MPRA

Munich Personal RePEc Archive

Simulating the potential of swarm grids for pre-electrified communities - A case study from Yemen

Martha M. Hoffmann and Dawud Ansari

Energy Access and Development Program (EADP), Technische Universität Berlin (TU Berlin), German Institute for Economic Research (DIW Berlin)

23 July 2018

EADP

Discussion
Paper

Simulating the potential of swarm grids for pre-electrified communities -

A case study from Yemen

by Martha Hoffmann & Dawud Ansari

Simulating the potential of swarm grids for pre-electrified communities - A case study from Yemen [*]

Martha M. Hoffmann [†1,2] and Dawud Ansari [‡1,3]

[1]Energy Access and Development Program (EADP), Pflügerstr. 18, 12047 Berlin, Germany
[2]Technische Universität Berlin (TU Berlin), Straße des 17. Juni 135, 10623 Berlin, Germany
[3]German Institute for Economic Research (DIW Berlin), Mohrenstr. 58, 10117 Berlin, Germany

July 23, 2018

Abstract:

Swarm grids are an emerging approach for electrification in the Global South that interconnects individual household generation and storage to a small electricity network for making full use of existing generation capacities. Using a simulation tool for demand, weather, and power flows, we analyse the potential of an AC swarm grid for a large pre-electrified village in rural Yemen. Service quality and financial indicators are compared to the cases of individual supply and a centralised micro grid.

While the swarm grid would, in fact, improve supply security from currently 12.4 % (Tier 2) to 81.7 % (Tier 3) at lower levelised costs, it would be inferior to the micro grid in both service (Tier 4) and costs. This is mainly driven by the large pre-installed fossil-fuel generator and storage capacities in our case study. However, this situation may be representative for other relevant locations. Under these conditions, a swarm grid poses the danger to create (possibly-undesired) incentives to invest in diesel generators, and it may fail to support prosumerism effectively.

Nevertheless, the swarm's evolutionary nature with the possibility for staggered investments (e.g. in smaller yet complementary groups of consumers) poses a central advantage over micro grids in the short-term alleviation of energy poverty.

Keywords: Swarm electrification, swarm grid, micro grid, energy access, distributed generation, Yemen

---

[*]The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position of any of their institutions.
[†]martha.hoffmann@eadp.eu
[‡]ansari@eadp.eu

ملخص:

تعد شبكات السرب إحدى الطرق الناشئة للكهربة (لإدخال الكهرباء) في الدول النامية، حيث يتم ربط التوليد والتخزين الكهربي بين المنازل لتكوين منظومة كهربائية صغيرة لتحقيق الاستخدام الأمثل لسعة التوليد الكهربي المتواجدة مسبقا. قمنا في هذه الورقة بتحليل إمكانية لشبكة سرب تعمل على التيار المتردد في قرية كبيرة سبق كهربتها في ريف اليمن باستخدام أداة محاكاة لجانب الطلب، الحالة الجوية، وتدفق القوى الكهربية. كما قمنا بمقارنة لجودة الخدمة والمؤشرات المالية لشبكة السرب في القرية مقابل حالتي الإمداد الفردي وتركيب شبكة صغرى مركزية.

بالرغم من أن شبكة السرب قادرة في الواقع على تحسين تأمين الإمداد الكهربي من الوضع الحالي 12.4 % (المستوى الثاني) ليصل الى 81.7 % (المستوى الثالث) وبتكلفة مستوية للكهرباء أكثر انخفاضاً، إلا انها مقارنة بشبكة صغرى ستكون دون مستوى الخدمة (المستوى الرابع) وبتكلفة أكبر. هذا يعود بشكل رئيسي نتيجة للسعات الكبيرة الموجودة مسبقا لمولدات الديزل والتخزين الكهربائي في حالتنا التي نتناولها في هذي الدراسة. ولكن، يمثل هذا الوضع في الغالب مواقع أخرى مشابهة في الشرق الأوسط. تحت هذه الظروف، تحمل شبكة السرب معها مخاطر تتمثل في صنع حوافز غير مرغوبة على الاستثمار في مولدات الديزل، كما انها قد تفشل في دعم مفهوم "المنتجين المستهلكين". مع ذلك، تحمل شبكة السرب بطبيعتها التطورية التي تمتلك إمكانيات استثمار تدريجية (مثلا في مجموعات صغيرة لكن متكاملة من المستهلكين) ميزة أساسية مقارنة بالشبكات الصغرى تتمثل في إمكانيتها القضاء على فقر الطاقة في مدة زمنية قصيرة.

1 Introduction

Over 1.1 billion people worldwide still suffer from electricity poverty, and, while only 4 % of the urban population do not have access to electricity, 27 % of worldwide rural communities are affected [1, p. 114]. An extension of the national grid will be the best option for urban and 30 % of rural areas, but a major share of rural areas may be provided off the grid [1, p. 21], [2]. There is a manifold of different approaches (see, e.g. [3] for a recent survey of prominent systems) towards rural electrification:

- A traditional **grid extension** offers unlimited electricity and inherits the quality of a national grid. However, construction can be lengthy and expensive, particularly for remote areas or difficult terrain. Also, outages or other shortcomings of the national grid are inherited directly and might result in limited electricity access despite the interconnection.

- **Individual solutions** are mostly fuel generators and solar home systems (SHS), consisting of solar photovoltaic (PV) panels and a battery. Scalability and simplicity lead to low prices that can be affordable even for households outside higher income classes. Historically, diesel generators were the most common type of systems [4, p. 6], but SHSs have seen a sharp rise due to quickly-decreasing prices. An individual supply solution is not necessarily designed to meet the household's demand, and a mismatch can result in either unused capacities or lost load. Therefore, prospects for individual solutions are often limited.

- **Micro grids** are tailored to meet local demand, but they require professional planning and large upfront investments that prove infeasible for many communities. Nevertheless, hybrid micro grids (renewables and fuel-based generators combined) are the least-cost option for sufficient electrification in many cases, outperforming grid extensions [5], [6]. Installations undertaken previously are often not taken into account and considered sunk investments or stranded assets. Yet, this is also the fate of the micro grid in case a national grid interconnection is due, potentially discouraging prospective investors [7, 147f].

In contrast to that, a **swarm grid** may provide the advantages of a grid extension or micro grid in the long run, but without requiring the significant upfront investment. The emerging approach (see [8]–[14] or, for the broader term of peer-to-peer grids, [15]–[17]) proposes the interconnection of decentralised individual supply units to a network. This promises an improvement of electricity services for communities that are pre-electrified by owning low-capacity individual supply units: Complementarity in generation capacities and demand patterns allows consumers to benefit from sharing their individually-produced electricity. This enables them to reach a de-facto higher standard of electricity services without (necessarily) installing new capacities.

As illustrated by Figure 1, over time, the swarm grid evolves from a smaller network of households to a local grid. Including previous installations prevents asset stranding, and an increasing number of households and generating units enhance the network as bottom-up action. The network would eventually grow into a mature grid with high service quality, and it could be interconnected with the national grid one day.

Figure 1: Swarm grid evolution and potential to improve supply

Benefits of swarm grids are not limited to supply improvement, but advocates see them as a chance for social development and democratisation. Households remain independent in their investment and supply decisions and become prosumers [18], [19], i.e. they become involved in the generation, storage, and distribution of electricity. This empowerment of the bottom of the pyramid turns citizens (in rural areas) more responsible [15], [20]. Establishing electricity trading as a new form of income and engaging households and local stakeholders in service infrastructure may boost social and economic development [18].

Until today, a growing body of literature is available, but the niche approach and its potential, particularly in comparison to other off-grid approaches, are still largely unstudied; also, previous literature has focused on DC swarm grids [9], [21], [22], although AC might be preferable for a number of reasons. To prevent dangers and save electrical equipment, DC approaches have been limited to low-voltages, thus capping generation and long-term services implicitly; a standard-voltage AC grid may allow a more flexible and secure system of distribution. Moreover, most household or business appliances will require AC. Hence, especially for villages with pre-existing AC devices, DC is hardly an option.

In this study, we assess the potential of a 230 V AC swarm grid for the case of Bayhan A'mas Aljabal, a pre-electrified community in rural Yemen. Located in the southern part of the Arabian Peninsula, the country suffers from energy poverty, undersized generation capacity, and low rural electrification rates [23], [24]. However, previous studies have shown a large potential for off-grid systems in rural Yemen [25], [26].

Using a Python-3-based tool, we simulate weather (and, thus, generation), demand, and power flows to compare three different electrification solutions: Individual supply,

a swarm grid, and centralised micro grid (see Section 2). For each scenario, we assess the system's potential to supply the intended demand (via supply security and generation losses) as well as its costs (via levelised costs of electricity, net present value, and breakeven costs for grid extension). Data was taken from a household survey (see Section 3) as well as numerous technical studies and a market research. Additionally, the simulation is aided by an optimal energy mix (OEM) program.

The results (see Section 4) show that a swarm grid can improve supply security from 12.4 % in the individual supply scenario to 81.7 %, improving electricity supply at LCOE of 29.4 €ct./kWh. However, a micro grid offers higher supply security of 97.6 % at even lower costs of 23.1 €ct./kWh. Both systems can be cheaper than a grid extension, depending on terrain, with breakeven grid extension costs of 17 €/km (micro grid) and 18.8 €/km (swarm grid).

In our study, the large benefits of a swarm grid can be mostly attributed to existing (fossil fuel) generators that could be run on higher load factors and supply customers without own dispatchable generation (see Sections 5 and 6). PV systems, on the other hand, did not contribute to this effect considerably, as initial storage capacities were already oversized. This is opposed to other studies, which cite large PV generation losses in individual supply as the main driver for swarm grid benefits. The superiority of a micro grid, in turn, results from the OEM-approach that chooses more cost-efficient capacities than consumers have done until now. Although these results depend entirely on the parameters of the case study, the situation may be representative for a number of pre-electrified communities. The study also hints at the potential of strategic scheduling of generation and storage by the swarm grid controller, solidifying our conclusion towards the benefits of planned or at-least aided grid design. Also, tariff design, setting (dis-)incentives for owners of generation units, and effects on social development will be important issues to consider for the future.

2 Simulation tool and assumptions

We coded a simulation tool in the open-source programming language Python 3, using a multitude of input data that is specified in an Excel data sheet. The simulation analyses performance and costs of the different supply solutions individual supply, swarm grid, and micro grid. Figure 2 shows a flow chart outlining the program.

The tool simulates a time series with one-hour steps, covering a whole year. This time series includes variations of demand, weather, and resulting power flows that occur on an intra-day, inter-day, and intra-annual basis. As individual solution and swarm grid focus on distributed systems, each consumer has to be simulated individually. However, in case of a micro grid, consumers and power generation can be aggregated.

Figure 2: Flow chart of the simulation tool

First, each consumer's demand and the specific generation of PV panels are simulated for each time-step. Based on type, number, and turn-on probabilities of the electric devices owned by consumers, a randomised demand profile is estimated. Global irradiation is generated with Python 3 library pvlib [27] and input values for the monthly local cloud cover factor. The tool uses day and night temperatures on a monthly basis to calculate specific PV generation. To account for volatilities, white noise of 15% is added to both temperature and cloud cover profiles in each time-step individually.

Subsequently, the tool simulates power flows. For the micro grid, an optimal energy mix (OEM) is determined in advance (see Appendix 6.1). In general, for supplying demand, the tool treats PV generation as preferred, followed by battery discharge and diesel generator. Surplus generation can be stored in batteries, when available. Performance indicators, i.e. supply security and generation efficiency, as well as financial indicators (net present value, levelised costs of electricity, breakeven costs for a grid extension) are then computed based on the results.

2.1 Scenarios

We assess the potential of a swarm grid by comparing supply and costs with alternative supply solutions, namely the current system of individual supply and a micro grid. The three cases are defined as follows:

- **Individual supply (IS)**: Only the existing, private generation units provide power for each consumer individually. Consumers are not interconnected, and diesel generators are not shared. No additional investments into control units or inverters are made, and the current systems operate on their present parameters. Existing capacities are replaced completely when exceeding their lifetime. We treat this scenario as our base case.

- **Swarm Grid (SG)**: Existing generation and storage capacities are interconnected. Individual household demand is primarily met by own devices, while the grid is used when a local mismatch occurs. All capacities are replaced completely when their lifetime ends. Figure 3 visualises the algorithm that determines the power flows for the SG scenario.
  In the case of an excess supply (due to full storage capacities or fixed steps of generation control of the diesel generator), power can be shared with the local grid (feed-in), subject to distribution losses. To promote a feed-in and avoid low efficiencies for charging, the batteries charge up to 90%.
  In the case of excess demand (i.e. lost load in individual supply), consumers may be supplied from the grid, if sufficient feed-in is provided. Only if excess demands cannot be covered with the present feed-ins, unused generation capacities of the diesel generators are activated for additional generation. However, in a swarm grid, optimal coordination of the decentralized generation units demands complex control mechanisms. Its system interactions are up to the swarm grid controller design. Here we assume that all prosumers are granted equal income opportunities in feed-in.

Figure 3: Flow chart of the power flow algorithm for the swarm grid scenario

- **Micro Grid (MG)**: A joint demand for the whole village is supplied using centralised generation and storage capacities. Ex-ante, an OEM program determines optimal capacities, based on average daily demand and solar irradiation (see Appendix 6.1). We assume that existing capacities are not included in the planning process.

  In contrast to the other scenarios, households appear as pure consumers that do not interact with generation or supply actively, which is why variables can be aggregated for the whole village. During performance evaluation, demand will be lowered by the generation of existing PV panels, as owners may still rely on their devices and self-supply. Existent batteries will not be used. Thus, the micro grid will encounter a lower demand in the first years of operation and can appear to be oversized. Investment costs into the existent generation units are not considered.

2.2 Performance indicators

We compare the different scenarios regarding their performance in service provision using two indicators. Both evaluate the base year; hence, demand growth is not considered in either of them.

- Supply security indicates the potential to meet consumer demand E_{dem} with a successful supply E_{ss}. A supply security of 100 % would imply a successful supply at all times.

$$\text{Supply security} = \frac{E_{ss}}{E_{dem}} \tag{1}$$

- Generation loss represents the generation that remains unused E_{loss} as a share of the overall generation E_{gen}. Generation losses take place when batteries are fully charged and cannot store any more excess generation, or due to fixed load factor steps of the diesel generators without the possibility of storage. In the SG, unused feed-in is accounted as generation losses.

$$\text{Generation loss} = \frac{E_{loss}}{E_{gen}} \tag{2}$$

In the MG scenario, we compute the indicators for the aggregated grid right-away. In IS and SG scenarios, the indicators are computed for each household individually at first. Overall indicators are then defined as the unweighted average of individual indicators. This ensures the absence of a bias due size effects; e.g. for the case of supply, the weighted average, which is equivalent to the ratio of overall supply and overall demand, could exhibit high values even if a single but large consumer manages to supply himself while a large majority of consumers could even have a supply security equaling zero. In other words, a weighted average would focus on the size of consumers but it would conceal effects of their number. The approach of an unweighted average is equivalent to normalising each consumer to a unit demand / generation and then considering aggregated indicators. Hence, the method resembles a rather Rawlsian approach to evaluating the grid that prioiritises equality in energy access.

2.3 System costs

We use three annuity-based financial indicators to compare each solution's costs: Net present value (NPV), levelised costs of electricity (LCOE) and breakeven grid extension costs. They are based on an estimation of investment and operation costs in order to provide electricity for a given time horizon (we will refer to this as project, henceforth).

The NPV represents total discounted costs. This includes replacement costs for components whose lifetime ends during the project lifetime, residual values at the end of the project, and transport as well as fuel costs. We neglect installation and O&M costs.

Capital costs for each scenario are calculated from the investment costs for main system components, including transport costs. The investment for any component i in the first year, C_i, is calculated from its capacity CAP_i, its costs per unit c_i, and its transport costs $p_{transport}$ specific to its weight m_i:

$$C_i = CAP_i \cdot (c_i + p_{transport} \cdot m_i) \tag{3}$$

Then, including the costs of k replacements within n years, a residual value $C_{i,res}$, a project lifetime T, and a nominal interest rate d, the present value of capital costs for any component NPV_i can be expressed as:

$$NPV_i = C_i + \sum_k \frac{C_i}{(1+d)^n} - \frac{C_{i,res}}{(1+d)^T} \tag{4}$$

Operational expenses, in this case, are only based on fuel consumption q_{fuel} of the of diesel generators. Given a fuel price p_{fuel}, fuel expenditures in the first year CF can be expressed as:

$$CF = p_{fuel} \cdot q_{fuel} \tag{5}$$

Given a capital recovery factor CRF to split a present value into annuities over the the whole project lifetime (and its inverse performing the opposite), the final NPV for the whole project can then be expressed as:

$$NPV_{total} = \sum_i NPV_i + \frac{CF}{CRF} \text{ , with } CRF = \frac{d \cdot (1+d)^T}{(1+d)^T - 1} \tag{6}$$

Levelised costs of electricity $LCOE$ imply an electricity price per unit, as used in ordinary electricity tariffs for instance. As such, we define them as the ratio between the annuity of total costs and the successfully supplied electricity in the first year (analogous to the supply indicators).

$$\text{LCOE} = \frac{NPV_{total} \cdot CRF}{E_{ss} \text{ [kWh/a]}} \tag{7}$$

Lastly, the tool computes breakeven grid extension costs npv_{ext}. They indicate how expensive a grid extension may be, relative to a unit distance, before the off-grid approach would become superior. They are based on the breakeven grid extension distance, as defined and analysed in [28, 203ff], [29]. Importantly, this includes the assumption that the grid is able to supply all intended demand, as opposed to the off-grid system, which may not do so. Therefore, at the breakeven point itself, the LCOE of a grid extension are equal or lower than those of the off-grid solution. Using a distance D to and given a fixed price for electricity p_{el} from the national grid, the breakeven grid extension costs can be calculated as NPV per km:

$$npv_{ext} = \frac{1}{D} \cdot (NPV_{system} - \frac{E_{dem} \cdot p_{el}}{CRF}) \tag{8}$$

2.4 System parameters

The following parameters have been chosen for the simulation (a summary is included in Appendix 6.2):

Electricity distribution in the local grid is subject to 12% losses from inverters and distribution cables [30, p. 74].

For charge and discharge, the system prefers lithium-ion batteries over lead-acid batteries, as the former show a longer cycle life [31, pp. 49,52]. Discharging is assumed to be free of losses with a depth of discharge (DOD) dependent on battery type (Lithium-ion: 80 % [31, p. 52] lead-acid: 50 % [31, p. 49]). For charging, a constant Ah efficiency is assumed (Lithium-ion: 95 % [31, p. 45], lead-acid: 80 % [32, p. 417]). This simplification ignores the dependency of charge efficiencies of both lithium-ion and lead-acid batteries on their state of charge (SOC). Also, battery degradation is neglected.

The efficiency of diesel generators is dependent on their load factor LF. We assume that diesel generators run on load factor steps of 10 %, strictly rounded up to the higher share for ensuring that the intended demand is supplied. This results in a higher fuel consumption and more unused generation than in optimal, continuous operation.

The fuel consumption q_{fuel} depends on the rated capacity P_{rated} and actual generation P [33], resulting in a maximal diesel generation efficiency of 30.7 % at full load:

$$q_{fuel} = P_{rated} \cdot (0.08415 + 0.246 \cdot LF) \tag{9}$$

Technical parameters for mono- and polycrystalline photovoltaic modules (mono-PV / poly-PV) were chosen based on a market research. With 18.3 % (mono-PV) and 16.6 % (poly-PV), PV efficiencies are slightly higher than in literature (e.g. mono-PV: 15 %, poly-PV: 14 % [34, p. 44]). Additionally, a performance ratio PR of 90 % is considered for „[l]osses due to array mismatch, dirt, shading" [30, p. 75]. We do not consider module degradation during their lifetime.

3 The case study: Bayhan A'mas Aljabal

As a case study, we analyse a large pre-electrified community in Yemen. Households own various consumption devices from earlier times, when national grid supply was present. Also, the majority of households own PV systems, but they are unable to supply their demand sufficiently. With the large pre-existing capacities, the case should provide obvious potential for a swarm grid.

With 14 out of the 18 million Middle Easterners without electricity access, Yemen is the least electrified country in the Middle East; this amounts to approximately 48% of Yemenis, unequally distributed with 68% of the country's rural population being affected [1, p. 116]. However, the actual number may even be higher, as it accounts mostly for the sole interconnection with a grid and not necessarily for actual supply. The country is marked by widespread poverty, and progress in human development has virtually been absent during the last three decades [35]. This situation has peaked in the ongoing war, leaving the vast majority of the country without any electricity from the grid. Hence, in most cases, the remaining electricity supply is limited to a few hours daily, and it depends on private diesel generators and PV panels, despite occasional scarcities in diesel and tremendous surcharges for solar equipment.

The village Bayhan A'mas Aljabal is located 45 km northeast of Yemeni capital Sana'a, connected by unpaved roads. The village has some 1700 inhabitants and contains a school, two mosques, and a small health care unit. Occupation is concentrated in agriculture and some smaller private businesses. Temperatures can be high with an average of 30 °C during summer days (monthly day and night temperatures from [36]). Conditions are not favorable for hydro or wind plants, but solar irradiation is overly high (see Section 4, monthly cloud cover factors from [37]), as it is the case for Yemen in general [38].

Data for the case study is taken from surveys of the village, undertaken in 2016 by the Energy Access and Development Program (EADP). Each consumer (households, business, others) was surveyed for number and type of consumption devices, storage and generation capacities, and previous investments into current supply systems. An aggregated usage (turn-on) schedule for each consumption device for the whole village was compiled. Tables of input parameters can be found an Appendix 6.2.
The village had been connected to the national grid until 2014, with sporadic service of up to 2 hrs per day. Since the connection broke down completely, many households have invested in own generation units. Renewable energy supply has become increasingly popular in the country [39], [40], and studies confirm the large potential of off-grid solutions [23], [24]. As PV systems have become competitive to diesel generators, especially due to occasional fuel shortages, 85% of consumers in Bayhan have decided to invest into SHS,

most of them using older car batteries for storage. Capacities accumulate to 18.5 kW$_p$ poly-PV, 65 kW in diesel generators, and a battery capacity of 173.5 kWh lead-acid. Since the village had (sporadic) access to the national grid in earlier years, the households and businesses own various devices. Households appliances include lamps, fridges, vacuum cleaners, and blenders. Businesses own various specialized devices such as water pumps, welding machines, sewing machines, and mill grinders. The health care unit owns a laboratory and an X-ray. Obviously, most of these devices are not used due to the shortage of electricity.

In addition to the beforesaid, we assume a project lifetime T of 20 years and a discount rate d of 10 %. Transport are assumed at 17.15 €/t from the Yemeni port Aden [41]. The diesel price amounts to 0.708 €/l [42], considering neither transport costs nor fuel shortages. Electricity from the national grid has an official price of 0.086 €/kWh [43]. Investment costs, NPV per unit over the time accounted, mass, and expected lifetime are given in Appendix 6.2. It should be noted that these prices can be slightly upwards biased, as they do not consider any major bulk discounts; thus, investment costs in the MG might appear higher than usual.

4 Results

4.1 Demand profile

The tool computes the specific load profile for each consumer - and, thus, the whole village - as explained before and given the survey data. The presence of numerous devices, a result of the previous grid connection, leads to a high yearly demand of approximately 565 MWh/a. Households account for the largest share in consumption with 85 % of total demand (largely due to electric lamps and fridges), followed by businesses with a share of 14.7 %. The annual peak amounts to 175 kW, while daily demand peaks at a mean of 103 kW, typically at lunch and in the evening (see Figure 4a).


(a) Overall demand, consecutive days   (b) Specific generation of PV panels

Figure 4: Demand and specific PV generation in the case study

Irradiation is high with an annual amount of 2333 kWh/m^2. Daily global irradiation varies between 5.7 and 7 kWh/m^2. In combination with profiles of day and night temperatures, this results in a daily specific PV panel generation between 0.85 and 1.16 kWh/m^2, depending on the panel type (see Figure 4b).

4.2 Supply and performance indicators

The current **individual supply (IS)** of the village proves vastly-insufficient with a very low supply security of 12.4 % (see Figure 5). In terms of service quality, this translates to the inhabitants not being able to use electric appliances as planned for 86.7 % of the time.

Private households suffer most from electricity scarcity with a supply security of only 10.4 % (i.e. a deficit of 2169.6 kWh/a per household). They are only provided with 0.6 kWh/day instead of 6.5 kWh/day as demanded. Businesses, in contrast, reach an average supply security of 22.2 % due to their diesel generators (i.e. a deficit of 4103.4 kWh/a per business). Yet, generator availability and size (and, thus, also supply) differ substantially between different businesses. The health care unit is able to supply its demand entirely, as it owns a sufficiently large generator.

Total unused generation is low with 12 MWh/a, compared to the total supply deficit of 473.6 MWh/a. Batteries in the SHS are rarely used in full charge cycles: The daily mean battery charge of the village is at about 52.1 %. Thus, PV systems operate very efficiently with only 0.7 % generation loss (0.3 MWh/a).

| E_{dem} [MWh/a]	565
E_{ss} [MWh/a]	91.4
E_{unm} [MWh/a]	-473.6
E_{loss} [MWh/a]	12
q_{fuel} [l/a]	43900
Renewable fraction	44 %
Supply security	12.4 %
Generation efficiency	98.5 %

Figure 5: Supply in Individual Supply scenario

By interconnecting existing capacities in a **swarm grid (SG)**, a significant rise in supply security to 81.7 % can be observed (see Figure 6). This improvement can be largely attributed to the vast diesel generator capacities in the village that now feed-in considerably. The share of renewables in overall generation therefore is low with only 8.4 %. Fuel consumption q_{fuel} rises from 43900 l/a in the individual supply scenario to 155800 l/a.

Both households and businesses profit from the possibility to consume electricity from the swarm grid, as their supply security indicators rise to 81.2 % and 80.3 % respectively. On average, consumption from the grid equals 4.2 kWh/day for households and 8.9 kWh/day

for businesses.

Households only provide a feed-in of 0.02 kWh/day, while business feed-in 35.9 kWh/day from generators supplying on higher load factors. The health care unit has a remarkably-high feed-in of 173.8 kWh/day. Supply deficit takes place in times of peak-demand, i.e. at noon and in evenings.

Batteries are used more intensively than in IS, but they continue to have a low daily mean charge of only 55.3 %, and less batteries complete full charge cycles. They store the insignificant excess PV generation (0.02 kWh/day) but mostly store diesel generator overproduction, essentially eliminating generation losses.

|	
E_{dem} [MWh/a]	565
E_{ss} [MWh/a]	460.8
E_{unm} [MWh/a]	-104.2
E_{loss} [MWh/a]	0
$E_{feed-in}$ [MWh/a]	390.9
$E_{consumption}$ [MWh/a]	346.6
$E_{losses,grid}$ [MWh/a]	49.4
q_{fuel} [l/a]	155800
Renewable fraction	8.7 %
Supply security	81.7 %
Generation efficiency	100 %

Figure 6: Supply in Swarm Grid scenario

The OEM results in a cost-minimising combination of generation and storage for the **micro grid (MG)**, including 98.5 kW diesel generator capacity, 20.8 kW$_p$ mono-PV and 58.5 kW$_p$ poly-PV, as well as 4.3 kWh lithium-ion and 23.7 kWh lead-acid battery storage. This system yields a supply security of 97.6 % at a share of 37.8 % renewable generation (q_{fuel}: 137700 l/a). Supply deficits occur in the evening hours and amount to 13.4 MWh/a. Figure 7 summarises the results. Generation losses are only marginal (0.2 MWh/a).

4.3 Cost indicators

In terms of LCOE, IS proves to be the most expensive solution (52 €ct./kWh), followed by SG (29.4 €ct./kWh) and MG (23.1 €ct./kWh). This includes sunk costs in the form of currently-existing capacities for IS and SG scenarios. In absolute terms, it is no surprise that IS proves cheapest with an NPV of 431 t€. Yet, noteworthy, the centralised MG holds also lower total costs than SG, with NPVs of 1155 t€ and 1230 t€ respectively. The subsequent section discusses potential reasons for this result. In terms of breakeven grid extension costs, the results apply likewise: SG proves superior above 18.8 t€/km, compared to MG with only 17 t€/km.

E_{dem} $[MWh/a]$	565
E_{ss} $[MWh/a]$	551.6
E_{unm} $[MWh/a]$	-13.4
E_{loss} $[MWh/a]$	0.2
q_{fuel} $[l/a]$	135200
Renewable fraction	37.8 %
Supply security	97.6 %
Generation efficiency	99.9 %

Figure 7: Supply in micro grid scenario

The results are summerised in Table 1.Note that the breakeven costs for IS are not given as they lack any meaningful interpretation: Its NPV would be in balance with expenditures for electricity from the national grid, while supplying only a small share of the villages' demand.

Table 1: Indicators of all three cases compared

Performance indicator	Individual	Swarm Grid	Micro Grid
Supply security	12.4 %	81.7 %	97.6 %
Generation efficiency	98.5 %	100 %	99.9 %
NPV [t€]	431.1	1229.6	1155.3
LCOE [€ct/kWh]	52	29.4	23.1
Breakeven grid extension costs [t€/km]	N.A.	18.8	17

5 Discussion

In the case study, individual supply is confirmed not to be able to meet the village's demand, and supply improves considerably with the implementation of a smart grid. Noticeably, though, a micro grid outperforms the swarm grid in both supply and costs. The following subsections will highlight and discuss these points, alongside with many issues that arise from the results.

5.1 Supply and performance

Supply performance will be evaluated with the well-known multi-tier framework for electrification [44, 77f]. The consumers have an intended average demand of 6.5 kWh/d (2375.9 kWh/a). This would be classified as Tier 4 or, given the need for 24 h of service and a high base load of about 22 kW, even Tier 5. Yet, the current solution of individual supply enables Tier 2 services only. Numerically, barely 0.6 kWh/day can be realized on

15

average, and the high share of hours with supply deficits translates to sufficient electricity supply for only about 4 h/d (although shared diesel generators - not considered in the simulation - may improve this picture slightly).

The rise in supply security from 12.4 % (IS) to 81.7 % (SG) is evidence for the large benefits a swarm grid may have for pre-electrified communities. It is able to provide the village with Tier 3 electricity access at a capacity of 5.3 kWh/d and uninterrupted supply of approximately 14 h/d. Opposed to that, the MG offers electricity supply of Tier 4 with about 3 hours of generation deficit per day.
Improvements both in system modelling and additional swarm grid controller capabilities, to be discussed below, could improve the benefit of a swarm grid.
The performance indicators imply that interconnecting groups of households to include PV systems and a diesel generator would improve their supply noticeably. Hence, this can be an immediate and cost-effective alleviation until a sufficient supply solution for the whole community arrives.

Due to the large pre-existing battery capacities, only minor PV generation losses of 0.7 % have occurred for the sole SHSs in the IS scenario. This differs crucially from other studies, which cite large losses of individually-generated PV electricity (e.g. about 30% for a case in Bangladesh [12]) as the main driver for swarm grid benefits. In this case, however, simulated SOC profiles of batteries show that a full-charges occur seldom or even never, indicating oversized storage capacities.

Closely related to this, the already-large capacities of diesel generators are the main driver for an improved supply in the swarm grid. However, this ties grid performance closely to the load factor steps of diesel generation control. If the generator was able to match demand closely with load factor steps of 1 %, the swarm grid would perform worse (supply security: 80.5 %, LCOE: 30.8 €ct./kWh) than in the case of a rigid control with load factor steps of, for instance, 30 % (Supply security: 91.1 %, LCOE: 25.4 €ct./kWh). In that case, batteries are large enough to store the excess generation and use it later. Thus, surveys should include operation conditions of diesel generators to properly forecast swarm grid potential.

The more sufficing approach can be found in the micro grid, which supplies almost 100 % of the intended demand (the slightly lower result of 97.6 % does not indicate an invalid approach but room for improved power flow algorithms in the simulation and for the OEM). High supply security and generation efficiency confirm that an OEM based on a mean demand profile of 24 h is sufficient for a comparison between different scenarios, yet not for system design. A rough estimation the LCOE for supplying demand completely is 22.5 €ct./kWh (margin of 0.5 €ct./kWh).

A necessity for strategic scheduling of generation and storage processes can be observed for both MG and SG. Supply deficit peaks occur during the day (SG) and in the evening hours (SG and MG), when the batteries are fully discharged. The decision to always discharge batteries prior to using diesel generators (see Figure 3) prohibits batteries from supporting in peak hours, and it results in empty batteries even before the evening peak. Supply security could have been increased using smarter algorithms in all scenarios. This

16

issue is by no means limited to the simulation, but the lack of strategic scheduling affects most off-grid households and villages. Scheduling the battery discharge to the evening hours should increase supply security and needs to be considered for both for simulation and swarm grid controller design.

5.2 Economic and social aspects

Judging from the LCOE of the supply systems, IS is by far inferior with electricity costs of 52 €ct./kWh. Implementing a swarm grid would be able to decrease these costs to 29.4 €ct./kWh and a micro grid appears as the least-cost option with 23.1 €ct./kWh. The breakeven grid extension costs of MG are 17 t€/km and of SG 18.8 t€/km. As such, both SG and MG could be about as expensive as a common grid extension with costs between 6 t€/km and 22 t€/km, depending on remoteness and territory [31, p. 5].

In this specific case of Bayhan A'mas Aljabal, a grid extension is not an alternative even if it was cheaper than the off-grid solutions. Conflict in Yemen has taken its toll on grid infrastructure, and continued damaging of newly-built infrastructure cannot be ruled out. Moreover, as the national grid is chronically-low on generation capacities, an interconnection would not imply sufficient electricity supply.

As mentioned previously, micro grid approaches often ignore pre-existing supply units. This process results in asset stranding and may have a detrimental effect on villagers' incentives to participate. Yet, the inclusion of previous sunk costs increases the LCOE only slightly by some 4 %. Other approaches, such as a micro grid that includes previously-installed capacities by purchasing them from the owners, is possible but not considered in this study.

A swarm grid, on the other hand, builds upon already-existing capacities. In its LCOE of 29.4 €ct./kWh, the previous investments into currently-existing capacities are included (SHS: 28.7 t€, estimation for diesel generators: 22.6 t€). Yet, in line with the MG estimation, an exclusion only yields a moderate reduction in LCOE of 4 %.

Nevertheless, and not only for comparing costs, it is essential to differentiate on a case-by-case basis how these previously-installed capacities will be treated. Obviously, for a narrower gap between micro and swarm grid, this accounting issue could conceal an eventual switch in the least-cost option, such that the wrong system design will be preferred. However, as elaborated above, this question has also profound social implications. As off-grid work is linked to bottom-up action, compliance with the project is essential, but residents owning capacities before the project may become reluctant or even oppose it, if their assets are endangered of being rendered stranded. Also, setting electricity tariffs - an issue this article is not considering -, becomes inevitably more complicated.

Although the micro grid is less expensive than the swarm grid, the possibility to implement a swarm grid in a staggered fashion can be pivotal. The central nature of the micro grid will require the system to be built in a single project, implying all non-operational costs to be due upfront. In the context of a conflict-torn developing country with a dried-up public budget, such as Yemen, government financing is unlikely, and competition for international grants is high. Self-financing would require a high degree of coordination,

17

not to mention the infeasible costs. Hence, the step-wise and modular nature of swarm electrification enables neighbouring consumers to form smaller groups and invest rather small amounts in an interconnection. Over time, such different networks can be interlinked again. As elaborated above, given the "right" subset of households, even such smaller interconnections can have a strong positive impact:
If the interconnected groups contain both solar systems and fossil fuel generators, the supply can already be improved significantly.

At this point, it should be mentioned that cost indicators in our study are rather high, but still in line with the literature and correct, given the simulation's input parameters. However, even an unlikely upward bias of prices would not affect our conclusions regarding the comparison of micro and swarm grid, since they their comparison is made on a relative basis. Yet, the rather large figures also indicate the benefit of public action in the electricity sector as opposed to the current trend of regarding individual action to be the new benchmark.

Nevertheless, is crucial to analyse why micro and smart grid yield different costs. A first look at the composition of investment costs (see Figure 8) reveals large similarities. As the grid topology is identical, distribution grid costs are equal with 59.7 t€. Costs for the central micro grid controller (in MG) amount to 85.7 t€, while controllers and inverters in the SG amount to 20 t€. A brief sensitivity analysis shows that LCOE for the smart grid are linearly-dependent on the expenses for the smart grid controller. With controller costs posing only a small share of the overall costs, LCOE decrease with controller costs of 30 € just slightly to 27.9 €ct./kWh, while they would increase to 28.4 €ct./kWh for controller costs of 100 €.
Diesel generators account for a minor part of the investment (SG: 31.3 t€, MG: 46.8 t€), while fuel costs are the largest cost component (MG: 868.9 t€ / 75.2% NPV, SG: 1001.1€ / 81.4% NPV). The MG has higher diesel generator and PV capacities, resulting not only in a better supply security but a higher renewable factor of the MG, which decreases fuel expenditures and, thus, LCOE.


Figure 8: Composition of the scenario's NPV

While optimal investment in PV panels is quite high in the MG (45.5 t€, 79.5 kW$_p$), the existing panels in SG only amount to an investment of 10.9 t€ (18.9 kW$_p$). At the same time, expenditures for battery capacities equal 17 t€ (MG, 28.8 kWh) and are significantly lower than for the SG with 106.4 t€ (173.2 kWh). A minor share (16.7%) have been previous investments, whereas the rest will be future reinvestments to replacement

the current capacities.

Despite the oversizing of batteries, the SG assumes an entire replacement. If capacities were only replaced to the optimal PV-to-storage ratio as suggested by the OEM, only 16.9% of present storage costs would have to be invested. This would result in decreased LCOE of 27.3 €ct./kWh, saving a margin of 2.1 €ct./kWh. Moreover, additional PV capacities in the SG (in combination with appropriate storage capacities) could increase successfully supplied demand at even lower LCOE by decreasing fuel expenditures. Thus, we strongly advise profit and non-profit actors to not only provide SG control units to a project site but also counseling for future investments, e.g. by implementing an algorithm for automated advice on SG development in the SG controller.

The strong role for fossil fuel generation in our case is subject to social and economic remarks. Rural electrification is often set in the context of sustainable development, a term not equal but often set into close connection with green energy. However, depending on generator and fuel costs, a swarm grid could create incentives to invest in fossil fuel generators to profit from their feed-in. This may not only be unwanted from an environmental perspective, but fuel expenditures indicate that higher renewable factors might decrease LCOE. Whether such incentives are set is largely contingent on government policies with regard to subsidisation and taxation of fuel and PV systems. Nevertheless, a promising business model for fossil fuel producers in swarm grids might attract the necessary funding to invest in extensions and enhancements. Thus, drawing a clear conlusion is difficult.

6 Conclusion

Throughout the rural Global South, individual systems for electricity supply are popular, yet mostly unable to meet the intended demand of households. Swarm grids pose a possible solution to improve pre-electrified communities towards better energy services: Existing generation and storage can be interconnected in a decentralised local power distribution grid. This article has used a simulation approach to compare individual supply, swarm grid, and a micro grid for the case of a large, pre-electrified community in rural Yemen. The different cases have been compared by means of their service quality and financial indicators.

The study has been able to confirm the low quality of individual supply: Only a tenth of the intended demand could be supplied, resulting in a Tier 2 electrification level, and levelised costs were the highest among all systems. We confirmed that a swarm grid has the potential to improve supply noticeably, resulting in a Tier 3 electrification with more than 80 % of demand realised at nearly half the levelised costs. Yet, a centralised micro grid was shown to outperform the swarm grid in both costs and supply, leading to a Tier 4 electrification.

A major part of the results origin in the case study's specific parameters, i.e. the large amount of pre-existing diesel generators and oversized storage. They have been the main driver for the large benefits of a swarm grid, as existing generators could be run on higher load factors and their supply could be distributed towards smaller customers in a swarm grid who were undersupplied in autarky. PV systems, on the other hand, do not contribute to this effect considerably, as their losses were low due to oversized initial battery

capacities. This is opposed to other studies, which cite large PV generation losses in individual supply as the main driver for swarm grid benefits. As a consequence of the high fuel expenses and misled reinvestments into oversized battery capacities, the micro grid has proven superior and less expensive due to its approach of installing the optimal energy mix.

Certainly, the idiosyncrasy of the case study aggravates the possibility for a generalisation of the results. Yet, this situation may well resemble a significant amount of communities throughout the Middle East but also worldwide. Many of them are not pre-electrified by means of professional planning but in an uncontrolled and individual way that could lead to missized capacities for all components. In the case analysed, the swarm grid's benefits arise mostly from distributing fuel-based generation, leading to a series of economic and social considerations. Firstly, resulting profit margins may create incentives to increase fuel generators capacity, which is at odds with many rural electrification projects attempting to support renewable energy systems. Of course, this depends on the relative price of fuel generation and PV systems, which is largely an outcome of domestic tax and subsidy schemes. Secondly, the process would effectively turn some villagers into producers of electricity, while others were to stay consumers for the most. Although most (especially low-income) households may not disapprove remaining pure consumers, this uneven development is strongly opposed to the concept of prosumerism and its ascribed benefits, which advocates attribute to swarm grids.

As a corollary, the tremendous difference between the micro grid's optimal energy mix and the swarm grid shows that the individual decisions regarding the purchase of whatever generation and storage capacities are far from optimal, at least regarding the joint community. Therefore, even a swarm grid may attempt to shift on a trajectory towards the optimal energy mix by not replacing existing capacities but instead adding optimal capacities, when lifetimes are reached. This, however, would be another step towards guided or aided planning of infrastructure and contribute to the departure of the bottom-up concept. Still, to sustain the grid's financial efficiency, we advocate for the at least partial inclusion of experts in grid planning and reinvestment decisions. We also derive this conclusion because the study has proven the potential for non-trivial strategic scheduling of generation and storage. Lastly, a swarm grid will require at least some form of central planning to develop tariffs and billing systems for the local trade of electricity. Thus, the degree to which swarm grids are decentral beyond their physical topology is questionable.

However, and despite the above said, swarm grids can be a viable plan, even in communities like the one analysed. In accordance with the economic concept of second-best solutions, a micro grid may be superior but infeasible, as the largest portion of costs are upfront investments. Given scarce capital of low-income households and responsible governments, an interconnection of a small group of households can already lead to significant improvements in the quality of supply at relatively low costs, given that the households complement each other in generation devices or demand patterns. Then, and in line with the evolutionary concept of swarm grids, different grid stages can bridge between individual supply and the establishment of a stable grid infrastructure with sufficient supply.

Appendix

6.1 Optimal energy mix

A micro grid is often planned centrally by a team of experts. Decision-making tools, such as numerical programming or gird design software, help to derive an optional energy mix (OEM), i.e. the cost-minimising set of generation and storage capacities that ensures a successful supply of the demand at all times. For our micro grid case, we assume such an optimisation is done in advance and provides the basis for grid design. Hence, before simulating the electricity flows, the tool runs a program to find the least-cost combination of capacities CAP for diesel generator, monocrystallin and polycrystallin PV panels, as well as lithium-ion and lead-acid batteries. The optimisation program uses the Python 3 module scipy.minimize.optimize (SLSQP-Method) and the technical parameters and costs specified for the simulation analysis. The objective is to minimise the levelised costs of electricity as given by the equations below, based on a time series of 24 h for both irradiation and overall demand (as the mean of yearly data), including losses. Inverter costs do not have to be considered, as they are included in the micro grid central controller (MGCC), which is determined by the maximum load. Generation control of the diesel generator is possible without fixed load factor steps LF.

$$min\{\text{LCOE}\}$$

$$\text{LCOE} = \frac{NPV_{system}}{\sum E_{dem,oem} \cdot 365 \cdot a} \geq 0$$

$$SOC_{i,t+1} = SOC_{i,t} - \frac{E_{charge} \cdot \eta_{charge}}{CAP_{battery}}$$

$$P_{gen,pv} = P_{irrad} \cdot \frac{CAP_{pv}}{P_{irrad,test}} \cdot PR$$

$$LF_t = \frac{P_{dem} - P_{gen,pv} - P_{charge} - P_{gen,diesel}}{CAP_{diesel}}$$

$$P_{gen,diesel} = LF_t \cdot CAP_{diesel}$$

$$P_{supply} = P_{gen,pv} + P_{charge} + P_{gen,diesel} - P_{dem} \geq 0$$

$$NPV_{diesel} = CAP_{diesel} \cdot npv_{diesel}$$

$$q_{fuel,t,oem} = 0.246 \cdot LF_t \cdot CAP_{diesel} + 0.08415 \cdot CAP_{diesel}$$

$$C_{Var,diesel} = p_{diesel} \cdot \sum_t q_{fuel,t,oem} \cdot 365 \cdot a$$

$$NPV_{pv} = \sum CAP_{pv,i} \cdot npv_{pv,i}$$

$$NPV_{battery} = \sum CAP_{battery,i} \cdot npv_{battery,i}$$

$$NPV_{system} = NPV_{diesel} + NPV_{pv} + NPV_{battery} + C_{Var,diesel}$$

$$0 \leq LF_t \leq 1$$

$$1 - DOD_i \leq SOC_{i,t} \leq 1$$

$$0 \leq CAP_{battery}, CAP_{pv}, CAP_{diesel}$$

Resulting capacities of the OEM are rounded to the next higher value of available batch size (Diesel: 2.5 kW, PV: 100 W_p, Batteries: 1.2 kWh). To avoid low load shares and to maximise generation efficiency, a number of diesel generators in batch size is used in the micro grid to provide electricity.

6.2 Simulation input parameters

Table 2: Simulation parameters

Evaluated interval	8760 h	
Grid efficiency η_{grid}	88 % [22, p. 75]	
Diesel generators Fuel consumption Generation control	$P_{rated} \cdot (0.08415 + 0.246 \cdot LF)$ [33] 10 %-steps of maximal load	
Batteries	Lithium-ion	Lead-acid
Depth of discharge	80 % [31, p. 52]	50 % [31, p. 49]
Charge efficiency	95 % [31, p. 45]	80 % [32, p. 417]
Initial charge in simulation	60 % (IS, MG, SG)	
Max. charge	95 % (IS, MG), 90 % (SG)	
Degeneration	none	
PV panels	Mono-crystallin	Poly-crystallin
Efficiency	18.3 %	16.6 %
Temperature coefficient	-0.4 %/K	-0.43 %/K
Performance ratio	90 % [22, p. 75]	
Test conditions	1000 $\frac{W}{m^2}$, 25 °C	
Degeneration	none	

Table 3: Survey data on Bayhan A'mas Aljabal

(a) Accumulated

Households	171
Other consumers	26
PV (poly-crystallin)	18.5 kW$_p$
Diesel	65 kW
Storage (lead-acid)	173.5 kWh
Previous investments (SHS)	28692 €

(b) Generation groups

Non-electrified	28
PV system	161
Diesel	1
PV system & diesel	7
Battery owners	166

Table 4: Financial parameters

Project lifetime Discount rate	20 a [45] 10 % [22, p. 221]
Exchange rates	1 € = 296.769 YER [46] 1 € = 1.18614 $ [47]
Diesel price Electricity price national grid Distance to national grid Transport costs	0.708 $\frac{€}{l}$ [42] 0.086 $\frac{€}{kWh}$ [43] 42 km 17.15 €/t based on [41]

Table 5: Electrical devices in Bayhan

Households

Device	Units	Load W/unit
Lamps	2310	30
Iron	49	1000
TV	196	100
El. water heater	98	1200
El. water pump	39	400
Washing machine	147	400
Computer	12	250
Vacuum	30	1000
Blender	70	300
Oven	49	1000
Fridges	158	70

Businesses

Device	Units	Load W/unit
Welding machine	8	10000
Sewing machine	15	2000
El. mill grinder	8	15000
Submersible pump	3	20000
Airpump	1	5000

Medic point

Device	Units	Load W/unit
Washing machine	1	400
Laboratory	1	5000
X-ray	1	5000

Table 6: Costs of system components

Component	Unit u	Cost [€/u]	Weight [kg/u]	Life span [a]	NPV [€/u] *
LV cables Three phase, Cu, ∅ 70 mm² **	km	25630	2950	25 [48, p. 41]	25680.5
One phase, Cu, ∅ 4 mm²	km	650.2	97.7	25 [48, p. 41]	651.9
MGCC***	kW_{dem}	532.04	7.124	15	617.1
Swarm controller****	piece	50	0.5	15	58
Inverter (only SG)	kW	205.52	4.81	15 [22, p. 219]	238.4
Battery Lead-acid	kWh	195.6	24.9	3 [49, p. 11], [50]	708.2
Lithium-ion	kWh	1112.5	12.4	6 (est., [22])	2295.5
PV Mono-crystallin	kWp	992.1	68.2	20 [22, p. 255], [50]	993.3
Poly-crystallin	kWp	774.4	115.1	20 [22, p. 255], [50]	776.4
Diesel generator	kW	337.2	26.2	10 [48, p. 52], [51]	467.8

Costs and weight per unit based on market study ⋆) Including transport costs
**) Very high costs compared to other sources but no negative effect on comparability, as SG and MG are based on the same grid topology
***) Hybrid inverter with charge controller, sized after maximal load
****) Swarm grid controller including communication and charge controller for each household. Price estimated from 30 US\$ for a DC SG controller [52]. Additional investment into inverter capacity for PV systems and batteries needed

References

[1] OECD and IEA, "Energy Access Outlook 2017. From Poverty to Prosperity," 2017. [Online]. Available: `http://www.iea.org/publications/freepublications/publication/weo-2017-special-report-energy-access-outlook.html` (visited on 01/27/2018).

[2] R. K. Akikur, R. Saidur, H. W. Ping, and K. R. Ullah, "Comparative study of stand-alone and hybrid solar energy systems suitable for off-grid rural electrification: A review," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 27, pp. 738–752, 2013, ISSN: 1364-0321.

[3] S. Mandelli, J. Barbieri, R. Mereu, and E. Colombo, "Off-grid systems for rural electrification in developing countries: Definitions, classification and a comprehensive literature review," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 58, pp. 1621–1646, 2016, ISSN: 1364-0321.

[4] E. Terrado, I. Mukherjee, and A. Cabraal, "Designing Sustainable Off-Grid Rural Electrification Projects: Principles and Practices. Operational Guidance for World Bank Group Staff.," The World Bank, Washington, DC, Nov. 2008. [Online]. Available: `http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTENERGY2/Resources/Offgrid Guidelines.pdf`.

[5] A. Das and V Balakrishnan, "Sustainable energy future via grid interactive operation of spv system at isolated remote island," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 16, no. 7, pp. 5430–5442, 2012, ISSN: 1364-0321.

[6] C. O. Okoye and B. C. Oranekwu-Okoye, "Economic feasibility of solar PV system for rural electrification in sub-Sahara Africa," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 2017, ISSN: 1364-0321.

[7] S. C. Bhattacharyya, "Business Issues for Mini-Grid-Based Electrification in Developing Countries," in *Mini-Grids for Rural Electrification of Developing Countries*, S. Bhattacharyya and D. Palit, Eds. New York: Springer, 2014, pp. 145–164, ISBN: 978-3-319-04815-4.

[8] H. Kirchhoff, N. Kebir, K. Neumann, P. W. Heller, and K. Strunz, "Developing mutual success factors and their application to swarm electrification: Microgrids with 100% renewable energies in the Global South and Germany," *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 128, pp. 190–200, 2016, ISSN: 0959-6526.

[9] H. Kirchhoff, "Identifying hidden resources in solar home systems as the basis for bottom-up grids," in *Decentralized Solutions for Developing Economies*. Springer, 2015, pp. 23–32, ISBN: 978-3-319-15964-5.

[10] S. Groh, D. Philipp, B. E. Lasch, and H. Kirchhoff, "Swarm electrification: Investigating a paradigm shift through the building of microgrids bottom-up," in *Decentralized Solutions for Developing Economies*. Springer, 2015, pp. 3–22, ISBN: 978-3-319-15964-5.

[11] M. Koepke and S. Groh, "Against the odds: The potential of swarm electrification for small island development states," *Energy Procedia*, vol. 103, pp. 363–368, 2016, ISSN: 1876-6102.

[12] S. Aziz, S. A. Chowdhury, and S. Groh, "The success of solar diesel minigrids in Bangladesh: A case study of Sandwip Island," *Energy Procedia*, vol. 103, pp. 316–321, 2016, ISSN: 1876-6102.

[13] K. Unger, "Organically Grown Microgrids. The Development and Simulation of a Solar Home System-based Microgrid," University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Canada, Master of applied science thesis, 2012. [Online]. Available: `https://uwspace.uwaterloo.ca/handle/10012/6727`.

[14] P. Hollberg, "Swarm grids. Innovation in rural electrification," KTH School of Industrial Engineering and Management. Department of Energy Systems Analysis, Stockholm, Master of science thesis, 2015.

[15] C. Giotitsas, A. Pazaitis, and V. Kostakis, "A peer-to-peer approach to energy production," *Technology in Society*, vol. 42, pp. 28–38, 2015, ISSN: 0160-791X.

[16] C. Zhang, J. Wu, C. Long, and M. Cheng, "Review of existing peer-to-peer energy trading projects," *Energy Procedia*, vol. 105, pp. 2563–2568, 2017, ISSN: 1876-6102.

[17] Y. Zhou, J. Wu, C. Long, M. Cheng, and C. Zhang, "Performance evaluation of peer-to-peer energy sharing models," *Energy Procedia*, vol. 143, pp. 817–822, 2017, ISSN: 1876-6102.

[18] W.-P. Schill, A. Zerrahn, and F. Kunz, "Prosumage of solar electricity: Pros, cons, and the system perspective," *Economics of Energy & Environmental Policy*, vol. 6, no. 1, 2017.

[19] G. Ritzer and N. Jurgenson, "Production, consumption, prosumption: The nature of capitalism in the age of the digital 'prosumer'," *Journal of consumer culture*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 13–36, 2010, ISSN: 1469-5405.

[20] J. Ruotsalainen, J. Karjalainen, M. Child, and S. Heinonen, "Culture, values, lifestyles, and power in energy futures: A critical peer-to-peer vision for renewable energy," *Energy Research and Social Science*, vol. 34, pp. 231–239, 2017, ISSN: 2214-6296.

[21] E. Planas, J. Andreu, J. I. Gárate, I. Martínez de Alegría, and E. Ibarra, "AC and DC technology in microgrids: A review," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 43, pp. 726–749, Mar. 2015, ISSN: 1364-0321. DOI: `10.1016/j.rser.2014.11.067`. [Online]. Available: `http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032114010065` (visited on 05/13/2017).

[22] S. C. Bhattacharyya and D. Palit, Eds., *Mini-Grids for Rural Electrification of Developing Countries*. New York: Springer, 2014, ISBN: 978-3-319-04815-4.

[23] L. El-Katiri and B. Fattouh, "Energy poverty in the Arab world: The case of Yemen," Journal Article, 2011. DOI: `/10.26889/9781907555350`. [Online]. Available: `https://www.oxfordenergy.org/publications/energy-poverty-in-the-arab-world-the-case-of-yemen/`.

[24] A. S. Rawea and S. Urooj, "Strategies, current status, problems of energy and perspectives of Yemen's renewable energy solutions," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 2017, ISSN: 1364-0321.

[25] A. Ajlan, C. W. Tan, and A. M. Abdilahi, "Assessment of environmental and economic perspectives for renewable-based hybrid power system in Yemen," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 75, pp. 559–570, 2017, ISSN: 1364-0321.

[26] M. Hadwan and A. Alkholidi, "Solar power energy solutions for Yemeni rural villages and desert communities," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 57, pp. 838–849, 2016, ISSN: 1364-0321.

[27] R. W. Andrews, J. S. Stein, C. Hansen, and D. Riley, "Introduction to the Open Source PV_lib for Python Photovoltaic System Modelling Package, 40th IEEE Photovoltaic Specialist Conference.," 2014. [Online]. Available: `http://energy.sandia.gov/wp-content//gallery/uploads/PV_LIB_Python_final_SAND2014-18444C.pdf`.

[28] R. Sen and S. C. Bhattacharyya, "Renewable Energy-Based Mini-Grid for Rural Electrification: Case Study of an Indian Village," in *Mini-Grids for Rural Electrification of Developing Countries*, S. Bhattacharyya and D. Palit, Eds. New York: Springer, 2014, pp. 203–232, ISBN: 978-3-319-04815-4.

[29] J. Susanto, "Limits of grid extension in the Lao PDR: A financial perspective," *Journal of Humanitarian Engineering*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2012, ISSN: 2200-4904. [Online]. Available: `https://www.ewb.org.au/jhe/index.php/jhe/article/view/5` (visited on 01/08/2018).

[30] P. Mohanty and T. Muneer, "Smart Design of Stand-Alone Solar PV System for Off Grid Electrification Projects," in *Mini-Grids for Rural Electrification of Developing Countries*, S. Bhattacharyya and D. Palit, Eds. New York: Springer, 2014, pp. 63–93, ISBN: 978-3-319-04815-4.

[31] M. Wiemann, S. Rolland, and G. Glania, "Hybrid Mini-Grids for Rural Electrification: Lessons Learned," Alliance for Rural Electrification (ARE) and USAid, Eds., Mar. 2011. [Online]. Available: `https://ruralelec.org/sites/default/files/hybrid_mini-grids_for_rural_electrification_2014.pdf` (visited on 05/15/2017).

[32] I. Patrao, E. Figueres, G. Garcerá, and R. González-Medina, "Microgrid architectures for low voltage distributed generation," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 43, pp. 415–424, Mar. 2015, ISSN: 1364-0321. DOI: `10.1016/j.rser.2014.11.054`. [Online]. Available: `http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1364032114009939` (visited on 05/13/2017).

[33] A. Gudelj and M. Krčum, "Simulation and Optimization of Independent Renewable Energy Hybrid System," University of Split, Croatia, doi: 10.7225/ toms.v02.n01.004, 2013. [Online]. Available: `https://toms.com.hr/archive/vol2/no1/toms_vol2no1_doi004.pdf`.

[34] P. J. Boait, "Technical Aspects of Mini-Grids for Rural Electrification," in *Mini-Grids for Rural Electrification of Developing Countries*, S. Bhattacharyya and D. Palit, Eds. New York: Springer, 2014, pp. 37–61, ISBN: 978-3-319-04815-4.

[35] D. Ansari, "Resource curse contagion in the case of Yemen," *Resources Policy*, vol. 49, pp. 444–454, 2016, ISSN: 0301-4207. DOI: `http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.resourpol.2016.08.001`. [Online]. Available: `http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301420716302409`.

[36] Time and Date AS. (). Climate & Weather Averages in Sana, Yemen, [Online]. Available: `https://www.timeanddate.com/weather/yemen/sana/climate` (visited on 01/26/2018).

[37] Weatherspark. (). Average Weather at Sana'a International Airport, Yemen, Year Round, [Online]. Available: `https://weatherspark.com/y/148800/Average-Weather-at-Sana&%2339;a-International-Airport-Yemen` (visited on 06/01/2017).

[38] O. Nematollahi, H. Hoghooghi, M. Rasti, and A. Sedaghat, "Energy demands and renewable energy resources in the Middle East," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 54, pp. 1172–1181, 2016, ISSN: 1364-0321.

[39] D. A. Baharoon, H. A. Rahman, and S. O. Fadhl, "Publics' knowledge, attitudes and behavioral toward the use of solar energy in Yemen power sector," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 60, pp. 498–515, 2016, ISSN: 1364-0321.

[40] D. A. Baharoon, H. A. Rahman, and S. O. Fadhl, "Personal and psychological factors affecting the successful development of solar energy use in Yemen power sector: A case study," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 60, pp. 516–535, 2016, ISSN: 1364-0321.

[41] The Cornell Group, *Phase II. Transport-Cost Report. Development of a National Port Strategy for Yemen*, USA, 2009. [Online]. Available: `http://www.villacarmen.de/reports/Yemen%20NPS%20Transport-Cost%20Report.pdf` (visited on 01/07/2018).

[42] (). Yemen diesel prices, 09-Oct-2017 | GlobalPetrolPrices.com, [Online]. Available: `http://www.globalpetrolprices.com/Yemen/diesel_prices/` (visited on 10/11/2017).

[43] The World Bank. (). Doing Business. Getting Electricity in Yemen, Rep, [Online]. Available: `http://www.doingbusiness.org/data/exploreeconomies/yemen/getting-electricity` (visited on 10/11/2017).

[44] M. Bhatia and N. Angelou, "Beyond Connections. Energy Access Redefined," The International Bank for Reconstruction And Development / THE WORLD BANK GROUP, Washington, DC, Conceptualization report 008/15, Jul. 2015. [Online]. Available: `https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/24368/Beyond0connect0d000technical0report.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y` (visited on 02/18/2018).

[45] P. M. Costa and M. A. Matos, "Economic Analysis of Microgrids Including Reliability Aspects," in *2006 International Conference on Probabilistic Methods Applied to Power Systems*, Jun. 2006, pp. 1–8. DOI: 10.1109/PMAPS.2006.360236.

[46] X. Inc. (). XE: (YER/EUR) Jemen Rial zu Eurozone Kurs, [Online]. Available: `http://www.xe.com/de/currencyconverter/convert/?Amount=1&From=YER&To=EUR` (visited on 10/11/2017).

[47] ——, (). XE: (EUR/USD) Eurozone zu US-Dollar Kurs, [Online]. Available: `http://www.xe.com/de/currencyconverter/convert/?From=EUR` (visited on 10/11/2017).

[48] The World Bank, "Technical and economic assessment of off-grid, mini-grid and grid electrification technologies," The World Bank, 43099, Dec. 2007, pp. 1–100. [Online]. Available: `http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/634581468333897517/Technical-and-economic-assessment-of-off-grid-mini-grid-and-grid-electrification-technologies` (visited on 05/13/2017).

[49]   *Solar PV in Africa: Costs and Markets.* Sep. 2016, ISBN: 978-92-95111-48-6. [Online]. Available: `https://www.irena.org/DocumentDownloads/Publications/IRENA_Solar_PV_Costs_Africa_2016.pdf`.

[50]   M. Lee, D. Soto, and V. Modi, "Cost versus reliability sizing strategy for isolated photovoltaic micro-grids in the developing world," *Renewable Energy*, vol. 69, Renewable Energy, Ed., pp. 16–24, Sep. 2014, ISSN: 0960-1481. DOI: `10.1016/j.renene.2014.03.019`. [Online]. Available: `http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0960148114001633` (visited on 05/13/2017).

[51]   A. Roy and G. N. Kulkarni, "Analysis on the feasibility of a PV-diesel generator hybrid system without energy storage," *Clean Technologies and Environmental Policy*, vol. 18, no. 8, pp. 2541–2553, Dec. 2016, ISSN: 1618-954X, 1618-9558. DOI: `10.1007/s10098-015-1070-2`. [Online]. Available: `https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10098-015-1070-2` (visited on 01/28/2018).

[52]   S. Badiei. (Nov. 2016). 'Swarm Electrification' in Bangladesh Lets Neighbours Swap Solar Electricity, [Online]. Available: `http://motherboard.vice.com/read/mesolshare-rural-bangladesh-swarm-electrification-off-the-grid` (visited on 01/06/2017).