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## $+$ <br> Out topic as a riddle:

■What is:
■ Renewable \& abundant
■ Technologically mature
■ Closely situated to demand
$■$ Easily integrated to the built environment

■ Silent

- Almost maintenance



## + Agenda

- Background on energy cooperation and the HiQSTEP project
- The results of our EU practices review

■ Benchmarking the status in third countries
■ A city-level technical potential assessment

- CBA and scenario building
- Can this work out in GCC region?
- Questions and feedback


## + EU HiQSTEP Project Objective



The objective of the Project is to provide short-term expertise which can be mobilised at short notice in order to carry out different types of studies
The Project started on 13 January 2014. It runs for 4 years (January 2018).
$\square$ The Budget is 5M EUR and it is funded by the EU (DG NEAR)

## The EaP Countries Question(s)

- Does it malke sense for a country to go forward with rooftop PV?

Towards a stronger Eastern Partnership

- How much should we develop?
- How we may possibly dévelop a "programme"
- What are the costs?
- What are the benefits?



## The answer: A Building PV regional study

EU practices


Technical Potential Assessment

## HiQSTEP Building Solar Power Study

Component 1: Review of EU practices

## ■

## Component l: Key Results

## The pattern and trend of PV installation in EU



Source: SPE, Global Market Outlook 2016


## Component 1: Key Results

## Prosumer Models (in terms of production based support scheme characteristics)

|  | / |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Production based: classical "FiT" - style. No self-consumption | Self-consumption with constraints | Self-consumption $+\mathrm{FiT}$ | Net-billing | Net-metering | Self-consumption <br> + Premium |
| 1 | Right to selfconsume | Not Allowed | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2 | Revenues from self-consumed PV | N/A | Savings on the electricity bill | Savings on the electricity bill | Netting of production revenues and consumption costs | Savings on the electricity bill | Savings on the electricity bill |
|  | Additional revenues on selfconsumed PV | N/A | No | No | No | No | Premium |
| 3 | Charges to finance $T \& D$ cost | N/A | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| 4 | Revenues from excess electricity | $N / A$ | Zero | < retail price | <= retail price | = retail price | > retail price |
| 5 | Maximum timeframe for compensation | $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{A}$ | Real-time | Real-time | Long period | Long period | Real time |

## Component l: Key Results

Business Models Taxonomy

## Solar PV Ownership Models

## Third Party Ownership (IPO)

# Direct Ownership 

## PPI

## Lease

PPA, Net metering, etc.

## Component l: Key Results

## Support Schemes \& their taxonomy



## Component l: Key Results

## Funding of support schemes

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|c|c|c|c|}\hline & \begin{array}{c}\text { No support } \\
\text { schemes in } \\
\text { place }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { General } \\
\text { taxation paid } \\
\text { by all } \\
\text { citizens }\end{array}
$$ \& \begin{array}{c}Through specific non-tax <br>
levies like PSOs paid by <br>
all customers via <br>

electricity bills\end{array} \& Other\end{array}\right]\)|  |
| :--- |
| Austria |
| Belgium |
| Czech Republic |
| Denmark |
| Estonia |
| Finland |
| France |
| Germany |
| Greece |
| Hungary |

## HiQSTEP Building Solar Power Study

Component 2: Review of EaP Countries practices

## $+$

## Component 2: BaP counties status

quo
Contents of the Component 2 report:
An overview of building PV (common \& national specificities)

## 6 Specific Country Profiles

Review criteria provided by Cl

Conclusions and country recommendations

## An overview of the criteria (1/2)

- Liberalised \& liquid ?

Electricity Market

- Vertically integrated?
- Targets (by year, by technology)
- Institutional setting
- RES support scheme
- Cost coverage \& distribution


## An overview of the criteria (2/2)



- Simplified connection procedure

Connection \& Access

- Access (curtailment rules)
- Business model
- Programme/Project finance


## HiQSTEP Building Solar Power Study

Component 3: Surface-based building-PV potential assessment

## Component 3: Methodology in a nutshell - 1 Assessment of existing GIS data



Existing Cadastral data
Option-2


Aerial/Satellite imagery


GIS output
Expected accuracy reduction of Option-3 vs. Option-1: $\leq 10 \%$

Building classification

## Component 3: Methodology in a nutshell - 2 Estimation of PV potential

## Component 3: Market Segments

Segment A (Residential):

- Single-family houses
- Larger but more fragmented market

Segment B (Non-residential):

- Multi-family, commercial, industrial, public
- Smaller but more attainable market segment



## Component 3: Potential




Target Cities: Chisinau, Balti, Cahul Seg. A: 0.16 GWp / Seg. B: 0.34 GWp

Cities: Tbilisi, Batumi, Kutaisi, Rustavi Segm. A: 0.8 GWp / Segment B: l GWp


Cities: Baku, Sumgayit, Ganja Seg. A: 2.8 GWp / Seg. B: 0.8 GWp

Cities:Yerevan, Vanazdor, Gyumri Seg. A: 1.8 GWp / Seg. B: 0.5 GWp

## .

## Component 3: Average Specific Annual Yield (kWh/kWp)



## HiQSTEP Building Solar Power Study

Component 5: Programme planning based on Costs \& Benefits

## Components 4 \& 5: CBAs and Programming

- Staged development scenarios (Market segment, MWp/y, level of support)
- End-user point of view
- CBA = social planner's view
- Cost of policy support
- Environmental/social benefits
- Grid benefits/costs
- Other potential issues:
- Relation with national RES targets
- Relation with CoM SEAPs
- Off-grid applications

- Source of financing (NIF/E5P, etc.)


## From theoretical potential to scenario building

Components in progress: 4 and 5
Surface-based calculation of roof area and installed PV capacity (C3)

Only 20\% of Residential

- Multiple constraints (International experience)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 30 \%(2018-24) \\
& 70 \%(2025-30)
\end{aligned}
$$

- S-curve effect

Low (5\%)
Mid (50\%)
High (100\%)

- Level of support as a driver


## + Example: Attractiveness of

 building PV in Ukraine Levelised Cost of Electricity (LCOE)

## Costs and Benefits

Policy level cost and environmental benefits:

| PV capacity potential, MW (Component 3) | 2618.22 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Medium Scenario |  | High Scenario |  |
| Estimated total installed capacity over 2018-2022 (MW) | 280.5 |  | 561.0 |  |
| Total electricity produced over lifetime (kWh) Policy implemented | 5,613,013,949 |  | 11,223,176,081 |  |
|  | FiT $€ / \mathrm{kWh}$ |  | Capital Grant €/MW | FiT $£ / \mathrm{kWh}$ |
| Total Capital Grant cost, over 2018-2022 (€/MW) <br> Average annual Capital Grant cost ( $€$ /year) <br> Capital Grant cost per kWh produced ( $€ / \mathrm{kWh}$ ) | $\begin{array}{r} € 176,901,750 \\ € 35,380,350 \\ € 0.03 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} € 414,690,993 \\ € 82,938,199 \\ € 0.04 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
| Total FiT Cost, over lifetime ( $€ / \mathrm{kWh}$ ) Average annual FiT cost ( $€$ /year) Cost of FiT per kWh produced |  | $\begin{array}{r} € 809,266,685 \\ € 32,370,667.41 \\ € 0.14 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} € 1,932,172,314 \\ € 77,286,893 \\ € 0.17 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Benefits |  |  |  |  |
| CO2 emissions saved (tCO2) Value of CO2 emission saved ( $€ / \mathrm{tCO} 2$ ) Jobs creation (jobs-year/MW) | $\begin{gathered} 4,529,702 \\ € 30,258,411 \\ 7,139 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 9,057,103 \\ € 60,501,449 \\ 14,279 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Impact of FIT on consumers | Annual Average over lifetime |  | Annual Averageover lifetime |  |
| Annual total electricity consumption - Armenia, kWh Total annual FiT cost - High Scenario |  | $126,215,932,991$ $€ 32,370,667$ |  | $126,215,932,991$ $€ 77,286,893$ |
| Cost per kWh consumed |  | $€ 0.000$ |  | € 0.001 |
| Average retail electr. price (resid+non-resid) over the period $€ / \mathrm{kWh}$ |  | $€ 0.087$ |  | $€ 0.087$ |
| Impact on average retail electr. price |  | € 0.003 |  | $€ 0.007$ |
| Household consumption kWh/year |  | 2080 |  | 2080 |
| Impact on Household bill $€$ /year |  | € 0.53 |  | € 1.27 |

## Can this work in the GCC region Food for thought:

■ What would be the motives (including benefits expected) for introducing rooftop PV in the region particularly in the light of higher LCOE compared to other RES (and in particular solar technologies)?

■ What would be the most promising support schemes for the technology and how the extra cost may be covered/distributed?

■ Is there any assessment of the technical potential (in installed capacity or expected annual yield) at city level in the region?

■ Is there any anticipation for specific market segments which may comprise attractive application areas e.g. tertiary sector buildings?

## Can this work in the GCC region Food for thought:

■ Is there any obligation for RES in buildings imposed by means of building energy performance regulations?

■ How can an investment programme on rooftop PV be envisaged? Based on sovereign funds, with private lending or by a combination of the above? Are there any applications in which project financing has been used?

■ Can PV prosumers interact with the electricity market?
■ Is there any assessment on the penetration limits for Variable Renewable Energy additions to the national/regional electricity system?

## Closing remark: the future is now

- Google Project Sunroof

- The 3 D's of our electricity future


Image:Younicos
"By failing to prepare, you are preparing to fail" - Benjamin Franklin

## Thank you

## Contact:

Nikos Tourlis
Study Team Leader
nikos.tourlis@gmail.com
faceboolk.com/studeast

