

# Fair heat distribution under deficits in district heating networks

Felix Agner<sup>\*1</sup>, Pauline Kergus<sup>\*</sup>, Richard Pates<sup>\*</sup> and Anders Rantzer<sup>\*</sup>

**Abstract**—In order to improve the energy efficiency in district heating networks and the comfort of their customers, these networks need to overcome the problem of unfair heat distribution under heat deficits. This paper introduces a new strategy to achieve this thermal fairness objective: it is low-cost in terms of communication and computation. The proposed approach is illustrated on a simulation example.

## I. INTRODUCTION

District Heating networks are undergoing major changes as technological advances allow a transition to the so called 4th generation of district heating systems in order to play a role in future sustainable energy systems [1]. To fulfill this potential, district heating networks face different challenges, such as the integration of low-temperature sources or intermittent renewable energy sources. The global trend throughout the development of district heating networks has been to move toward low-temperature distribution. As space heating in buildings represents a substantial part of the global energy consumption [2], the development of sustainable buildings plays an important role in the transformation of district heating systems into fully sustainable energy systems. Therefore, coordinating the performance of the connected buildings (units) in order to improve the operation of the total system will be a useful tool in implementing the new generation of district heating systems.

As pointed out in [3], the development of advanced control strategies can help tackle these challenges. New strategies should explore the flexibility of district heating networks while traditional control strategies aim at making the heat supply equal to the heat demand. In particular, advanced control strategies should be able to ensure a fair distribution of the available energy among the buildings connected to the grid. The objective is then to limit the energy going to each building's substation in times of heat deficit. As explained in [4], the flow that is going from the grid into each substation is traditionally controlled locally, only having access to local information. In times of heat deficit it results in an unfair distribution of heat: the users close to the heat sources will be able to meet their demand exactly while consumers at the grid periphery will face a shortage as the peripheral differential pressure is too low to extract a sufficient flow.

This article aims at proposing a control strategy to fairly distribute the load deficit between the customers by changing

their heat demand in times of heat deficiency. As explained in [5], such approaches, based on modifying the user demand in order to reach a given objective, here fair heat distribution across the network, is called *Demand Response*. These methods have a rich literature in the context of power grids [6], [7], and are on the rise even in the context of district heating. A review of such techniques, deployed for district heating networks, is given in [5]. Demand response can be employed in many ways, one of which is when a central utility can directly influence the consumption of specific user appliances. This is referred to as *Direct Load Control*. When employed in the context of district heating, these techniques should account for both the buildings and network dynamics and face the following challenges.

They require a continuous communication of data, preferably having low computational time and a flexibility in managing different time-periods. While most of these techniques aim at the reduction or limitation of the thermal peak, or at the minimization of total heat consumption, this paper focuses exclusively on *thermal fairness*, as treated in [8]. In [8], this problem is tackled by centrally optimizing the heat power delivered to each building in order to achieve thermal fairness across the network. It is based on thermodynamic models of district heating networks. However, it might be challenging to implement for large district heating networks with several thousands of customers with respect to computation, communication, but also modeling. Indeed, as recalled in [9], all buildings are more or less unique, which makes it complicated to maintain a centralised model of each connected unit.

This paper tackles the problem of unfair heat distribution under heat deficits through a scalable and flexible control strategy. The proposed approach relies on a low-communication architecture and, as it does not imply solving an optimization problem, has a low computational cost. The main idea is to collect the desired heat demand of all the connected buildings and to use the aggregated demand to fairly divide the available heat power among the units through a novel allocation policy.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: preliminaries on buildings' thermal behaviour and their control are recalled in Section II to formalize the considered thermal fairness problem. The proposed approach is then introduced in Section III, starting with an overview of the strategy and the involved communication architecture before detailing the choice of the allocation policy and the tuning of the involved parameters. Finally, the proposed technique is applied on a simulation example in Section IV. Conclusions and outlooks are given in Section V.

<sup>\*</sup>Department of Automatic Control, Lund University, Sweden

<sup>1</sup>Contact: felix.agner@control.lth.se

This work is funded by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement No 834142 (ScalableControl). This work has been submitted to the IEEE for possible publication. Copyright may be transferred without notice, after which this version may no longer be accessible.




Fig. 1: Indoor climate control for units connected to a district heating network: each unit extracts a heat load  $P$  from the grid through a heat exchanger (HEX), heating the water in the heating system (temperature  $T_{hs}$ ). The heating system radiates heat  $q_{hs}$  to the interior of the building (temperature  $T_{in}$ ), which in turn radiates heat  $q_{ext}$  to the exterior (temperature  $T_{ext}$ ).

## II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

In order to achieve a fair heat distribution among district heating networks, it is necessary to understand how the connected units extract heat power through individual control and how it influences their indoor temperature, which is represented on Figure 1. The thermal behaviour of buildings is detailed in II-A and their indoor climate control is detailed in II-B. The problem of unfair heat distribution is then highlighted in II-C on a numerical example that will be used throughout this paper to illustrate the proposed approach.

### A. Building thermal dynamics

In this paper, a simple model based on a classical thermal resistance–capacitance (RC) approach is used to describe a building’s thermal dynamics. The system described is designed as a classical district heating unit in Sweden [10]. The indoor temperature is denoted  $T_{in}$  and its evolution is described by:

$$C_{in}\dot{T}_{in} = q_{ext} - q_{hs}, \quad (1)$$

where  $q_{ext}$  denotes the heat-flow between the interior and the exterior of the building while  $q_{hs}$  corresponds to the heat flow between the building’s heating system and the interior space. The interior space is characterized by its thermal capacitance  $C_{in}$ . The heat flows involved in (1) are given below:

$$q_{ext} = \frac{1}{R_{ext}}(T_{in} - T_{ext}), \quad (2)$$

$$q_{hs} = \frac{1}{R_{hs}}(T_{hs} - T_{in}), \quad (3)$$

where  $R_{ext}$  is the thermal resistance between the interior and exterior, depending on the building’s insulation, and  $R_{hs}$  is the thermal resistance between the heating system and the interior.

The heat flow  $q_{hs}$  furnished by the heating system is determined by the temperature  $T_{hs}$ , which is the temperature of water flowing through the building’s piping.  $T_{hs}$  is described by (4) and depends on the heat load  $P$  extracted from the district heating network through the building’s heat exchanger, which connects the building to the grid and has a coefficient of performance (COP)  $\eta$  (assumed to be constant) connecting the unit to the district heating network.

$$C_{hs}\dot{T}_{hs} = -q_{hs} + \eta P, \quad (4)$$

*Remark 1:* In practice, the indoor temperature is affected by other factors such as resident activities, solar irradiation, forced ventilation, and complicated heat diffusion patterns. Such additional heat flows are neglected in (1), see [11] for a more complete description based on an RC approach. In the present case, the proposed model reflects the impact of the heat delivery and the outdoor temperature, which is sufficient to illustrate the proposed approach.

### B. Indoor temperature control

Each building connected to the network is equipped with its own controller determining the amount of heat power to extract from the district heating network in order to ensure that the customers comfort requirements are met. The objective is to maintain the indoor temperature  $T_{in}$  around a desired comfort temperature  $T_c$ . To that extent, the controller should ensure that the temperature  $T_{hs}$  of the water flowing in the heating system is sufficient in order to reject the disturbances, here the outdoor temperature  $T_{ext}$ . In the present case, we will assume that the controller is composed of a feedforward component and a feedback component, which is common standard in the Swedish systems as suggested in [10]. The feedforward determines the necessary temperature in the heating system  $T_{hs}^{ref}$  according to the outdoor temperature  $T_{ext}$ :

$$T_{hs}^{ref} = a_0 + a_1 T_{ext} \quad (5)$$

where  $a_0$  and  $a_1$  are tuned according to the buildings RC-characteristics to ensure comfort requirements. The feedback then determines the desired heat load  $\tilde{P}$  to be extracted from the district heating network in order for  $T_{hs}$  to track  $T_{hs}^{ref}$ . It consists of a proportional gain  $k_p$ :

$$\tilde{P} = k_p(T_{hs}^{ref} - T_{hs}) \quad (6)$$

*Remark 2:* In practice, other controller structures (such as PI or PID) can be implemented in buildings, and the proposed methodology could be extended to these cases.

### C. Heat deficit and unfair distribution

Given  $N$  buildings, if each building  $i$  wants to extract heat power  $\tilde{P}_i$  from the district heating grid, the heat distribution

TABLE I: Simulation Parameters

Unit	$R_{\text{ext}}$ ( $^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{kW}$ )	$R_{\text{hs}}$ ( $^{\circ}\text{C}/\text{kW}$ )	$C_{\text{in}}$ ( $\text{kJ}/^{\circ}\text{C}$ )	$C_{\text{hs}}$ ( $\text{kJ}/^{\circ}\text{C}$ )	$\eta$ (no unit)	$k_p$ ( $\text{kW}/^{\circ}\text{C}$ )	$a_1$ ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ )	$a_0$ (no unit)
1	201.6	270.0	1000	20	0.90	100	1.54	50.8
2	180.0	270.0	1000	17	0.87	100	1.73	54.6
3	160.1	280.8	1300	20	0.90	200	1.88	57.6

will be fair as long as the total heat consumption does not exceed the total available heat power  $P_{\text{max}}$ , i.e:

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{P}_i \leq P_{\text{max}}. \quad (7)$$

In times of high heat demand, district heating networks can reach saturation at this upper limit: the controllers in the units' substations will require high flows to satisfy their heat demand, and thus open their control valves, which in turn leads to a significant pressure drop along the network. The units at the far end of the network will not experience enough differential pressure to supply the necessary flow, leading to their temperatures dropping, whereas other buildings are relatively unaffected.

This problem is illustrated here on a simple numerical example, as represented in Figure 1: three buildings, whose parameters are given in Table I, are connected to the district heating network. For this simulation, the outdoor temperature

$T_{\text{ext}}$  comes from the Swedish Meteorological and Hydrological Institute [12] and is open access. The data is from the Swedish town of Gävle Jan. 25 to Feb. 3 2019, sampled on an hourly basis and interpolated. It is visible in Figure 2a along with the corresponding total heat demand  $P_{\text{tot}}$  needed in order to maintain a temperature  $T_c = 20^{\circ}\text{C}$  in the three buildings. When the outdoor temperature turns cold, the heat demand saturates at the limit  $P_{\text{max}} = 2200\text{kW}$  and the desired heat load  $\sum_i \tilde{P}_i$  begins exceeding the threshold. The demand cannot be satisfied, and the impact on the units' indoor temperatures is visible in Figure 2b: As the first two units extract heat freely from the network, their demand is met, while there is not enough heat power left for the last unit which faces degrading indoor climate.

*Remark 3:* In practice, the upper limit  $P_{\text{max}}$  from (7) is time-varying, it depends on the available heat supply from the connected heat sources, but also on the networks' dynamics such as delays and losses.

### III. COORDINATION STRATEGY


The problem caused by the current lack of coordination which we seek to combat is that the indoor temperature in certain units will deviate heavily under heat deficiency. In a perfectly equal system, no unit would experience worse temperature deviations than other units. A suitable metric for the discomfort of a customer is

$$J = \int_{t_0}^{t_{\text{end}}} |T_c - T_{\text{in}}(t)| dt, \quad (8)$$


where  $J$  is the experienced user discomfort between the times  $t_0$  and  $t_{\text{end}}$  and  $T_c$  is the desired comfort temperature.

To achieve a fair distribution of heat in the problem scenario where the system experiences heat deficiency, the units need to be coordinated in some way. Many of the works written on direct load control in district heating networks have a model predictive control-based solution [8], [13]. While these strategies are sophisticated and can achieve other goals such as predictive behavior and general load optimization, they can be hard to implement in practice due to high demands on system models, measurements and communication. To achieve a strategy that is more readily implementable in existing infrastructure, the strategy should preferably have few such requirements.

Fig. 3 shows the proposed solution architecture. Each unit calculates their desired heat load  $\tilde{P}_i$  and sends it to a central summation unit. The central unit compares the sum of requested loads to the maximum possible load ( $P_{\text{max}}$ ), and returns the deficit ( $P_{\text{sat}}$ ). The units then subtract a portion of  $P_{\text{sat}}$  from their individual load so that the total load does not exceed  $P_{\text{max}}$ . The strategy is formulated mathematically:



(a) Outdoor temperature  $T_{\text{ext}}$  and total furnished heat power  $P$  along with desired heat power  $\tilde{P}$ .



(b) Indoor temperature

Fig. 2: The uncoordinated case, all three units function individually. The third unit experiences the full heat deficit.




Fig. 3: An illustration of how information is propagated in the suggested coordination scheme. Individual unit controllers  $K_i$  upload their desired heat load  $\tilde{P}_i$ , and a central unit computes and distributes the current heat deficit  $P_{\text{sat}}$ .

$$P_{\text{sat}} = \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{P}_i - P_{\text{max}}, & \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{P}_i > P_{\text{max}} \\ 0, & \text{else,} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

$$P_i = \tilde{P}_i - w_i P_{\text{sat}}. \quad (10)$$

$w_i$  is a weight that distributes the heat deficit among units, where  $\sum_i w_i = 1$ . This coordination law ensures  $\sum_i P_i \leq P_{\text{max}}$ . The control law requires only two steps of communication - the individual units sending their desired  $\tilde{P}_i$  to a central unit for summation, and the central unit distributing  $P_{\text{sat}}$  to the controllers. There is no central optimization involved. Increasing the size of the network only requires adding more parameters  $w_i$ . These factors combined make the architecture highly scalable. The choice of the parameters  $w_i$  defines the coordination strategy. In this paper we investigate four different choices of  $w_i$ ; *skewed*, *flat*, *gain-proportional* and *price-proportional*.

#### A. Proposed coordination strategies

1) *Skewed strategy*: In the most extreme case of unfair heat distribution, the weights  $w_i$  would be:

$$w_i = \begin{cases} 0, & i \neq N \\ 1, & i = N \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

This means that the last unit is subject to the full saturation, a scenario similar to a district heating network with no coordination, i.e. the current architecture. This coordination strategy, or rather lack of coordination, will be referred to as *skewed*.

2) *Flat strategy*: A straight-forward strategy would be

$$w_i = \frac{1}{N}, \quad (12)$$

so that the saturation is distributed equally over all units. This strategy requires no knowledge or modeling of individual units whatsoever. However this strategy also does not take into account the individual characteristics of units. We will refer to this strategy as *flat* coordination.

3) *Gain-proportional strategy*: To account for the difference between units, we turn to our model of the buildings. Given a saturation  $P_{\text{sat}}$  and the coordination introduced in (10), the final heat consumption of a unit is

$$P = k_p(a_0 + a_1 T_{\text{ext}} - T_{\text{hs}}) - w P_{\text{sat}}. \quad (13)$$

Note that the index  $i$  for unit  $i$  is excluded here for ease of notation. When combined with (1) and (4), this gives the full dynamics of the unit. The evolution of this system depends on the disturbance  $T_{\text{out}}$ , but to ensure the system is not systematically unfair, we investigate the stationary case of  $\dot{T}_{\text{in}} = 0$ ,  $\dot{T}_{\text{hs}} = 0$ , which the system will converge to given a constant outdoor temperature as the system is stable. When solving for the stationary indoor temperature  $T_{\text{in}}^0$  given stationary exterior temperature  $T_{\text{ext}}^0$  and stationary heat deficit  $P_{\text{sat}}^0$ , we receive

$$T_{\text{in}}^0 = \frac{(1+k_p\eta R_{\text{hs}}+k_p\eta a_1 R_{\text{ext}})T_{\text{ext}}^0 + R_{\text{ext}}k_p\eta a_0 - R_{\text{ext}}\eta w P_{\text{sat}}^0}{1+k_p\eta R_{\text{hs}}+k_p\eta R_{\text{ext}}}. \quad (14)$$

We assume that each unit has been tuned to reject the stationary error of the outdoor temperature, i.e. that  $T_{\text{out}}$  will not affect this stationary temperature. According to (14), this holds if

$$1 + k_p\eta R_{\text{hs}} + k_p\eta a_1 R_{\text{ext}} = 0. \quad (15)$$

Assuming that the unit is well tuned in this way, the remaining contribution to the temperature will be

$$T_{\text{in}}^0 = \frac{R_{\text{ext}}k_p\eta a_0 - R_{\text{ext}}\eta w P_{\text{sat}}^0}{1 + k_p\eta R_{\text{hs}} + k_p\eta R_{\text{ext}}}. \quad (16)$$

Here (15) allows the exchange  $1 + k_p\eta R_{\text{hs}} = -k_p\eta a_1 R_{\text{ext}}$ . Thus the temperature deviation caused by the coordination strategy,  $\Delta T_{\text{in}}^0$  will be

$$\Delta T_{\text{in}}^0 = -\frac{w}{k_p(1-a_1)} P_{\text{sat}}^0. \quad (17)$$

This motivates the *gain-proportional* strategy (18).

$$w_i = \frac{k_p^i(1-a_1^i)}{\sum_{j=1}^N k_p^j(1-a_1^j)} \quad (18)$$

Here the  $w_i$  is proportional to the controller gain  $k_p$  and the temperature set-point feed-forward factor  $a_1$  of unit  $i$ . When inserted in (17), the resulting deviation is

$$\Delta T_{\text{in}}^0 = -\frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^N k_p^j(1-a_1^j)} P_{\text{sat}}^0. \quad (19)$$

This expression is without unit-individual parameters, and thus the deviation is equal for all units.

*Remark 4*: Only the stationary case is covered by this motivation. Differences will in practice be seen in a dynamic system where time-constants vary between units and the disturbance is non-constant, which motivates the following simulation study.




Fig. 4: Indoor temperatures, along with unit 3 from the *skewed* strategy,  $T_{sk}$ .

4) *Price-proportional strategy*: The objective might not be to produce an entirely equal temperature deviation in all buildings. It is possible that some units are more inflexible with regards to comfort temperature, and are willing to pay to avoid deviations. Thus a fourth coordination is possible, by introducing a price factor  $\lambda$ .

$$w_i = \frac{1}{\lambda_i} \frac{k_p^i (1 - a_1^i)}{\sum_{j=1}^N k_p^j (1 - a_1^j) / \lambda_j}, \quad (20)$$

where  $\lambda_i$  indicates the price a customer is willing to pay to avoid temperature deviations due to coordination. We can see that this coordination strategy is structurally similar to (18), but with the inclusion of the price factor. We will therefore refer to it as the *price-proportional* strategy. The temperature deviation that arises in a unit is

$$\Delta T_{in}^0 = - \frac{1}{\lambda \sum_{j=1}^N k_p^j (1 - a_1^j) / \lambda_j} P_{sat}^0, \quad (21)$$

which is inverse-proportional to the price factor  $\lambda$ .

#### IV. SIMULATIONS

The following study compares different coordination techniques on three units in a district heating network. Four examples follow, examining the effect of the coordination strategies *skewed* (11), *flat* (12), *gain-proportional* (18) and *price-proportional* (20) respectively. All experiments utilize the same weather data and the same maximum extracted heat power  $P_{max} = 2200\text{kW}$ . The parameters used for simulation are shown in Table I.

In the first example, the *skewed* strategy, there is no coordination between the units. This was demonstrated as the illustrating example of the problem in section II, where Fig. 2 showed the results. Fig. 2b showed how this strategy leads to the temperature dropping several degrees in unit 3, while units 1 and 2 deviate very little from comfort temperature.

The *flat* coordination technique follows (12), i.e. the saturation is divided equally among all three units. The results shown in Fig. 4a indicate an improvement to the *skewed* case. Here all units deviate from comfort temperature, meaning that no individual unit experiences deviations of the previous magnitude. However, unit 3 in this scenario has higher

controller gains  $k_p$  and  $a_1$  than the other two units. The result is that this unit can greedily utilize a greater load than the other two, and thus experiences a lower deviation from comfort temperature.

We investigate the effect of using the *gain-proportional* coordination strategy (18) in Fig. 4b. Here, units with higher controller and set-point gains will be penalized with a higher proportion of the heat power deficit. The difference in indoor temperature between the three units is now more equal than the two previous simulations, demonstrating a significant improvement. However when comparing the *flat* and the *gain-proportional* strategies, it has to be considered that there is an increased complexity involved in the *gain-proportional* strategy, and it is based on stronger assumptions on the model of the building.

Finally the results of a simulation using the *price-based* strategy (20) is shown in Fig. 4c. Units 1 and 2 are willing to pay double the price  $\lambda$  compared to unit 3, and their indoor temperatures deviate half as much as the indoor temperature of unit 3.

Fig. 5 shows the discomfort experienced by each unit through the simulation, calculated through (8). The results




Fig. 5: Discomfort metric for each building through each coordination strategy.

TABLE II: Discomfort measures.

Discomfort (°Ch)	unit 1	unit 2	unit 3	total
Skewed:	4.7	1.7	128.3	134.7
Flat:	56.5	51.8	25.5	133.8
Gain:	43.4	43.0	45.4	131.9
Price:	31.6	31.7	67.3	130.6

TABLE III: Heat consumption.

Heat consumption (MWh)	unit 1	unit 2	unit 3	total
Skewed:	97.3	112.7	118.8	328.8
Flat:	96.0	111.2	121.7	328.9
Gain:	96.2	111.4	121.1	328.8
Price:	96.5	111.7	120.5	328.8

indicate that the skewed strategy indeed creates a skewed distribution of discomfort. Unit three experiences higher discomfort than any unit in any simulation. In the flat strategy the distribution is improved, but is not quite fair. The gain-proportional strategy provides an almost perfectly equal distribution of discomfort. Lastly the price-proportional strategy demonstrates how unit 3 experiences twice the discomfort of the other two units, proportional to their price factors, showing how this strategy indeed can be utilized to approach flexibility between units. Table II illustrates the same data in numbers, as well as the total discomfort. We can see that the total discomfort among units varies very little between the strategies. Table III illustrates the heat consumption during the simulations, showing no major variation in total or individual consumption between strategies.

## V. CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOKS

### A. Conclusions

The proposed direct load control method as a response to heat deficiency in district heating networks has shown to be able to increase the fairness of heat distribution significantly in the sense that units will experience similar levels of temperature deviations. The main contribution of the method in comparison to the related literature is the simplicity, lack of centralized modeling, and ease of calculation (indeed the main computation is only a sum). The simplicity of calculation makes the method highly scalable. The data required to run the method is individual unit heat consumption and controller gains, but in the current district heating architecture this would already be known to the district heating operator through installation of substations (controller parameters) and invoicing (heat consumption), making it feasible in practice.

The skewed strategy simulation, corresponding to the current system design, demonstrates how much improvement could be made even with the simple flat strategy which rests on few assumptions on both the individual units and grid dynamics. As coordinating the units in this way increases robustness in the sense that a heat deficit will not impact user comfort levels to the same degree, it is possible that this could allow district heating grids to be designed with a

lower design load in mind, increasing the resource efficiency of the grid.

### B. Future Work

The investigated building models can be extended. Useful contributions would be including internal controllers of PI(D) structure and modelling non-linearities such as time delays and non-linear heat transfer through the heat exchanger.

Modeling time delays between units, heat losses, and non-linear pressure distributions could improve and expand the notion of  $P_{max}$  to better represent the network constraints.

The method could be improved by considering time dynamics, accounting for the heat capacity of buildings so that not only the stationary case is investigated mathematically. This could also involve predictive behaviour, as is often utilized in a model predictive control architecture, so as to offer peak-shaving and valley filling through pre-heating units in anticipation of high loads.

Furthermore, even though the proposed architecture is light-weight, it would be interesting to consider means of reducing the dependency on communication even further. For instance through strategic measurements in the network, such as available differential pressure at the peripheral units.

## REFERENCES

- [1] H. Lund, S. Werner, R. Wiltshire, S. Svendsen, JE. Thorsen, F. Hvelplund, and BV. Mathiesen. 4th Generation District Heating (4GDH): Integrating smart thermal grids into future sustainable energy systems. *Energy*, 2014.
- [2] L. Pérez-Lombard, J. Ortiz, and C. Pout. A review on buildings energy consumption information. *Energy and buildings*, 2008.
- [3] A. Vandermeulen, B. van der Heijde, and L. Helsen. Controlling district heating and cooling networks to unlock flexibility: A review. *Energy*, 2018.
- [4] S Frederiksen and S Werner. *District heating and cooling*. Studentlitteratur, 2013.
- [5] Elisa Guelpa and Vittorio Verda. Demand response and other demand side management techniques for district heating: A review. *Energy*, 219:119440, 2021.
- [6] Niamh O’Connell, Pierre Pinson, Henrik Madsen, and Mark O’Malley. Benefits and challenges of electrical demand response: A critical review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 39:686–699, 11 2014.
- [7] Nikolaos Paterakis, Ozan Erdinç, and João Catalão. An overview of demand response: Key-elements and international experience. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 69:871–891, 03 2017.
- [8] Saptarshi Bhattacharya, Vikas Chandan, Vijay Arya, and Koushik Kar. Demand response for thermal fairness in district heating networks. *IEEE Transactions on Sustainable Energy*, PP:1–1, 07 2018.
- [9] Fredrik Wernstedt, Paul Davidsson, and Christian Johansson. Demand side management in district heating systems. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Joint Conference on Autonomous Agents and Multiagent Systems*, New York, NY, USA, 2007. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [10] Jonas Gustafsson, Jerker Delsing, and Jan van Deventer. Improved district heating substation efficiency with a new control strategy. *Applied Energy*, 87(6):1996 – 2004, 2010.
- [11] P. Bacher and H. Madsen. Identifying suitable models for the heat dynamics of buildings. *Energy and Buildings*, 2011.
- [12] Swedish Meteorological and Hydrological Institute. <https://www.smhi.se/en/services/open-data/search-smhi-s-open-data-1.81004>.
- [13] Costanza Saletti, Agostino Gambarotta, and Mirko Morini. Development, analysis and application of a predictive controller to a small-scale district heating system. *Applied Thermal Engineering*, 165:114558, 10 2019.