

## Energy balance calculation for positive energy districts: A Review of the status quo and challenges

Vicky Albert-Seifried<sup>1</sup>, Gerhard Stryi-Hipp<sup>1</sup>, Laura Aelenei<sup>2</sup>, Lina Murauskaite<sup>3</sup>, Savis Gohari Krangsås<sup>4</sup>, Daniela Baer<sup>5</sup>, Beril Alpagut<sup>6</sup>, Paolo Civiero<sup>7</sup>, Marc-André Triebel<sup>1</sup>, Marie Gondeck<sup>1</sup>

**Keywords: Positive Energy Districts (PEDs); Energy Balance Calculation; Quantitative Methods; PED Assessment** 

The strategic vision of creating 100 Positive Energy Districts (PEDs) across Europe by 2025 is compelling. PEDs are seen as one of the key drivers for the urban energy transformation. The PED concept is evolving and in recent years, there has been a growing number of PED-oriented initiatives and projects especially in Europe. While these PED projects may share some common values and goals, there is not a common PED definition. Several EU organisations or programmes established their own PED definitions, but these definitions are primarily qualitative description in nature. They are often overly general and thus, open to interpretation. As a result, different PED projects set different baselines, which makes it difficult for comparison.

There is a call for a common European PED definition and within which, a clear quantitative method for assessing PEDs. A core part of the quantitative method concerns the energy balance calculation as a positive balance is a distinctive characteristic of PEDs. This paper presents a review of the energy balance calculation methods used in existing PED-relevant projects. By drawing similarities and finding discrepancies between

\_

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Fraunhofer Institute for Solar Energy Systems ISE, Heidenhofstr. 2, 79110 Freiburg, Germany, vicky.bo.ki.albert-seifried@ise.fraunhofer.de (corresponding author), gerhard.stryihipp@ise.fraunhofer.de, marc-andre.triebel@ise.fraunhofer.de and marie.gondeck@ise.fraunhofer.de.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> National Energy and Geology Laboratory (LNEG), Paço do Lumiar 22, Lisbon, Portugal, laura.aelenei@lneg.pt.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Lithuanian Energy Institute, Breslaujos st. 3, LT-44403 Kaunas, Lithuania, lina.murauskaite@lei.lt.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research (NIBR), Oslo Metropolitan University, 0166 Oslo, Norway, savisgk@oslomet.no.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> SINTEF Community, Strindveien 4, 7034 Trondheim, Norway, daniela.baer@sintef.no.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Smart Cities Department, Demir Energy, 34718 Istanbul, Turkey, balpagut@demirenerji.com.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> University of Roma Tre, 00153 Rome, Italy, paolo.civiero@uniroma3.it.

## 4<sup>th</sup> International Conference SSPCR Smart and Sustainable Planning for Cities and Regions 2022



the methods, the paper aims to identify the gaps in existing work. It will discuss the challenges in developing a common calculation method and conclude by outlining possible ways forward. The outcome of this work will shed light on the development of a common PED definition, particularly on the setting of tangible criteria, which represents a crucial step towards the PED vision.