark is a world leader in wind power, with 39% of the country's electricity coming from wind in 2015 (59). Denmark targets 50% of its electricity from wind power by 2020, and 100% of its electricity from all forms of renewables by 2035. These ambitions have put Denmark at the forefront of grid integration, with many strategies implemented or planned (32, 40, 43, 54, 59–61). So far, cross-border market-based power exchanges with neighboring countries, flexible coal plants, flexible combined-heat-and-power plants (CHPs) coupled with thermal storage, must-run capacity, ancillary service innovations, day-ahead wind output forecasting, and advanced power grid operational measures have all allowed Denmark to successfully integrate and balance its renewables. Indeed, there have already been days when wind power has supplied more than 100%

of the country's power demand. In the future, Denmark will be further integrating its heating, transport, and electricity sectors into a transformed energy system that balances very high shares of variable renewables.

Many other jurisdictions around the world are addressing the grid integration challenge as the share of renewable energy grows. Such efforts may be driven by the emerging imperatives of grid integration, or they may be part of broader electricity market reforms focused on market or system efficiency. In the United States, beyond California, the power grids of the Midwest (MISO), the Mid-Atlantic (PJM), New York, Texas (ERCOT), and Hawaii are all undertaking or considering a wide variety of measures for transmission, demand response, distributed generation, market design, ancillary services, and/or distribution systems, in parallel with national policy changes by the federal energy regulator [the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC)] (2, 32, 62–66). In Europe, numerous European Union (EU)-wide initiatives are underway related to grid integration by 2020 and beyond, including transitions in EU electricity market designs, long-term transmission planning, and planning flexible coal and gas plants (41, 67–69). The EU as a whole had a 27% renewables share in 2014. Among individual EU countries, Italy targets distributed energy storage in areas with high shares of solar power. Spain, a wind power leader, pioneered advanced grid controls and wind forecasting and has relied on its hydro resources for balancing, in addition to planning for larger grid balancing areas. Ireland, also a leader in wind power (supplying more than 50% of the country's power on some days), has been undertaking transmission strengthening and a cross-border energy market with the United Kingdom, along with better wind forecasting and grid planning to improve both flexibility and stability (2, 32, 70–71). In Australia, the state of South Australia, with a 30% wind power share in 2014, has also developed advanced wind forecasting and has been grappling with grid flexibility and electricity market volatility given its relative isolation from other grids (40).

Among developing countries, China, India, South Africa, and several others are beginning to respond to the grid integration challenge with a variety of measures as renewable energy development accelerates (2, 40, 54, 72–73). South Africa is facing the particular challenge of integrating a growing share of distributed solar power within its distribution networks, as well as making coal plants more flexible. In China, a large portion of the challenge has been strengthening and extending transmission networks to transfer wind power from remote regions that lack sufficient power demand to absorb the wind power locally, as well as making coal plants more flexible. Measures in India have included transmission planning, strengthening transmission corridors for wind power, renewable output forecasting, and regulatory measures for power market operation and scheduling.

Several countries around the world already have very high shares of renewables, in the 60–90% range, including Austria, Brazil, Costa Rica, Georgia, Iceland, Mozambique, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, and Uganda (13). But in these cases, the renewables are mostly dispatchable hydro, geothermal, and/or biomass, rather than variable wind and solar. As such, the grid integration challenge is less pronounced in these countries at present.

3. FLEXIBILITY OF POWER SYSTEMS

Flexibility is a key attribute of power systems. Power system flexibility has existed since the dawn of electric power networks more than a century ago. However, conventional flexibility was based primarily on being able to vary generation output to match changes in load, and also to respond to sudden unexpected changes in power system components, such as a transmission line or generator experiencing a fault or accident. So flexibility needs were driven by the accuracy of load forecasting and the probabilities of various discrete events. However, flexibility needs and the meaning of

power system flexibility are being reconsidered and redefined—going beyond traditional flexibility needs to also include the need to balance large shares of variable solar and wind resources, whose output is neither constant nor perfectly predictable, as well as accommodate a variety of new technologies such as energy storage, electric vehicles, and demand response. Over the past decade, there has been a burgeoning literature on the needs, costs, and assessment of flexibility in power systems with increasing shares of variable renewables (24–30, 40–46).

Net load: the required level of nonvariable resources on a power system after subtracting out variable renewables generation; also referred to as residual load

3.1. Flexibility Needs and Assessment

The additional needs for flexibility based on variable renewable energy arise for several reasons. First, the variability of renewable output in real time (seconds to hours) means that the remaining resources on a power system must respond in real time to changes in renewable output to keep the system balanced and stable (see also curtailment in Section 6). This is called the balancing timescale. Second, flexibility needs arise from system "ramping" caused by large swings in renewable power output over short periods of time. This may be caused by large and sudden changes in wind output, for example, but most typically by the daily swings in solar output in the morning and evening as the sun rises and sets, leading to large swings (ramps) in net load. Third, a longer-term need on the scale of months and years is ensuring that enough resources exist to counter longer periods of low renewable output (see Section 4). For example, during the month of November, in particular, Germany sees little wind or sun, such that other resources must fill the void.

Flexibility needs for system ramping have become a major concern in California, where the grid operator CAISO predicts a 13-GW ramp in net load occurring over a 3-h period each afternoon by 2020 (against a 30–35-GW total load), due to solar output declining as the sun sets. This ramp is pictured in CAISO's so-called duck curve (23). Meeting that 13-GW ramp is the equivalent of turning on 13 large (1-GW) coal or gas plants over a 3-h period, every afternoon. In Germany, projected ramps by 2022 reach an unprecedented 40 GW (58). However, Germany proved in 2015 that it is already able to handle a 13-GW ramp today, with little difficulty. This "demonstration" occurred during a midday solar eclipse, which caused a 6-GW down-ramp of solar (over 60 minutes) followed by a 13-GW up-ramp (over 75 minutes). Germany's imports and exports with neighboring countries, power market design allowing negative prices to curtail renewables (see Section 6), and flexible coal plants together handled these ramps with no power outages (56). Whereas the eclipse was an example of a predictable ramping event, as are daily ramps due to the sun rising/setting or weather changes that can be sufficiently predicted, unpredictable ramping, for example, from fast-moving weather fronts, is more difficult to manage (74).

Flexibility needs can be mitigated with greater geographical diversity of renewable resources over a strongly interconnected grid, such that the total output of all renewables over the whole grid at any given time is less variable than from any individual source or location, for example, due to geographical diversity (anticorrelation) of wind strength and cloud cover. (Although, ramps due to daily sunsets are not managed as easily with geographic diversity, unless strong long-distance east–west interconnections are involved.) Flexibility needs can also be mitigated through mixtures of different types of renewable resources that may compliment or balance each other, again leading to lower overall variability. This resource mixture may even include different mixes of solar panel east–west–south orientations (or east–west–north in the southern hemisphere), affecting solar output profiles over different times of the day (26).

Finally, weather forecasting that can predict renewable output, on scales from minutes to days in advance, reduces the flexibility burden on a power system by allowing renewable output to be precisely modeled and scheduled in advance, thereby reducing the magnitude of the balancing burden to merely the difference between predicted and actual output (see more in Section 9).

FLEXIBILITY ANALYSIS NEEDS IN CALIFORNIA

The CPUC lays out four analytical needs for attaining, in a least-cost manner, the necessary flexibility for California with a 50% renewables share in 2030 (23):

1. Determine the flexibility implications of existing policies, programs, and initiatives, including those for distributed energy resources, i.e., how far the policies and programs currently implemented take California on the pathway toward sufficient flexibility to achieve its 50% renewables goal;
2. Make improved assessments of flexibility and ancillary services needs based on the existing and planned generation fleet and the emerging set of distributed energy resources;
3. Conduct a cost-benefit analysis of potential grid integration measures, including supply-side resources, distributed energy resources, and market designs, as well as show the additional flexibility that could be obtained from existing and new resources and consider flexibility attributes such as ramping speed, ability to modify the net-load shape, and provision of ancillary services;
4. Assess least-cost pathways toward grid integration that account for all potential measures and compare the costs of curtailment, increased ancillary services, and potential reliability impacts from overgeneration under a status-quo trajectory to 50% renewables, against the costs of packages of grid integration measures

Renewables may be variable, but they are highly predictable in advance, as the state of the art in renewable output forecasting has shown, with profound implications for grid integration.

A subset of the literature addresses the assessment of flexibility needs. Part of this literature addresses the practical quantification of flexibility using various metrics, some highly technical in the domain of power engineering and some suited to system planners and policy makers (75–78). For example, the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) (75) puts forth metrics in a planning context that include Period of Flexibility Deficit (PFD), a measure of periods when available flexible resources are less than required flexibility, and Expected Unserved Ramping (EUR) and Insufficient Ramp Resource Expectation (IRRE), two metrics related to the probability of being unable to meet ramping needs.

The literature also provides practical frameworks for assessing flexibility needs and solutions (79, 80). Notable is the International Energy Agency's (IEA's) Flexibility Assessment Tool (FAST), which first characterizes flexible resources available, then determines flexibility needs, and then compares needs with available resources (26, 27). The result is a characterization of how much variable renewables can be accommodated in the "status quo" system, and/or additional levels of flexibility that would be needed. In a white paper on grid integration policy through 2030, the CPUC laid out similar analytical steps (23; see also Sidebar, Flexibility Analysis Needs in California).

Flexibility needs to accommodate higher shares of variable renewables are also a function of the level and definition of system reliability requirements, that is, the likelihood, duration, and/or frequency of power outages. Different reliability requirements can result in different flexibility needs (see Section 9). In addition, higher shares of variable renewables may require higher levels of system reserve capacity, which can be analyzed using the capacity value of the renewable resources (30, 46, 81, 82).

Reserve capacity: power capacity that is held back from generating, entirely or partly, to provide ancillary services when signaled by the grid operator

Capacity value: effective fraction of renewable capacity that can be counted in determining reserve capacity needs; also referred to as effective load carrying capacity

3.2. Cost of Flexibility and Integration Costs

The additional costs of increasing the flexibility of a power system to accommodate higher shares of renewables are typically called the "cost of flexibility," or more broadly "integration costs"

Generation fleet: all of the dispatchable power plants connected to a grid

Measures and innovations: literature uses several different terms, including measures, options, solutions, and innovations, which are taken as roughly synonymous

Balancing area: geographic and technical scope of a power grid in which supply and demand must be continuously balanced; typically controlled by one balancing authority

(26, 83–86). (Integration costs can also include the costs of higher levels of reserve capacity required given the lower capacity value of variable renewables, as noted above.) Because each power grid is different, and consequently the measures needed to increase flexibility are different, and because analytical underpinnings are not well developed (including what counts as additional or incremental costs), the field is still relatively undeveloped, and controversy exists over how and what to count.

For Germany, Agora (83) gives integration costs of onshore wind and solar power, counting costs of "grid reinforcement" and "balancing" (ancillary services and forecast errors) as 0.5–1.3 eurocents/kilowatt-hour (kWh), which represent perhaps one-tenth to one-twentieth of the direct costs of renewable power. Agora also adds costs of 0.0–1.0 eurocents/kWh for costs imposed on the conventional generation fleet, in terms of backup capacity and lost revenue, an even more controversial and difficult-to-quantify figure. For Europe as a whole, Pudjianto et al. (86) similarly estimated integration costs of solar power at between 0.5 and 2.5 eurocents/kWh counting all costs, also noting that integration costs decline when demand response or energy storage is present. California is among the first of several US jurisdictions to try to apply integration costs to formal regulatory proceedings, and has been developing a "renewable energy integration costs adder" to use when calculating least-cost portfolios of renewable energy as part of the state's Renewable Portfolio Standard (**http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/RPS_Calculator**).

The IEA (26) did a groundbreaking study on the economics of power system flexibility that developed two integration cost metrics. The first, called levelized cost of flexibility (LCOF), compares the cost of providing flexibility from different measures, including flexible generation, storage, demand flexibility, and distribution network upgrades. LCOF is expressed in units of dollars per megawatt-hour and represents the additional cost for supplying or consuming power more flexibly. The second metric was a benefit-cost ratio of applying a specific flexibility option to a given power system. The study found a wide range of integration costs across all measures considered and concluded that demand-side measures, distributed heat storage, and district-heating applications might be among the most cost effective. The IEA study also created new models for combining packages of flexibility measures and concluded that these combinations resulted in cheaper total system costs compared to considering measures individually. This finding was echoed by Agora (83), which also concluded that comparing total system costs of different power grid scenarios could be more appropriate than measure-by-measure costs.

3.3. Flexibility Measures and Innovations

Flexibility can come from both supply-side resources and demand-side resources on a power system. Flexibility also arises from the design and operation of electricity markets, from transmission and distribution networks, and from the technical operation of the grid itself. Long-term power system planning for flexibility incorporates all of these elements. The literature describes specific measures and innovations for flexibility both conceptually and on the basis of practical real-world experience. These measures and innovations are reviewed in the following sections.

Of course, every power system and electric-power regulatory jurisdiction is different. A blueprint for grid integration in one jurisdiction will most likely have only partial relevance to another jurisdiction. The grid integration challenge can vary greatly in scope and solution based on the properties of individual jurisdictions. The IEA and IEA-RETD (IEA Renewable Energy Technology Deployment) (26–29) pioneered approaches to analyzing the conditions that determine flexibility needs and solutions, including the types and geographic spread of variable renewables, the flexibility afforded by dispatchable generation, the strength of transmission and distribution networks, the degree of interconnection with neighboring power systems, the size of the grid balancing area, the power control/dispatch regimes in use, the dividedness or unity of

power markets, and the characteristics of power demand. The International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA) (40) characterizes the ease of grid integration with three variables: whether grids are isolated or interconnected, whether the power system is growing or already mature/developed, and the speed of renewable energy deployment.

So-called smart-grid technologies enable many of the flexibility measures and innovations discussed throughout this article. There is already a large literature on smart grids, much of which could be considered part of the so-called grid integration literature (11, 87–90). Although some of the smart-grid literature focuses more technically on the data and communication tools to enable various measures and innovations, in many works and conventional thinking, smart-grid development targets or results in increased flexibility. Thus, a subset of the smart-grid literature encompasses the broader planning, operational and innovation needs, and functions for flexibility and grid integration.

Baseload plants: power plants that generally run continuously at constant output year-round or those with the lowest marginal operating costs and, as such, always dispatched first

Intermediate plants: plants designed to run part time, often cycled multiple times per day

4. SUPPLY-SIDE FLEXIBILITY INNOVATIONS FOR GRID INTEGRATION

4.1. Flexible Coal, Natural Gas, and Nuclear Plants

The flexibility of coal and natural gas power plants is based on three basic characteristics: (*a*) their ability to cycle on and off and the lead time required (i.e., start-up time); (*b*) their minimum and maximum output range while running; and (*c*) the ramping speed at which they can vary their output levels. Existing plants will have given levels of flexibility but can be modified (retrofitted) to increase their flexibility, requiring a variety of hardware modifications plus changes to operational practice. New plants can be designed at the outset for higher levels of flexibility. When employed to balance variable renewables on a grid, flexible coal and natural gas plants may cycle on/off once or multiple times per day, frequently ramp their output up/down, and lower their output to minimum limits (2, 26, 27, 34, 91–94).

In most of the world, coal plants are designed to run at constant output, as baseload, and rarely to be turned down or off completely. Such plants, usually considered inflexible, can experience reduced efficiency, increased costs, lower equipment lifetime, and more maintenance if cycled on/off or ramped up/down on a frequent basis (91, 93, 94). Such consequences led to long-standing "conventional wisdom" that coal plants could not be flexible. However, there are many examples of flexible coal plants in use today, including those that have been retrofitted from their original designs. One example is the Majuba coal plant in South Africa, commissioned in 1996, which was redesigned from original 1970s-era plans to enable quick start-ups and ramping. As redesigned, the plant can compete in the South African Power Pool, cycling on/off twice daily despite its original baseload design (2). In Denmark and Germany, ramping and cycling of coal plants has long been considered normal practice (54–56, 59–61, 95). Denmark has anticipated the need for flexibility since the 1990s, and coal plants in Denmark have been built to be highly flexible. In Germany, most of the hard-coal plants have been originally designed or later modified for flexible output, whereas many lignite plants, although less flexible, have been modified in recent years for lower minimum output. Cochran et al. (94) provide a case study of a coal plant in North America that was retrofitted from inflexible baseload to flexible operation with twice-daily shutdowns and low minimum output.

Combined-cycle natural gas power plants are designed to run as baseload plants or intermediate plants. Similar to coal plants, these natural gas plants can be designed or retrofitted to be more flexible, although also with some loss of generation efficiency, higher maintenance costs, and higher emissions (38). Several gas turbines now on the market are explicitly designed and marketed as flexible, or fast-acting plants, with shorter start-up times and faster ramping rates. One example

is the Sloe Centrale combined-cycle natural gas plant in the United Kingdom, built in 2009 with flexibility factored into its design, which can ramp to full output in just 30 minutes (2, 96). Simple-cycle gas turbine plants have been employed as peaking plants for decades to provide flexibility, although they are less efficient. Of course, natural gas plants depend on the availability of fuel and natural gas infrastructure, including pipelines and storage, so codevelopment of natural gas infrastructure and grid flexibility may be an issue (97).

Peaking plants: plants designed to run only a few hours per day, at peak hours

Full-load hours: number of hours per year a plant operates at maximum output; capacity factor, the annual average share of maximum output, is related

Nuclear power plants, generally considered the most inflexible of baseload plants, can also provide flexibility if designed and operated appropriately (27, 98). France and Germany have long designed and operated their nuclear plants for flexibility. In France, nuclear plants provide ancillary services and also act in load-following mode, which means they ramp their output up/down in response to changes in load. The Nuclear Energy Agency (98) notes, however, that operating nuclear plants at less than maximum output has been demonstrated to increase unscheduled outages, and that diligent operations and maintenance are needed for safe operation.

The IEA (26) provides a generic characterization of the differences between flexible and inflexible plants. Flexible coal plants offer ramping rates of 4–8%/minute, 2–5-h start-up times, and minimum output limits of 20–40% (of maximum), compared to inflexible plants with ramping rates of less than 4%/minute, 5–7-h start-up times and minimum output limits of 40–60%. Flexible natural gas plants show similar improvements, with minimum output limits of 15–30% compared to 40–50% for inflexible plants. A fast-acting gas turbine plant on the market today can offer start-up times of just 40 minutes (38). Flexible nuclear plants offer minimum output limits of 30–60%, compared to 100% for inflexible plants. In France, existing nuclear plants can ramp down to 30%, with ramp rates of up to 1%/minute (27).

Although power plant owners have emphasized the increased costs, additional wear-and-tear, and reduced equipment lifetimes of coal and gas plants operated more flexibly than originally designed, the IEA (26) concluded that "the cost implications from increased cycling and start-ups may not constitute a very large part of total system costs . . . particularly as older inflexible plants are retired and more flexible plants added to the system" (p. 34). However, another financial consequence of coal and natural gas plants operated more flexibility, rather than as baseload, is that such plants may produce fewer units of electricity per year, and thus less revenue (also depending on market design and alternative means of revenue such as ancillary services or capacity payments). Such an impact on the business and economics of power companies is one of the reasons Rogol (12), Sioshansi (7), Gray et al. (99), and others foresee major shifts in the power industry.

The most serious effects may first be seen in countries such as Germany, where Agora (58) notes that up to one-quarter of all dispatchable power capacity (i.e., coal, gas, and hydro) may operate at full output for just a small fraction of the time—less than 200 hours per year by 2020—otherwise operating at reduced output. Most other plants also face reductions in annual full-load hours. This projection is echoed by the IEA (26) in its modeling results, where it notes that in a hypothetical transformed power system, the power plant mix shows a structural shift, comprising a strong decrease in the number of baseload or inflexible power plants, and "an increase in the number of flexible power plants designed for part-time operation" (p. 15). Spain is another example of such shifts in practice (100). Some have suggested that shifts to more flexible plants will require a reconception of the meaning of baseload, and even that renewable plants, by virtue of their almost-zero marginal operating cost, could well be considered a new form of baseload (2, 19, 22, 24, 101).

4.2. Flexible Combined-Heat-and-Power Plants with Heat Storage

Denmark, Germany, and several other countries are already using, or considering using, CHPs coupled with heat storage to provide power grid flexibility (2, 26, 55, 59–61). Denmark is the

leading example, where more than half of all electricity is supplied by CHP, including many small and flexible plants. These plants feed into district heat-supply networks for heating buildings. Most of these networks include large water tanks for heat storage. Flexibility was designed into these systems starting in the 1980s and continuing today. In many typical CHP plants around the world, operation is driven by heat demand, with electricity as a secondary by-product, and thus electricity production is not flexible. In Denmark, CHP plants can vary the proportion of heat and electricity, using stored heat to offset any shortfalls if heat production falls below heat demand (i.e., given more electricity production and less heat production). This means that CHP plants can vary their electricity output in response to grid conditions and provide balancing.

Economically, this flexibility from CHP was supported by the legal integration of CHP plants into Denmark's electricity market, including capacity payments (subsidies) to keep CHP plants active in the electricity market; as such, electricity market design has played a key role. Also, many of Denmark's CHP plants are fueled by biomass, which thus provides a long-term pathway for balancing variable renewables with nonvariable but still renewable resources such as biomass. The scheme is a key part of Denmark's long-term integration of electricity, heating, and transport into a single transformed energy system, as well as Denmark's vision to become completely fossil fuel free. Denmark's experience is relevant to grid integration in many countries, as worldwide, many schemes for district heating and cooling coupled with electricity supply and renewable energy already exist and are growing (102, 103).

4.3. Electricity and Heat Storage

In the past, the only electricity storage resources generally considered practical for grid balancing were reservoir hydro and pumped hydro. Pumped hydro was often developed in combination with inflexible baseload plants such as coal and nuclear, storing electricity during the night and releasing it during the day. In current and future power systems, the long-standing tenet that instantaneous supply must always equal (and follow) instantaneous demand is being replaced by the flexibility granted by storage technologies, as well as many demand-flexibility innovations. Many emerging forms of storage allow power systems to become more flexible and accommodate variable demand as well as variable renewable generation, including batteries, supercapacitors, flywheels, fuel cells, compressed air, and hydrogen production, along with many forms of heat storage such as hot water tanks and phase-change materials. Storage can be incorporated at many locations and levels, such as the bulk-grid level, onsite at wind farms or other power plants, within local distribution networks, or at the building level. And storage can operate on different timescales, from seconds to days. Most grid integration literature addresses storage, and studies dedicated solely to storage have ballooned over the past decade (104–116).

Many future energy scenarios show growing levels of energy storage on power systems in the coming decades (19–22, 41, 58). However, storage remains a modest contribution to power systems in the short and medium term in many scenarios, by virtue of relatively high cost, and because other grid integration measures can be done first. Many studies show, and many experts suggest, that shares of renewables of up to 40% are possible before storage must become a major contributor to flexibility. For example, Agora (105) studies for Germany show storage being used only after 2032, as Germany approaches a 50% share of renewables. Denmark has no plans for electricity storage, relying instead on heat storage (along with other measures noted in Section 2). California has mandated 1.3 GW of storage to be procured by its power companies by 2020, a relatively modest amount as California reaches 33% renewables (23).

Numerous energy storage roadmaps have been published in recent years, casting light on how energy storage may evolve in the future, considering technologies, policy, economics, and

markets (113–115). A California roadmap, jointly created by the grid operator CAISO, the regulator CPUC, and the state Energy Commission, outlines a future series of actions for planning, procurement, rates treatment, interconnection, and market participation. An IRENA energy storage roadmap considers the economics and applications of storage, and outlines priority actions in the areas of system analysis, applications for islands and remote areas, distributed storage, and utility-scale storage.

Dispatchable resources: resources that the grid operator can directly control; dispatched according to market scheduling or as ancillary services

Although storage is often considered expensive relative to other grid integration options (26), storage at transmission and distribution levels is already beginning to provide clear economic value to transmission and distribution utility companies. As well, private power developers can sell storage into wholesale and ancillary markets in some jurisdictions where markets allow, or integrate, storage with their own generating plants (2, 38). Profitable projects and commercial business models for utility-scale storage are emerging in numerous US jurisdictions, including California, Hawaii, Mid-Atlantic (PJM), and Texas. One promising storage application has been the integration of heat storage with solar-thermal power plants, which enables these plants to produce power for several hours into the evening after the sun has set, making them appear more like baseload (13, 116). These emerging examples suggest that profitable storage may be a closer-term solution to grid integration than past scenarios or roadmap project.

4.4. Firm Renewable Energy Plants

Renewable energy plants such as reservoir hydro, biomass and biogas, geothermal, and concentrating solar-thermal power can also contribute to flexibility. These plants typically can be dispatched similarly to coal and natural gas plants, and can offer flexibility in terms of start-up time, ramping rates, and minimum output limits. The IEA (26) calls such plants firm or dispatchable renewable energy. Many future energy scenarios, particularly those for very low-carbon/low-fossil-fuel trajectories, show firm renewable resources playing significant roles in balancing variable renewables, mitigating some or all of the need for fossil fuel plants (although potentially with consequences for the costs and profitability of firm renewables).

Increasingly, jurisdictions with high shares of variable renewable energy are demonstrating that variable renewable energy generators themselves can be controlled and operated in ways similar to dispatchable resources, providing both flexibility and ancillary services (2; see also discussions below on smart inverters and curtailment). Denmark, for example, considers wind power part of the solution to grid integration, not just the cause of the balancing challenge. In Spain, the grid operator REE was the world's first operator to develop centralized, dedicated monitoring and control of variable renewable energy plants, dating back to 2006. In 2015, REE controlled the dispatch of up to 96% of the Spanish wind power fleet and was able to change aggregate wind power generation to any given level (consistent with wind resource) within 15 minutes. Ireland also appears likely to use its wind power fleet to provide grid flexibility in the future.

5. FLEXIBILITY FROM DISTRIBUTED ENERGY RESOURCES

A wide variety of distributed energy resources can provide flexibility from the demand side of power systems (2–4, 6, 11, 20, 22, 24, 26, 40, 51, 87, 117). Innovations in flexibility from distributed energy resources include static energy efficiency improvements aligned to grid needs, demand management and flexible demand, time-of-use and dynamic retail rate structures, distributed energy storage options for both electricity and heat, electric vehicle charging and discharging, and distributed generation coupled with so-called smart inverters. The grid integration literature covers all of these innovations, although more often as separate topics rather than collectively.

Overall, the literature on flexibility from distributed energy resources is much less developed and more recent compared to other grid integration topics. This is partly because real-world experience in employing distributed energy resources for flexibility is still very limited, relative to the long-term potential. Thus, for distributed energy resources, a larger portion of the literature focuses on envisioning what could happen in the future, suggesting new business models and policies, and documenting lessons and experience from demonstration projects.

5.1. Responsive Load and Demand Response

Responsive load and demand response innovations provide flexibility by enabling power consumption to vary in response to supply-side variability and grid conditions, and thus allow power demand to play a role in balancing variable renewables (3, 26, 118–127). This means that load can change in magnitude, or time-shift to other periods in response to a variety of conditions. The change in load might occur autonomously in response to time-of-use or dynamic retail prices, or through direct control of the load by the grid operator or a third party, or through the participation of demand response resources in competitive wholesale, ancillary, or capacity markets. Widespread deployment of smart meters, communications, and other enabling smart-grid technologies facilitates these innovations.

Demand response is most suited to loads that can be time-shifted to later periods without serious consequence, such as freezers/cold storage, heating, water pumping, and some industrial processes, particularly if enough inertia or storage capacity is present in whatever is being time-shifted. A larger class of interruptible loads can participate as load shedding, rather than shifting, where demand simply goes unserved. To date, most demand response in the United States has been employed as emergency peak load (and notably for ancillary services in ERCOT), to be used only infrequently, perhaps tens of hours per year (118, 119). Such traditional use of demand response, perhaps limited by customer willingness to incur more frequent calls for demand reduction, has limited its flexibility value. However, examples of demand response employed to provide greater power system flexibility on a regular (i.e., daily) basis are emerging slowly around the world. In 2014, Germany had approximately 1 GW of demand response feeding into its ancillary markets. California's power companies were procuring limited amounts of demand response under regulatory mandate (23). Direct bidding of demand response as a flexible resource into wholesale, ancillary, or capacity markets has been emerging in some jurisdictions, for example, PJM (mid-Atlantic) in the United States (65). Examples of long-term power system planning that has started to incorporate demand response as a resource in long-term plans can be found in California, the Canadian province of Ontario, France, and South Africa (2).

New aggregator business models are also part of the picture. An aggregator company might contract with hundreds or thousands of power consumers, allowing the aggregator to control certain elements of their power consumption upon receipt of a control signal. The aggregator can then sell that aggregated demand flexibility to the grid operator, to be activated at the request of the grid operator, or the aggregator could bid demand reduction into wholesale or ancillary electricity markets, in the same ways as power generation is bid into these markets.

Electric vehicle smart charging is a form of responsive load, where charging regimes can respond to dynamic rates or control signals to shift charging demand into the most favorable periods for the grid, subject to driver requirements for travel (126). Beyond smart charging are vehicle-to-grid (V2G) and vehicle-to-home (V2H) concepts, where electric vehicles become an integral part of the power grid and/or home energy system and can dynamically charge or discharge in response to external signals or dynamic prices (11, 117, 128). Emerging examples of such models can already be found in Scotland, Japan, and Hawaii, although many challenges still exist (2). An aggregator could

also aggregate the behavior of large numbers of electric vehicles and sell their battery capacity into the grid, charging or discharging in response to grid needs for flexibility (depending on market design and pricing).

Time-of-use and dynamic retail rates have traditionally been used to reduce load at peak times of day, when power system resources are most strained. But the application of such rates to creating flexibility at nonpeak times is relatively new, for example during swings in wind power output at whatever time of day, or to compensate for afternoon ramps as solar output declines. This can result in novel situations, such as low rates at midday to encourage more demand if solar output is high, and higher rates later to discourage demand as solar output declines. Some jurisdictions are just beginning to consider how time-of-use and dynamic rates can be applied to flexibility needs, or are engaged in dynamic pricing pilots, such as California, Connecticut, Oklahoma, and Washington, DC (2, 23). In California, CAISO has been considering shifting time-of-use periods to better match the customer responses desired during times of high solar generation and low load—i.e., times of high solar shares (129).

5.2. Distributed Generation and Distributed Energy Storage

Distributed generation, typically small-scale biomass or wind or rooftop solar, can also provide flexibility to the power grid, typically by reducing its output, although in some cases by increasing its output (e.g., if previously held back on purpose to allow later increases). This can occur autonomously under some programmable regime, when directly controlled by the grid operator, or when aggregated by an aggregator and sold into wholesale or ancillary markets. For distributed solar power, this typically happens through control by a smart inverter (87, 130). Technical standards, protocols, and regulatory frameworks for smart inverters are emerging in several jurisdictions, including California, Hawaii, and Germany (2). In Germany, all solar systems larger than 30 kW are required to be controllable by the grid operator. Smart inverters or technically capable wind turbines can also provide other technical services to local distribution grids, such as voltage and reactive power support. Revisions and additions to many technical standards related to distributed generation and smart inverters are key to grid integration, with development currently ongoing, for example IEEE 1547 standards by the Institute for Electrical and Electronics Engineers in the United States.

As discussed earlier, many forms of energy storage can provide flexibility, including distributed storage at the local or building level. In many jurisdictions, there is growing interest in household-level battery storage, primarily in conjunction with rooftop solar power. However, the economics of household-level storage depend greatly on the policy situation facing the household. Under a net metering policy common in the United States, there is no economic incentive for storage because any power can be sold to the grid at the retail price. In jurisdictions where retail prices are higher than the grid buy-back rate for power, such as in Germany after buy-back (feed-in tariff) rates were lowered drastically in recent years, then the self-consumption economic model for distributed solar power becomes more profitable, where power that is self-generated and self-consumed, for example through a local battery, has more economic value to the consumer than power that is sold to the grid (131). Local battery storage can also reduce peak-demand charges for commercial customers if they face capacity charges. Governments and/or power companies in some jurisdictions are beginning to provide incentives or foster distributed energy storage coupled with solar power, including California, Italy, Japan, and New Zealand (2). For example, the distribution utility Vector serving the city of Auckland, New Zealand, is installing batteries with rooftop solar, employing these batteries to reduce peak capacity charges it pays to the transmission grid operator.

Thermal loads and storage have long been utilized to shift daytime electricity loads to nighttime for cost savings and to reduce power system peak loads. This same concept is now being utilized in shorter time intervals and at different times of day to support balancing of variable renewable energy generation, cost reductions, demand response, and decreased system peak loads in conjunction with smart communications and controls. A variety of thermal loads and storage are being employed to provide demand response, including chillers in commercial buildings and electric water and space heaters in homes, sometimes coupled with thermal storage (2).

The concept of a virtual power plant is another emerging innovation for balancing renewables that has entered the literature, so far mostly in advancing the concept and documenting the experience from various demonstration projects that incorporate virtual power plants (45, 57, 132–134). A virtual power plant is some combination of distributed energy resources bundled together, such as distributed generation, storage, demand response, and electric vehicles, which all may be individually small and disparately located. Connected together via smart-grid links, with control and accounting systems, this virtual block of resources can become a dispatchable resource to the grid, can provide ancillary services, or can be used in local power networks and markets.

6. CURTAILMENT OF RENEWABLE GENERATORS

As more renewable energy is added to power grids, curtailment has emerged as a common response to grid integration (62, 135–140). Curtailment may occur (*a*) if there is too much generation at a given time (an overgeneration condition) and other generators cannot reduce their output fast enough or have reached their minimum output limits, (*b*) if there is not enough transmission or distribution line capacity to handle the renewable output, or (*c*) because of other grid conditions. Curtailment of wind and solar power plants causes a downward adjustment in their output, in spite of their potential to generate more power given prevailing wind or solar conditions. Thus, curtailment results in "spilled" or wasted generation that could have come from the renewable generator but is instead lost. Curtailment is often viewed negatively, and the "repercussions of discarded energy" can include lost revenues, lost incentives, and increased business risk.

There are different types of curtailment, sometimes causing confusion. The CPUC (23) defines manual curtailment as that ordered by the grid operator in response to system-reliability conditions and accomplished through exceptional dispatch (direct instruction to reduce/cease output); this is also called involuntary curtailment and generally regarded as undesirable. Economic curtailment or voluntary curtailment, however, occurs through the wholesale market, when renewable generators voluntarily reduce their output in response to market conditions or protocols, for example a negative wholesale price (see Section 10). Definitions of curtailment vary by jurisdiction (62).

Numerous jurisdictions with high renewables shares around the world currently face curtailment issues (62, 135). China is experiencing the highest levels of wind curtailment of any jurisdiction, with some provinces curtailing 15–25% of wind power output due to insufficient local demand coupled with lack of transmission capacity to other provinces (2, 136). Other countries with high levels of wind power, including Spain, Italy, and Ireland, have seen much lower levels, typically in the 1–3% range. Denmark and Portugal have virtually no forced curtailment. Among US states, curtailment levels have declined in recent years, and in 2013, wind power curtailment levels were typically less than 2%. Typical reasons given by US states for curtailment are transmission constraints, high wind ramps, and voltage control. In jurisdictions with high amounts of solar, such as California, Germany, Italy, and South Australia, very little solar curtailment occurs, although Hawaii and Japan face unique situations.

There is a large literature on the economics of curtailment, including the economic losses associated with curtailment, as well as methods to determine the economically optimum levels of

curtailment that balance the added costs of grid flexibility or network upgrades necessary to reduce curtailment against the economic losses of curtailment (137–140). One of the key variables is the degree to which business contracts with renewable generators, market rules, and/or regulatory provisions assign the economic losses of curtailment to the generator, rather than to the grid operator or to other market participants. Each jurisdiction is different.

7. TRANSMISSION STRENGTHENING AND GRID BALANCING AREAS

Transmission grid strengthening can be an important measure for grid integration of renewables, in terms of (*a*) balancing a broader geographical diversity of resources to reduce flexibility needs, (*b*) facilitating cross-border exchanges of renewable power, (*c*) integrating markets together to create more flexibility, and (*d*) providing access to geographic regions of high-concentration or remotely located renewable resources. Transmission planning has always been a core component of power system planning, but over the past two decades, transmission planning that specifically addresses these goals has emerged as a discrete topic of research and policy (2, 3, 22, 24, 26, 28, 31, 34, 40, 41, 58, 66, 68, 69, 141–144).

Many examples exist of transmission planning and investment for serving high-concentration or remote geographic regions of renewables development (2). China, where much wind development has occurred in remote areas, is planning transmission for a series of mega-scale concentrated wind power "bases" in at least eight provinces. Denmark's grid operator proactively plans new transmission capacity anticipating future interconnection of wind farms. Germany has been planning three major north–south DC transmission lines to relieve the imbalance in locations of wind generation versus the locations of power demand. Many regions of the United States have extended transmission to remoter wind power areas, and new regulatory frameworks at state and federal levels have required or supported such planning, such as Texas's competitive renewable energy zones regulatory process (145). Mexico developed a new planning process called open season, which identifies transmission needs based on planned wind capacity and guarantees authorization of new transmission (2).

Transmission capacity for regional interchanges of power can also support grid integration, and many large-scale schemes have been proposed, such as an EU "super grid," a North Asia super grid, the EU–North Africa Desertec concept, and the North Sea Countries Offshore Grid Initiative. Already in Europe, flows of hydropower from Norway and Sweden to neighboring countries provide significant balancing capacity for those neighbors.

A variety of studies have shown that strengthening interregional transmission capacity and planning, and expanding grid balancing areas under control of a single balancing authority, either a transmission system operator (TSO) or an independent system operator (ISO), to cover larger geographic territories can increase the flexibility of power systems for integrating renewables. Classic in this field were the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) Eastern States and Western States integration studies (142, 143). Higher shares of wind and solar increase the value of expanded balancing areas, which can provide more load diversity and reserve capacity, as well as greater "geographic smoothing" of the variability of wind and solar resources (e.g., anticorrelations across interconnected territories/locations). And even without balancing area expansion, stronger regional interconnection capacity, sometimes expressed as a share of total power demand (46), can allow neighboring jurisdictions to contribute to balancing.

Many real-world examples of coordinated transmission planning and balancing area coordination exist. The European Network of Transmission System Operators for Electricity (ENTSO-E) annually develops a ten-year network development plan and regional investment plan among its members. In the United States, the FERC requires regional transmission planners to analyze

alternative options and develop regional plans. Other examples of interregional coordination and planning can be found in the West Africa Power Pool, the ASEAN Power Grid initiative, and the South Asia region (2, 146).

8. DISTRIBUTION SYSTEMS

The distribution system is the part of the grid closest to end-consumers. Historically, distribution utility companies have not had to be innovators, as their job of load forecasting, grid expansion, and component replacement was relatively straightforward. And as regulated monopolies or state-owned entities in most jurisdictions, distribution companies receive a simple fixed return on capital invested or fixed budgets. With the advent of a wide array of distributed energy resources, the job of planning and operating distribution grids is getting more complicated, and the traditional business models and regulatory frameworks of distribution utilities are primed for future transformations.

In the future, distribution utilities will need to plan, operate, and innovate in a variety of new ways—to manage distributed generation, two-way power flows, demand response, storage, smart inverters, electric vehicle charging, microgrids, and a host of other trends. Distribution utilities will need to monitor, collect, analyze, and use data about their grids in completely new ways, and will need to analytically model their distribution systems to a degree far beyond current practice. Some call this the "smart utility of the future." A growing and diverse literature addresses these trends and the grid integration of renewables at the distribution level (3, 11, 22, 42, 87–90, 134, 147–151).

Among the many potential transformations, new forms of energy-service businesses are emerging alongside traditional utility business, including the aggregator and virtual power plant models discussed in Section 5, microgrids, and peer-to-peer energy exchange. And new local energy markets may emerge, operating semiautonomously to buy/sell and balance local renewable resources with local storage and demand response. Two examples of visions for such local energy markets and self-balancing are New York's Reforming the Energy Vision initiative, which also envisions local distribution grids providing ancillary services to the grid, and the distribution utility EWE in northwestern Germany (134, 148). Many distribution utilities are piloting smart-grid demonstration projects, as well as fundamentally reexamining how to handle distributed generation, particularly utilities facing rapidly growing shares of rooftop solar, such as Hawaiian Electric with its Distributed Generation Interconnection Plan (2). And regulators are grappling with a host of issues, such as tariffs, smart-inverter standards, control and data protocols, rules governing physical interconnection to the grid, and regulatory classification of resources.

9. POWER SYSTEM OPERATIONAL MEASURES

There are many power system operational measures that have and can be adopted to assist with grid integration of variable renewables. These measures have often been among the earliest steps taken in jurisdictions facing increasing shares of variable renewables, and among the most cost-effective of all measures because of the relatively small amounts of investment required. Many operational measures are rooted in innovative analytical methods and modeling of power systems, whereas others relate to market design and protocols. Operational measures are typically taken by the grid operator. One early step grid operators have taken when faced with higher shares of renewables is upgrading their power control and dispatch software, communications, and monitoring. Indeed, as wind power grew in Spain in the 2000s, the grid operator Red Eléctrica built a new control center dedicated to wind power.

This section outlines a selection of operational measures. Jones (25) has published a unique and comprehensive compendium of grid integration literature, a large share of it devoted to

operational measures. Other good resources for nonengineers include the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (3), the IEA (26), and the Union of Concerned Scientists (152). The operational measures are:

- Gate closure: In a power market, where resources are scheduled in advance (typically day-ahead through real-time scheduling), gate closure is the point before actual generation occurs, by which time a resource is committed and cannot be changed. Because renewable forecasting becomes more accurate closer to real time, a shorter gate closure time allows variable renewables to be scheduled more accurately, reducing imbalances and the need for flexibility.
- Dispatch interval length and transmission intervals: Dispatch interval is the time between each new market auction and schedule for generation. In many jurisdictions, dispatch intervals are hourly, but shorter dispatch intervals allow dispatch to adjust to renewable variations more quickly and accurately, reducing the balancing needs from system reserve capacity. Grid operators in the United States, Germany, and Denmark have reduced dispatch interval length to 15 minutes or 5 minutes. Similarly, transmission line scheduling intervals can also be reduced; for example, US FERC Order 764 shortened intervals from 1 hour to 15 minutes (63).
- System reliability calculations and coordination: Methodologies and processes for system reliability calculations, such as for n-minus-one ($n - 1$) contingency events where a generator or transmission line is suddenly lost, have evolved in some jurisdictions to incorporate the effect of variable renewables on the responses to such events. In Europe, the coordinating organization of EU grid operators, ENTSO-E, also began EU-wide reliability coordination in the face of increasing shares of variable renewables across Europe.
- System reserve capacity: Grids must maintain minimum levels of reserve capacity for system balancing and stability and for responding to contingencies. Variable renewables can create a greater need for reserves and greater challenges for system stability, including the potential need for additional operational and market measures to ensure frequency response on the shortest timescales (153–158; see also the discussion on capacity value of variable renewables in Section 3, in terms of higher reserve needs). However, the IEA (26) suggests that alternative methods of determining necessary reserves, breaking with deeply rooted practice and tradition, could reduce reserve needs of renewables. Examples include new analytical methods to look at the probabilities of simultaneous events occurring (using renewable forecasts), or dynamic reserve allocation that changes reserves as the level of renewables' variability changes (i.e., partly cloudy versus sunny days). The IEA (26) notes that "institutional 'inertia' may pose a significant barrier to revising the definition and size of reserves" (p. 97).
- Ancillary services from variable renewables: If variable renewables themselves can provide reserves, i.e., if they can contribute to ancillary services, then reserve requirements from other dispatchable generators can be reduced. However, the transition from conventional—inertial—reserves of spinning generators to reserves based on the operation of smart inverters (i.e., with solar power; see also Section 5) poses additional challenges. Several recent studies discuss the potential for wind and solar resources to provide ancillary services; such provision already exists in Denmark and Germany and is an emerging feature in some other jurisdictions (2, 49, 53, 60, 61, 158–160).
- Grid codes: Grid codes are the technical, operational, and planning requirements and rules for power systems, covering such topics as generator interconnection and operation, grid operation, generation and transmission planning, and market rules for balancing, congestion

management, and capacity allocation. A variety of literature proposes enhanced grid codes for integrating renewables (161, 162).

- Wind and solar forecasting: The incorporation of advanced wind and solar output forecasting, based on weather forecasting on timescales from day-ahead to real-time, has become common and highly sophisticated in jurisdictions with high shares of renewables (163, 164; see also **http://www.aemo.com.au/Electricity/National-Electricity-Market-NEM/Planning-and-forecasting/Solar-and-wind-energy-forecasting**). Such forecasting has made a major contribution to integrating and balancing high shares of renewables. Denmark has taken this innovation farther than most. In real time, the Danish grid operator updates wind forecasts and compares actual wind output against predictions made the day before. This information is then used to better forecast wind output over the coming hours. This process "virtually eliminates errors" in the predictability of wind output, said one senior manager of the grid operator (54, p. 10).

Resource adequacy: planning, investment, market, and/or operational processes to ensure enough resources are available to provide a minimum level of power system reliability

10. ELECTRICITY MARKET DESIGN FOR GRID INTEGRATION

Electricity market design is a highly complex subject that really dates back to the 1980s, when restructuring ("liberalization") of the power sector got underway in many countries, and electricity systems began to shift from being vertically integrated regulated or state-owned monopolies to being unbundled market-based sectors with competition at various levels. Market designs vary greatly around the world, and keep evolving with successive rounds of restructuring, deregulation, or reregulation. Sioshansi (1) provides an excellent volume exploring current market issues and market evolution in many jurisdictions around the world.

Many aspects of market design have an important bearing on grid integration of renewable energy, and a growing literature focuses on how market designs can evolve to better support grid integration and deliver flexibility in a least-cost manner (2, 26, 32, 40, 41, 57–61, 165–167). This subject would require an entire article by itself, but a few issues are highlighted here:

- Negative prices: Negative and zero electricity market prices have become an effective market mechanism for balancing variable renewables, by reducing generation during overgeneration conditions, rather than requiring the grid operator to force curtailment of renewables directly (167) (and also by encouraging more demand, which can also mitigate overgeneration conditions). In Germany, negative prices cause coal and gas plants to reduce output, and/or export their power to neighboring countries. "Negative prices are not necessarily a bad thing," notes Agora (167, p. 2), but they do add economic costs to Germany's feed-in-tariff system. Negative prices may also serve as an indicator of relative lack of flexibility of dispatchable generators; as such, declines in the incidence of negative prices may indicate growing grid flexibility.
- Capacity markets and resource adequacy: In the long term, electricity system operators, planners, and regulators must ensure that enough power capacity exists as power plants are retired and new plants built, a regulatory and planning process often called resource adequacy. There are ongoing debates in the literature, and in individual jurisdictions, as to the best ways to ensure resource adequacy (168, 169). Options include direct regulatory requirements, capacity mandates, capacity payments, capacity markets, and "must run" or "must offer" obligations. Some jurisdictions rely on energy-only markets without regard to capacity. As shares of variable renewables increase, the challenge increases to ensure resource adequacy, and uncertainty exists as to which options will or will not work in the long term. In recent years, California introduced separate flexible-capacity requirements into its resource adequacy process (23).

- Markets for regional power exchange: Integrated cross-border power markets can increase system flexibility and balancing, as amply demonstrated by Denmark's strong interconnection and integration with European and Nordic electricity markets that provides a strong component of Denmark's balancing needs. Germany also benefits from the European Energy Exchange for balancing. California and several western states are currently developing and expanding an Energy Imbalance Market that allows neighboring power grids to help balance each other, and potentially reduce curtailment and ramping issues, with different levels of market integration possible (23).
- Ramping markets: System ramping capacity has become a potentially key element in market designs for integrating renewables, particularly solar, which can create large morning and afternoon ramps. One example of a ramping market is California, which was in the process of introducing a new market called the Flexible Ramping Product (23). In this fast-response 5-minute-interval market during ramping periods, the grid operator pays generators to remain off or run at reduced capacity, so that some generators are available to increase generation during a subsequent 5-minute interval if ramping needs exceed forecasts. The payments for remaining off compensate the generator at the market price while off. Generators can voluntarily bid flexible capacity into this market and potentially earn extra revenue compared with the normal market. The market will be open to solar, wind, and storage resources as well.

11. CONCLUSION: RESEARCH, POLICY, AND LONG-TERM PLANNING

Research, policy, and long-term planning needs for grid integration suggested by this review cover numerous topics and questions. The most important and most immediate topics and questions are the following:

1. Flexibility assessments for specific jurisdictions, including existing levels of flexibility, flexibility needs, flexibility measures, and least-cost combinations of measures that meet future needs: What flexibility benchmarks exist? What flexibility characteristics of dispatchable generation and energy storage are possible, and at what cost? What is the special role of CHPs coupled with heat storage? What can variable renewables themselves contribute to flexibility?
2. Roles and flexibility possible from distributed energy resources such as distributed generation, energy storage, electric vehicles, demand response, and energy efficiency: What are the potentials considering time-of-use and dynamic rates, end-use equipment, aggregator business models, electric vehicle charging regimes, and opportunities for embedded electrical and thermal energy storage? How might these resources provide grid services? What tariffs, standards, control protocols, regulatory classifications, business models, and policies are necessary to unlock the potential of these resources?
3. Transmission network planning including grid integration considerations: What are the needs and opportunities for transmission strengthening, interconnection, and balancing area expansion? What policies can foster transmission to regions of high renewable resources? What types of transmission are feasible given social and environmental constraints? What are alternatives such as distributed resources, market design changes, and flexible generation that might be cheaper than transmission strengthening?
4. New models of distribution system planning and operation: How should distribution grids evolve to serve two-way power flows, data monitoring and analysis needs, storage, and demand response? What will be the relative roles and relationships of distribution utility companies, aggregator companies, energy-service companies, consumers, and the grid

operator? Who will control distributed energy resources in which markets? How might market boundaries change between the bulk-grid and distribution levels?

5. Long-term power system planning that considers the full range of flexibility measures and innovations: Considering all the possibilities for additional flexibility to integrate variable renewables, what are the least-cost approaches and least-cost combinations of measures? What are analytical frameworks and tools for determining least cost? Should incremental integration costs be used, or should total system cost under different scenarios drive planning?
6. Reliability, ancillary services and curtailment: How much curtailment occurs, of which types? What are the economic losses associated with curtailment, and who bears them? Under what circumstances does overgeneration create real reliability issues? What is the economically optimum level of curtailment, given resource mixes and contractual arrangements? How do the needs for ancillary services change, and what are new ways to meet those needs, including from renewable generators?
7. Electricity market designs and protocols that respond to the needs of grid integration: How will market designs affect the quantity of flexible resources in the future? What are the potential roles of capacity markets; ramping markets; inclusion of distributed generation, storage, and demand-response into wholesale and ancillary markets; local energy markets at the distribution-system level that may be semiautonomous or self-balancing; peer-to-peer energy; negative market prices; economic curtailment of renewables; and resource aggregators? How can cross-border integration of markets facilitate greater interregional interconnection and balancing?
8. Policy and regulatory frameworks that support grid integration: Policy makers face future challenges of understanding and analyzing grid integration; working across different technology, investment, and procurement areas that may currently be regulated separately; capturing the potential of integrated distributed energy resources; and working with grid operators to achieve least-cost outcomes. How should policy and regulation proceed, while maintaining reliability, safety, and environmental goals? What institutional changes are suggested, considering electricity, heating, and transport together and considering the interests of electricity market participants?

The answers to these questions are not simple, and such inquiries will continue well into the coming decades. The answers, and the policy, business, planning, and operational transformations implied by the answers, will lead to a high-renewable-energy future at the least cost, with all the consequent environmental, economic, security, and social benefits.

SUMMARY POINTS

1. Grid integration is of growing importance for attaining high shares of renewable electricity in power systems of the future. Numerous jurisdictions with already-high shares of renewables are amassing a wealth of real-world experience with grid integration today, such as China, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, South Africa, and Spain, and states such as California, Hawaii, Texas, and South Australia.
2. Shares of renewable energy in many power grids and jurisdictions around the world are already reaching 20–40% today, including large portions of variable renewables such as wind and solar, and grids are managing to balance these shares with a wide variety of measures and innovations, with only modest amounts of energy storage.

3. Flexibility is a key attribute of power systems for the integration of large shares of variable renewables. Flexibility already exists, but more is needed and can come from many different measures and innovations, including supply-side resources, demand-side resources, improvements to transmission and distribution grids, operational measures, and market changes.
4. Assessments of existing flexibility levels, future flexibility needs, costs of flexibility, and least-cost combinations of measures are needed, but assessment tools are relatively undeveloped. And because all power systems and markets across the world are uniquely different, solutions are extremely jurisdiction specific, although measures themselves can be understood generically.
5. Distributed energy resources such as distributed generation, energy storage, and demand response have a potentially strong but relatively less understood role in future power system flexibility. Many new innovations and smart-grid technologies, along with new energy-service business models such as aggregators and new regulatory frameworks, can unlock these potentials.
6. Market designs and protocols can and should evolve in response to flexibility needs of variable renewables in a variety of ways, including pricing, dispatch/schedule intervals, ancillary service (balancing) markets and requirements, capacity markets or other forms of resource adequacy, regionalization of power markets, and ramping.
7. Power system operational measures, including advanced renewable energy forecasting (weather forecasting), are among the cheapest and earliest measures. Curtailment of renewables and/or negative market prices are among the ways renewable variability can be balanced, and although both are generally considered economically undesirable, they both have a role to play.
8. Policy makers and regulators face the challenge of understanding and analyzing grid integration, working across different technology areas (and regulatory divisions), capturing the potential of distributed energy resources, and working with grid operators to achieve least-cost outcomes. Long-term planning and regulation should consider the full range of flexibility measures and innovations.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The author is not aware of any affiliations, memberships, funding, or financial holdings that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this review.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks to the Japan Renewable Energy Foundation, the Institute for Advanced Sustainability Studies (Potsdam, Germany), and the Institute for Sustainable Energy Policies (Tokyo) for support that made this research possible. And thanks for associated collaborations with many others, including Romain Zissler of JREF, Mackay Miller and his team at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, Molly Sterkel and Meredith Younghein of the CPUC, and Wang Zhongying and his team at the China Energy Research Institute. This body of work developed between 2011 and 2012 while writing the REN21 *Renewables Global Futures Report*.

LITERATURE CITED

1. Sioshansi FP. 2013. *Evolution of Global Electricity Markets: New Paradigms, New Challenges, New Approaches*. London: Academic
2. Miller M, Martinot E, Cox S, Speer B, Zinaman O, et al. 2015. *Status report on power system transformation: a report of the 21st Century Power Partnership*. Rep. NREL-64466, Nat. Renew. Energy Lab. (NREL), Golden, CO
3. Mass. Inst. Technol. (MIT) Energy Initiat. 2011. *The Future of the Electric Grid: An Interdisciplinary MIT Study*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
4. Zinaman O, Miller M, Adil A, Arent D, Cochran J, et al. 2015. *Power systems of the future: a report of the 21st Century Power Partnership*. Tech. Rep. NREL-62611, NREL, Golden, CO
5. Miller M, Bird L, Cochran J, Milligan M, Bazilian M, et al. 2013. *RES-E-NEXT: next generation of RES-E policy instruments*. Utrecht, Neth.: Int. Energy Agency–Renew. Energy Technol. Deploy. (IEA-RETD)
6. Edison Found. Inst. Electr. Innov. 2014. *Innovations across the grid: partnerships transforming the power sector*. Rep., Edison Found., Wash., DC
7. Sioshansi FP. 2012. Why the time has arrived to rethink the electric business model. *Electr. J.* 25(7):65–74
8. Sioshansi FP. 2014. The implications of distributed energy resources on traditional utility business model. See Ref. 25, pp. 275–84
9. Lehr RL. 2013. New utility business models: utility and regulatory models for the modern era. *Electr. J.* 26(8):35–53
10. Würtenberger L, Bleyl JW, Menkveld M, Vethman P, van Tilburg X. 2012. *Business models for renewable energy in the built environment (prepared for IEA-RETD)*. Rep. ECN-E–12-014, Energy Res. Cent., Petten, Neth.
11. Fox-Penner P. 2010. *Smart Power: Climate Change, the Smart Grid and the Future of Electric Utilities*. Washington, DC: Island Press
12. Rogol M. 2011. *Explosive Growth*. Berkeley, CA: Live Oak Books
13. Renewable Energy Policy Network for the 21st Century (REN21). 2015. *Renewables 2015: global status report*. Rep., REN21, Paris
14. Mitchell K, Sawin J, Pokharel GR, Kammen D, Wang ZY, et al. 2011. Policy, financing, and implementation. See Ref. 170, pp. 865–950
15. International Energy Agency (IEA). 2015. *World Energy Outlook*. Paris: IEA
16. IEA. 2015. *Energy Technology Perspectives*. Paris: IEA
17. Global Energy Assessment. 2014. *Global Energy Assessment—Toward a Sustainable Future*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press; Laxenburg, Austria: Int. Inst. Appl. Syst. Anal.
18. International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA). 2014. *Remap 2030: a renewable energy roadmap*. Rep., IRENA, Abu Dhabi, UAE
19. Greenpeace Int., Glob. Wind Energy Counc., SolarPowerEurope. 2015. *Energy [R]evolution: A Sustainable World Energy Outlook*. Amsterdam: Greenpeace Int.
20. REN21. 2013. *Renewables Global Futures Report*. Paris: REN21
21. Hand MM, Baldwin S, DeMeo E, Reilly JM, Mai T, et al. 2012. *Renewable electricity futures study*. Rep. NREL-52409, NREL, Golden, CO
22. Lovins AB, Rocky Mt. Inst. 2011. *Reinventing Fire: Bold Business Solutions for the New Energy Era*. White River, VT: Chelsea Green Publ.
23. California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC). 2015. *Beyond 33% renewables: grid integration policies for a low-carbon future*. White Pap., Energy Div. Staff, CPUC, San Franc.
24. Cochran J, Miller M, Zinaman O, Milligan M, Arent D, et al. 2014. *Flexibility in 21st century power systems: report of the 21st Century Power Partnership*. Rep. NREL-61721, NREL, Golden, CO
25. Jones L, ed. 2014. *Renewable Energy Integration: Practical Management of Variability, Uncertainty, and Flexibility in Power Grids*. London: Elsevier
26. IEA. 2014. *The Power of Transformation: Wind, Sun and the Economics of Flexible Power Systems*. Paris: IEA
27. IEA. 2011. *Harnessing Variable Renewables: A Guide to the Balancing Challenge*. Paris: IEA
28. IEA Renew. Energy Technol. Deploy. (IEA-RETD). 2014. *RE-integration: integration of variable renewable electricity sources in electricity systems—lessons learnt and guidelines*. Rep., Org. Econ. Co-Op Dev. (OECD), Paris

29. IEA-RETD. 2015. *Integration of Variable Renewables*, Vol. 1: *Main Report*. Paris: OECD
30. Sims R, Mercado P, Krewitt W, et al. 2011. Integration of renewable energy into present and future energy systems. See Ref. 170, pp. 609–705
31. Madrigal M, Porter K. 2013. *Operating and planning electricity grids with variable renewable generation: review of emerging lessons from selected operational experiences and desktop studies*. Rep., World Bank, Wash., DC
32. Cochran J, Bird L, Heeter J, Arent DJ. 2012. *Integrating variable renewable energy in electric power markets: best practices from international experience*. Rep. NREL-53732, NREL, Golden, CO
33. Miller M, Cox S. 2014. *Overview of variable renewable energy regulatory issues: a clean energy regulators initiative report*. Rep. NREL-61350, NREL, Golden, CO
34. Holttinen H, ed. 2013. *Expert group report on recommended practices: wind integration studies*, *IEA wind task 25*. Rep. IEA Wind RP16, IEA, Paris. **http://www.ieawind.org/index_page_postings/100313/RP%2016%20Wind%20Integration%20Studies_Approved%20091213.pdf**
35. GE Energy Consulting. 2014. *PJM renewable integration study*. Rep., GE Energy Consult., Schenectady, NY
36. Linville C, Migden-Ostrander J, Hogan M. 2014. *Clean Energy Keeps the Lights On*. Monpelier, VT: Regul. Assist. Proj.
37. Zane EB, Brückmann R, Bauknecht D, Jirous F, Piria R, et al. 2012. *Integration of electricity from renewables to the electricity grid and to the electricity market—RES integration*. Rep., Eclarion, Oeko Inst., Berlin, Freiburg, Ger.
38. World Bank Energy Sector Manag. Assist. Progr. (ESMAP). 2015. *Bringing variable renewable energy up to scale: options for grid integration using natural gas and energy storage*. Tech. Rep. 006/15, ESMAP, World Bank, Wash., DC
39. IRENA, IEA Energ. Technol. Syst. Anal. Progr. (IEA-ETSAP). 2015. *Renewable energy integration in power grids*. Technol. Brief E15, IRENA, Abu Dhabi, UAE
40. IRENA. 2015. *The age of renewable power: designing national roadmaps for a successful transformation*. Rep., IRENA, Bonn, Ger.
41. Agora Energiewende. 2015. *The European power system in 2030: flexibility challenges and integration benefits*. Rep., Agora, Berlin, Ger.
42. Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI). 2015. *The integrated grid: realizing the full value of central and distributed energy resources*. Rep., EPRI, Palo Alto, CA
43. Energinet. 2014. *Practitioner's guide to grid integration of variable renewable energy*. Rep., Energinet, Cph., Den.
44. Boie I, Fernandes C, Frias P, Klobasa M. 2014. Efficient strategies for the integration of renewable energy into future energy infrastructures in Europe. *Energy Policy* 67:170–85
45. Droste-Franke B, Paal BP, Rehtanz C, Sauer DU, Schneider JP, et al. 2012. *Balancing Renewable Electricity: Energy Storage*, *Demand Side Management*, *and Network Extension from an Interdisciplinary Perspective*. New York: Springer
46. Holttinen H, Meibom P, Orths A, Lange B, O'Malley M, et al. 2011. Impacts of large amounts of wind power on design and operation of power systems, results of IEA collaboration. *Wind Energy* 14(2):179–92
47. California State Legislature. 2015. *Clean Energy and Pollution Reduction Act of 2015*. Senate Bill 350, Chap. 547, Calif. State Legis., Sacram., CA. **https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201520160SB350#**
48. Advanced Energy Economy (AEE) Institute. 2015. *Toward a 21st century electricity system in California*. Work. Group Position Pap., AEE Inst., San Franc.
49. Nelson J, Wisland L. 2015. *Achieving 50 percent renewable electricity in California*. Rep., Union Concern. Sci., Oakland, CA
50. Energy and Environmental Economics (E3). 2015. *Investigating a higher renewables portfolio standard in California*. Rep., E3, San Franc. **https://ethree.com/documents/E3_Final_RPS_Report_2014_01_06_with_appendices.pdf**
51. Lazar J. 2014. *Teaching the "duck" to fly*. Res. Pap., Reg. Assist. Proj., Monpelier, VT
52. Brinkman G, Jorgenson J, Ehlen A, Caldwell H. 2016. *California low carbon grid study: analysis of a 50% emission reduction in California*. Rep. NREL-64884, NREL, Golden, CO

53. Lew D, Schroder M, Miller N, Lecar M. 2015. *Integrating high levels of variable energy resources in California*. Rep., GE Energy Consult., Schenectady, NY
54. Martinot E. 2015. *Grid integration of renewables in China: learning from the cases of California, Germany, and Denmark*. White Pap., China Energy Res. Inst., Beijing, China
55. Agora Energiewende. 2015. *The Energiewende in the power sector: state of affairs 2014: a review of the significant developments and an outlook for 2015*. Rep., Agora, Berlin, Ger.
56. Agora Energiewende. 2015. *The solar eclipse 2015: outlook for the power system 2030*. Rep., Agora, Berlin, Ger.
57. German Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy. 2015. *An electricity market for Germany's energy transition*. White Pap., Ger. Fed. Minist. Econ. Aff. Energy, Berlin, Ger.
58. Agora Energiewende. 2015. *Understanding the Energiewende*. Rep., Agora, Berlin, Ger.
59. Agora Energiewende. 2015. *The Danish experience with integrating variable renewable energy: lessons learned and options for improvement*. Rep., Agora, Berlin, Ger.
60. Agora Energiewende. 2015. *A snapshot of the Danish energy transition*. Rep., Agora, Berlin, Ger.
61. Strøm S, Andersen AN. 2014. The Danish case: taking advantage of flexible power in an energy system with high wind penetration. See Ref. 25, pp. 239–52
62. Bird L, Cochran J, Wang X. 2014. *Wind and solar energy curtailment: experience and practices in the United States*. Rep. NREL-60983, NREL, Golden, CO
63. Fine S, Kumaraswamy K. 2014. Policies for accommodating higher penetration of variable energy resources: US outlook and perspectives. See Ref. 25, pp. 13–26
64. Dumas J, Maggio D. 2014. ERCOT case study: reserve management for integrating renewable generation in electricity markets. See Ref. 25, pp. 117–24
65. Ott A. 2014. Case study: demand response and alternative technologies in (PJM) electricity markets. See Ref. 25, pp. 265–74
66. US Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). 2011. *Transmission Planning and Cost Allocation by Transmission Owning and Operating Public Utilities*. FERC Docket RM10-23-000, Order 1000, Washington, DC. **http://www.ferc.gov/whats-new/comm-meet/2011/072111/E-6.pdf**
67. Hogan M, Weston F, Gottstein M. 2015. *Power market operations and system reliability in the transition to a low-carbon power system: a contribution to the market design debate*. Rep., Regul. Assist. Proj., Brussels, Belg.
68. Eur. Netw. Transm. Syst. Op. Electr. (ENTSO-E). 2014. *10-year network development plan and regional investment plan*. Rep., ENTSO-E, Brussels, Belg. **https://www.entsoe.eu/major-projects/ten-year-network-development-plan/tyndp-2014/Documents/TYNDP%202014_FINAL.pdf**
69. Eurelectric. 2010. *Power choices: pathways to carbon-neutral electricity in Europe by 2050*. Rep., Eurelectric, Brussels, Belg.
70. EirGrid. 2015. *Your grid, your views, your tomorrow: a discussion paper on Ireland's grid development strategy*. Rep., EirGrid, Dublin, Irel.
71. EirGrid. 2011. *Offshore grid study*. Rep., EirGrid, Dublin, Irel.
72. Soonee SK, Agrawal VK. 2014. Integration of renewable energy—the Indian experience. See Ref. 25, pp. 203–14
73. Zhang SF, Li XM. 2012. Large-scale wind power integration in China: analysis from a policy perspective. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev*. 16(2):1110–15
74. Ela E, Kirby B. 2008. *ERCOT event on February 26, 2008: lessons learned*. Rep. NREL-43373, NREL, Golden, CO
75. EPRI. 2014. *Metrics for quantifying flexibility in power system planning*. Rep., EPRI, Palo Alto, CA
76. North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC). 2010. *Flexibility requirements and metrics for variable generation: implications for system planning studies*. Rep., NERC, Princeton, NJ
77. Welsch M, Mentis D, Howells M. 2014. Long-term energy systems planning: accounting for short-term variability and flexibility. See Ref. 25, pp. 215–26
78. Ulbig A, Andersson G. 2014. Role of power system flexibility. See Ref. 25, pp. 227–38
79. Mills A, Seel J. 2015. *Flexibility inventory for Western resource planners*. Rep. LBNL-1003750, Lawrence Berkeley Nat. Lab. (LBNL), Berkeley, CA
80. Zhao JY, Zheng TX, Litvinov E. 2015. A unified framework for defining and measuring flexibility in power systems. *IEEE Trans. Power Syst*. 31(1):339–47

81. Keane A, Milligan M, Dent CJ, Hasche B, D'Annunzio C, et al. 2011. Capacity value of wind power. *IEEE Trans. Power Syst*. 26(2):5640–72
82. Madaeni SH, Sioshansi R, Denholm P. 2013. Comparing capacity value estimation techniques for photovoltaic solar power. *IEEE J. Photovolt*. 3(1):407–15
83. Agora Energiewende. 2015. *The integration costs of wind and solar power*. Rep., Agora, Berlin, Ger.
84. Hirth L, Ueckerdt F, Edenhofer O. 2015. Integration costs revisited—an economic framework for wind and solar variability. *Renew. Energy* 74: 925–39
85. Milligan M, Ela E, Hodge BM, Krby B, Lew D, et al. 2011. Integration of variable generation, cost-causation, and integration costs. *Electr. J.* 24:51–63
86. Pudjianto D, Djapic P, Dragovic J, Strbac G. 2013. *Grid integration cost of photovoltaic power generation: direct costs analysis related to grid impacts of photovoltaics*. PVParity.eu Rep., Energy Futures Lab., Imp. Coll. London
87. Palensky P, Kupzog F. 2013. Smart grids. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour*. 38:201–26
88. IEA. 2011. *Technology Roadmap: Smart Grids*. Paris: IEA
89. Komor P, Hoke A, Kempener R. 2014. Seven steps to a smarter grid. *Electr. J.* 27(2):61–67
90. IRENA. 2013. *Smart grids and renewables: a guide for effective deployment*. Work. Pap., IRENA, Bonn, Ger.
91. Pickard A, Meinecke G. 2015. *The future role of fossil power generation*. Rep., Siemens AG, Erlangen, Ger.
92. Kubik ML, Coker PJ, Hunt C. 2012. The role of conventional generation in managing variability. *Energy Policy* 50:253–61
93. Kumar N, Besuner P, Lefton S, Agan D, Hilleman D. 2012. *Power plant cycling costs*. Rep. NREL-55433, NREL, Golden, CO
94. Cochran J, Lew D, Kumar N. 2013. *Flexible coal: evolution from baseload to peaking plant*. Rep. BR-6A20-60575, NREL, Golden, CO
95. Nicolosi M. 2010. Wind power integration and power system flexibility—an empirical analysis of extreme events in Germany under the new negative price regime. *Energy Policy* 38(11):7257–68
96. Balling L. 2011. Fast cycling and rapid start-up: new generation of plants achieves impressive results. *Mod. Power Syst.* 31:35–41
97. Qadrdan M, Chaudry M, Wu JZ, Jenkins N, Ekanayake J. 2010. Impact of a large penetration of wind generation on the GB gas network. *Energy Policy* 38(10):5684–95
98. OECD, Nuclear Energy Agency. 2012. *Nuclear Energy and Renewables: System Effects in Low-Carbon Electricity Systems*. Paris: OECD Publ.
99. Gray M, Leaton J, Schuwer R, Fulton M. 2015. *Coal: Caught in the EU Utility Death Spiral*. London: Carbon Track. Initiat.
100. Sáenz de Miera G, González P, Vizcaíno I. 2008. Analysing the impact of renewable electricity support schemes on power prices: the case of wind electricity in Spain. *Energy Policy* 36(9):3345–59
101. Ueckerdt F, Kempener R. 2015. *From baseload to peak: renewables provide a reliable solution*. Work. Pap., IRENA, Abu Dhabi, UAE
102. Lund H, Möller B, Mathiesen BV, Dyrelund A. 2010. The role of district heating in future renewable energy systems. *Energy* 35:1381–90
103. UN Environment Programme (UNEP). 2015. *District Energy in Cities: Unlocking the Potential of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy*. Paris: UNEP
104. Baxter R. 2006. *Energy Storage: A Non-Technical Guide*. Tulsa, OK: PennWell
105. Agora Energiewende. 2014. *Electricity storage in the German energy transition*. Agora Energ., Berlin, Ger.
106. EPRI. 2010. *Electricity energy storage technology options: a white paper primer on applications, costs, and benefits*. White Pap. 1020676, EPRI, Palo Alto, CA
107. Ecofys. 2014. *Energy storage: opportunities and challenges*. White Pap., Ecofys, Utrecht, Neth.
108. E3. 2014. *Valuing energy storage as a flexible resource. final phase 1 report for consideration in CPUC*. Rep. A.14-02-006, E3, San Franc.
109. IRENA. 2015. *Battery storage for renewables: market status and technology outlook*. IRENA, Abu Dhabi, UAE
110. IRENA, IEA-ETSAP. 2013. *Thermal energy storage*. Technol. Brief. E17, IRENA, IEA-ETSAP, Abu Dhabi, UAE

111. IRENA. 2012. *Electricity Storage and Renewables for Island Power: A Guide for Decision Makers*. Abu Dhabi, UAE: IRENA
112. Mohler D, Sowder D. 2014. Energy storage and the need for flexibility on the grid. See Ref. 25, pp. 285–94
113. IEA. 2014. *Technology Roadmap: Energy Storage*. Paris: IEA
114. California Independent System Operator (CAISO), CPUC, California Energy Commission. 2015. *Advancing and maximizing the value of energy storage technology: a California roadmap*. Rep., CAISO, Folsom, CA
115. IRENA. 2015. *Renewables and electricity storage: a technology roadmap for REmap 2030*. Rep., IRENA, Abu Dhabi, UAE
116. Sioshansi R, Denholm P. 2010. *The value of concentrating solar power and thermal energy storage*. Rep. NREL-45833, NREL, Golden, CO
117. Sioshansi FP. 2014. *Distributed Generation and Its Implications for the Utility Industry*. London: Academic
118. FERC. 2014. *Demand response and advanced metering*. Staff Rep. FERC, Wash., DC
119. Bayer B. 2015. Current practice and thinking with demand response for power system flexibility in U.S. and German electricity markets. *Curr. Sust. Renew. Energy Rep.* 2:55–62
120. Dupont B, Jonghe CD, Olmos L, Belmans R. 2014. Demand response with locational dynamic pricing to support the integration of renewables. *Energy Policy* 67:344–54
121. Kiliccote S, Sporborg P, Sheikh I, Huffaker E, Piette MA. 2010. *Integrating renewable resources in California and the role of automated demand response*. Rep. LBNL-4189E, LBNL, Berkeley, CA
122. Stern F, Corfee K, Schare S. 2012. *Potential role of demand response resources in maintaining grid stability and integrating variable renewable energy under California's 33 percent renewable portfolio standard*. White Pap., Navigant, Boston, MA
123. Shariatzadeh F, Mandal P, Srivastava A. 2015. Demand response for sustainable energy systems: a review, application and implementation strategy. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev*. 45:343–50
124. Broad D, Dragoon K. 2014. Demand response for integrating variable renewable energy: a Northwest perspective. See Ref. 25, pp. 253–64
125. Allcott H. 2011. Rethinking real-time electricity pricing. *Resource Energy Econ*. 33:820–42
126. Hahn T, Schönfelder M, Jochem P, Heuveline V, Fichtner W. 2013. Model-based quantification of load shift potentials and optimized charging of electric vehicles. *Smart Grid Renew. Energy* 4:398–408
127. Cappers P, Mills A, Goldman C, Wiser R, Eto JH. 2012. An assessment of the role mass market demand response could play in contributing to the management of variable generation integration issues. *Energy Policy* 48(0):420–29
128. San Roman TG, Momber I, Abbad MR, Miralles AS. 2011. Regulatory framework and business models for charging plug-in electric vehicles: infrastructure, agents, and commercial relationships. *Energy Policy* 39:6360–75
129. California ISO (CAISO). 2015. *CAISO's TOU period analysis to address "high renewable" grid needs*. Rep., CAISO, Folsom, CA
130. Obi M, Bass R. 2016. Trends and challenges of grid-connected photovoltaic systems—a review. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev*. 58:1082–94
131. Rickerson W, Couture T, Barbose G, Jacobs D, Parkinson G, et al. 2014. *Residential prosumers—drivers and policy options (RE-Prosumers)*. Rep., IEA-RETD, Paris
132. Findlay C. 2011. Strength in numbers: merging small generators as virtual power plants. *Living Energy* 4:51–57
133. Navigant Research. 2016. *Virtual power plants: demand response, supply-side, and mixed asset VPPs*. Rep., Navigant Res., Boulder, CO. **http://www.navigantresearch.com/research/virtual-power-plants**
134. Agsten M, Bauknecht D, Becker A, Brinker W, Conrads R, et al. 2014. *eTelligence final report*. Rep. EWE 102189, EWE AG, Oldenburg, Ger.
135. Lew D, Bird L, Milligan M, Speer B, Xi Wang, et al. 2013. *Wind and solar curtailment*. Rep. NREL-60245, NREL, Golden, CO
136. Li C, Shi H, Cao Y, Wang J, Kuang Y, et al. 2014. Comprehensive review of renewable energy curtailment and avoidance: a specific example of China. *Renew. Sustain. Energy Rev*. 41:1067–79

137. Jacobsen HK, Schroeder ST. 2012. Curtailment of renewable generation: economic optimality and incentives. *Energy Policy* 49:663–75
138. Henriot A. 2015. Economic curtailment of intermittent renewable energy sources. *Energy Econ*. 49:370–79
139. Kane L, Ault G. 2014. A review and analysis of renewable energy curtailment schemes and principles of access: transitioning towards business as usual. *Energy Policy* 72:67–77
140. Mills AD, Wiser RH. 2015. Strategies to mitigate declines in the economic value of wind and solar at high penetration in California. *Appl. Energy* 147:269–78
141. IRENA. 2015. *Grid investments for renewables*. Rep., IRENA, Abu Dhabi, UAE
142. Lew D, Brinkman G, Ibanez E, Florita A, Heaney M, et al. 2013. *The Western wind and solar integration study phase 2*. Rep. NREL-55588, NREL, Golden, CO
143. NREL. 2011. *Eastern wind integration and transmission study*. Rep. NREL-47078, NREL, Golden, CO
144. Milligan M, Ela E, Lew D, Corbus D, Wan Y. 2010. Advancing wind integration study methodologies: implications of higher levels of wind. In *Proceedings of American Wind Energy Association, Windpower 2010, Dallas, TX*. Washington, DC: Am. Wind Energy Assoc.
145. ERCOT. 2006. *Analysis of transmission alternatives for competitive renewable energy zones in Texas*. ERCOT, Austin, TX
146. Onyeji I. 2014. Harnessing and integrating Africa's renewable energy resource. See Ref. 25, pp. 27–40
147. Martinot E, Kristov L, Erickson JD. 2015. Distribution system planning and innovation for distributed energy futures. *Curr. Sustain. Renew. Energy Rep.* 2:47–54
148. New York State Department of Public Service. 2014. *Reforming the energy vision: NYS Department of Public Service staff report and proposal*. Case 14-M-0101. New York State Department of Public Service, Albany, NY
149. Union of the Electricity Industry. 2013. *Active distribution system management: a key tool for the smooth integration of distributed generation*. Discuss. Pap., Eurelectric, Brussels, Belg.
150. Sterling J, Davidovich T, Cory K, Aznar A, McLaren J. 2015. *The flexible solar utility: preparing for solar's impacts to utility planning and operations*. Rep. NREL-64586, NREL, Golden, CO
151. EPRI. 2012. *Integrating smart distributed energy resources with distribution management systems: an EPRI overview on managing distributed energy resources*. White Pap., EPRI, Palo Alto, CA
152. Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS). 2015. *Renewables and reliability: grid management solutions to support California's clean energy future*. Rep., UCS, Cambridge, MA
153. Kirby B, Ela E, Milligan M. 2014. Analyzing the impact of variable energy resources on power system reserves. See Ref. 25, pp. 83–100
154. Ela E, Gevorgian V, Fleming P, Zhang YC, Singh M, et al. 2011. *Operating reserves and variable generation*. Rep. NREL-51978, NREL, Golden, CO
155. Eto J, Undrill J, Mackin P, Daschmans R, Williams B, et al. 2010. *Use of frequency response metrics to assess the planning and operating requirements for reliable integration of variable renewable generation*. Rep. LBNL-4142E, LBNL, Berkeley, CA
156. Gen. Elect. (GE) Energy. 2011. *California ISO (CAISO) frequency response study*. Rep., GE Energy, Schenectady, NY
157. Ela E, Gevorgian V, Tuohy A, Kirby B, Milligan M, O'Malley M. 2014. Market designs for the primary frequency response ancillary service. *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.* 29(1):421–31
158. Miller NW, Clark K. 2010. Advanced controls enable wind plants to provide ancillary services. *Proc. IEEE Power Energy Soc. Gen. Meet., Minneapol.*, 25–29 July, pp. 1–6. IEEE Power Energy Soc. **http://www.ieee-pes.org**
159. Ela E, Gevorgian V, Fleming P, Zhang YC, Singh M, et al. 2014. *Active power controls from wind power: bridging the gaps*. Rep. NREL-60574, NREL, Golden, CO
160. Hirth L, Ziegenhagen I. 2013. *Control power and variable renewables: a glimpse at German data*. Rep., Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan, Italy
161. IRENA. 2016. *Study on connection grid codes: technical regulations for power systems enabling higher shares of variable renewable energy*. Rep., IRENA, Abu Dhabi, UAE
162. TWENTIES Project. 2013. *Final report.* Rep., TWENTIES Proj. **http://www.twenties-project.eu/system/files/Twenties%20final%20report_web_v2.pdf**

163. Foley AM, Leahy PG, Marvuglia A, McKeogh EJ. 2012. Current methods and advances in forecasting of wind power generation. *Renew. Energy* 37:1–8
164. Botterud A. 2014. Forecasting renewable energy for grid operations. See Ref. 25, pp. 137–48
165. Ela E, Milligan M, Bloom A, Botterud A, Townsend A, Levin T. 2014. *Evolution of wholesale electricity market design with increasing levels of renewable generation*. Rep. NREL-61765, NREL, Golden, CO
166. Morales JM, Conejo AJ, Hadsen H, Pinson P, Zugno M. 2015. *Integrating Renewables in Electricity Markets. Operational Problems*. New York: Springer
167. Agora Energiewende. 2014. *Negative electricity prices: causes and effects*. Agora, Berlin, Ger.
168. Finon D, Pignon V. 2008. Electricity and long-term capacity adequacy: the quest for regulatory mechanism compatible with electricity market. *Utilities Policy* 16(8):143–58
169. Roques FA. 2008. Market design for generation adequacy: healing causes rather than symptoms. *Utilities Policy* 16(8):171–83
170. Edenhoffer O, Pichs-Madruga R, Sokono Y, Seyboth K, Kadner S, et al., eds. 2011. *Renewable Energy Sources and Climate Change Mitigation Special Report*. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press