Assessing the performance potential of climate adaptive greenhouse shells

Please check the document version of this publication:

• A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
• The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
• The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.
Link to publication

Assessing the performance potential of climate adaptive greenhouse shells

Chul-sung Lee [a], [*], P. Hoes [b], D. Cóstola [c], J.L.M. Hensen [b]

[a] Dep. of Architectural Engineering, Hanbat National University, Deajeon, South Korea
[b] Dep. of the Built Environment, Eindhoven University of Technology, Eindhoven, the Netherlands
[c] Dep. of Mechanical Aerospace Engineering, University of Strathclyde, Scotland, United Kingdom

A B S T R A C T

Agriculture is responsible for 7.2% of the final energy consumption in the Netherlands; most energy is used for heating and lighting in the greenhouse sector. Currently, the greenhouse sector faces major challenges in reducing its energy demand while increasing crop quality and quantity. One route to improve the performance of industrial greenhouses could be based on using climate adaptive shells. These shells are capable of changing their thermal and optical properties on an hourly, daily, or seasonal basis to optimize performance. The climate adaptive shell concept shows considerable potential for performance improvement in the building sector. However, its potential for the greenhouse sector is yet unknown. This paper quantifies this potential by predicting the energy savings and the increase in net profit using a new framework based on numerical simulation and optimization techniques. The simulation results show that climate adaptive greenhouse shells increase net profit between 7% and 20% for tomato producing Dutch greenhouses. Monthly and hourly adaptation resulted in considerable primary energy savings of 23% and 37%, respectively. It is expected that the predicted net profit increase and energy savings will drive the attention of the greenhouse industry towards the development of climate adaptive greenhouse shells.

© 2019 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The agricultural and horticultural sectors represent a large part of the industrial energy consumption in Northern European countries [1]. Due to the climate in Northern Europe, many agricultural and horticultural growers utilize greenhouses with heating systems in order to provide favorable conditions for crop production [2,3]. As a result, the Dutch agricultural sector was responsible for 7.2% of the final energy consumption of the Netherlands in 2014, and natural gas represented more than 60% of the energy mix of the sector [4]. Most of this energy was used in greenhouses where it represented around 20%—30% of total production costs of the crops [5]. In addition to cost of energy, this industry is facing increasingly stringent energy use targets to reduce CO2 emissions from national and European legislation [6]. This shows that the greenhouse sector faces major challenges to reduce its energy demand while increasing crop quality and quantity.

In the Netherlands, the vast majority of commercial greenhouses use glass as the major component of the greenhouse shell. Glass is used due to its stable optical properties and its durability. However, glass has a relatively low thermal performance (e.g. high U-value and high emissivity), which has a significant impact on the energy costs for operating the greenhouse and also has implications for crop yield. In order to improve the thermal performance and crop production of greenhouses, various studies attempted to optimize the use of existing materials for greenhouse shells and others have introduced new, innovative materials and designs. These studies can be grouped into four thematic areas: 1) increasing the solar transmittance of the shell, for example by using Fresnel lenses [7], laser-cut panel glazing [8], anti-drop (anti-condensation) films [9,10], or anti-reflective coatings [11]; 2) increasing the thermal performance of the shell, for example with a Zigzag sheet [12] or low emissivity coatings [13,14]; 3) controlling or filtering of solar radiation, for example with NIR reflecting films [15—19], Photo selective films [20—23], or UV blocking films [24,25]; and 4) studies aimed at improving the greenhouse performance by integrating renewable energy systems, for example by using Fluorescent solar concentrators [26—28], Fresnel lenses with

T, PV and PVT [29–32], or semi-transparent photovoltaic modules [33–35].

Some new greenhouse concepts have been developed in recent times: for example, the solar greenhouse [36], the semi-closed greenhouse [37–41], the energy producing greenhouse [42], the Sunergy greenhouse [43], and the electricity generating greenhouse [44,45]. Most of the greenhouse concepts reduced energy use while maintaining or increasing the crop production. These previous greenhouse concepts are largely based on existing energy-saving technologies.

An alternative route to improve the performance of greenhouses could be based on the development of climate adaptive shells, which are capable of changing their thermal and optical properties on an hourly, daily, or seasonal basis to optimize performance in the face of changing boundary conditions [46]. The climate adaptive shell concept has shown considerable potential for performance improvement in the building sector [47–49], but the potential benefits in the greenhouse sector are unknown.

According to a model-based greenhouse design method [50,51], outdoor climate has the greatest impact on the greenhouse performance. This paper aims to identify the potential for energy saving and crop production increase in greenhouse shells capable of adapting to the weather conditions by changing several shell properties in various frequencies (monthly and hourly adaptation). At present, there are no cost-effective technologies capable of providing high levels of adaptation for greenhouse shells. By providing figures on potential savings, this paper aims to support building component developers and greenhouse contractors in making informed decisions to allocate research and development resources towards *climate adaptive greenhouse shells* (CAGS).

The CAGS performance assessment methodology introduced in this paper is based on dynamic simulation [52] and multi-objective optimization using genetic algorithms [53]. While both techniques are widely used in research, there are considerable challenges when optimizing shell properties during simulation runtime. For this purpose, a simulation-optimization framework was developed to assess the potential of CAGS. This framework is briefly presented in Section 2. Section 3 investigates the potential of CAGS through a case study with a tomato production greenhouse in the Netherlands. Section 4 shows the results of the case study and Section 5 discusses future developments and the control of the CAGS. Finally, Section 6 summarizes the main findings of this research.

2. Methodology

The main aim of this section is to arrive at a means to evaluate

the potential of the proposed CAGS concept. Since there are currently no real-world applications to study in the field, the potential of the CAGS concept will have to be demonstrated by other means. In situations where new and innovative building designs need to be put to the test, computational assessment through the use of simulation tools has proved to be extremely useful. Therefore, in this study we also use a simulation approach to assess the performance of CAGS. This section first introduces a simulation tool for greenhouse performance simulation. Next, a simulation approach is described based on multi-objective optimization. Lastly, it is explained how the simulation approach is implemented in a simulation toolchain.

2.1. Greenhouse performance simulation tool

A greenhouse performance simulation (GPS) tool needs to consider the combined effects of the many aspects that could influence the energy performance and productivity of a greenhouse [55], such as: all physical phenomena (conduction, convection, long and short-wave radiation, mass flow including air and moisture), heating and cooling systems, controls (shading devices, window opening/closure), and other operational issues (crop type, crop growth, CO_2 concentration). A literature review revealed the existence of several simulation tools that can address these aspects with various degrees of complexity and accuracy, such as KASPRO [54] and Greenhouse Environment Simulator [56]. In order to assess the performance of CAGS, it is necessary to vary the thermal and optical properties during simulation runtime [57]. However, this is not possible in the existing GPS tools. Moreover, the source-code of these tools is not open to third parties, which hinders their usage in the evaluation of CAGS. For this reason, this research adopted the widely validated open-source building energy simulation program, ESP-r [58,59], as the main simulation engine to assess the performance of the CAGS concept. ESP-r is a state-of-the-art BPS tool and it has significant power in modelling building physics. ESP-r has highly resolved and well validated methods for modelling the interactions between the indoor and outdoor environment and the building fabric [60]. ESP-r provides a small simulation time step for accurate calculations, and also offers flexibility and connectivity for both the control of shell properties and for coupling optimization algorithms from other tools.

In order to use ESP-r as a GPS tools, the authors had to extend and adapt a number of modelling aspects of ESP-r. The following key functions for greenhouse modelling were added/adapted (see also Fig. 1): sky temperature, photosynthesis and respiration, transpiration and evaporation, humidification, condensation, ventilation control, artificial lighting control, screen control and

Sky temperature considering cloudiness

Ventilation control with indoor humidity sensor

Shortwave transmissivity of Venlo type greenhouse

Condensation for moisture balance

Screen control with set-point temperature & SW radiation

Lighting control set-point with SW &PAR radiation

Transpiration for evaporative cooling & moisture generation

Photosynthesis and respiration for dry matter calculation

Fig. 1. Overview of features added to ESP-r for greenhouse performance simulation.

transitivity of greenhouse roof. Furthermore, the authors would like to emphasize the integration of a crop model to calculate the crop production for given environmental conditions. This extended ESP-r version was validated with the state-of-the-art greenhouse performance simulation tool, KASPRO [61].

2.2. Multi-objective optimization of shell properties per adaptation period

The CAGS concept changes or 'adapts' its shell properties (e.g. transmittance or emissivity) in reaction to changes in climate conditions to meet predefined objectives. In order to assess the potential of CAGS, the simulation tool should find the optimal values of the shell properties for each 'adaptation period' during the required assessment period. Note that in this work we define the 'adaptation period' as the period between changes of the shell properties; the length of this adaptation period can be hours, days or months (later in this article we will discuss the optimal length of this adaptation period). There are various methods that can be used to search for the optimal values of the shell properties, ranging from brute force search methods to gradient-based methods and genetic algorithms [62]. Genetic algorithms (GA) have been successfully used in a variety of applications in the building domain [63], therefore a GA was also chosen to optimize the shell properties in this study. The overall simulation approach including the GA is illustrated in Fig. 2 and described in detail below.

As mentioned above, the proposed simulation approach needs to find the optimal values for the shell properties during the whole assessment period (T0 ~ Tn). Each adaptation period (Ap) will have one set of optimal values for the shell properties. For each assessment period, the number of sets with optimal values is dependent on the length of the adaptation period ($A_{px} \sim Ap_{x+1}$). In this example, at time Ap_x, the master simulation pauses and sends its state values (air temperatures, surface temperatures, etc.) to the

shell optimizer. The optimizer evaluates various sets of shell property values (S1 ~ S6), defined by the GA algorithm, for the duration of the adaptation period by using the extended ESP-r tool. The calculated results (R1 ~ R6, corresponding to S1 ~ S6) are compared. The optimal set of shell properties (S6) that shows the desired performance (R6) is selected and returned to the master simulation. Finally, the master simulation continues with the current adaptation period ($Ap_x \sim Ap_{x+1}$) and implements the optimal set of shell properties (S6). Next, the optimization moves to the next adaptation period ($Ap_{x+1} \sim Ap_{x+2}$). Using this simulation approach, the CAGS concept can be evaluated without losing any historical thermal effects in the growing medium (in our case, soil) during the assessment period.

2.3. Virtual test environment for CAGS concept

This section describes the implementation of the simulation approach in a simulation toolchain. The simulation toolchain in this study is based on previous research [65] and uses co-simulation. Co-simulation means that two or more separate programs are coupled and exchange data at run-time. Co-simulation makes it possible to extend the capabilities of a single tool and to manage complicated and innovative systems [64], such as the CAGS concept. As shown in Fig. 2 the simulation approach in this study consists of a master simulation (running for the whole assessment period) and an optimizer (running multiple times for each adaptation period). Co-simulation is used to couple the master simulation with the optimizer at simulation run-time.

In this study the toolchain consists of ESP-r, Matlab and the BCVTB. ESP-r represents the model of the CAGS greenhouse, Matlab acts as the greenhouse shell optimizer/controller, and the BCVTB operates as middleware. The BCVTB (Buildings Control Virtual Testbed) [66] is a software environment that allows different simulation programs to be connected and to exchange data during


Fig. 2. Schematic description of multi-objective dynamic optimization for the CAGS concept.

runtime, and it allows for conducting hardware in the loop simulations. The software can be used for co-simulation and for real-time simulations.

In the proposed simulation approach the GA uses many iterations (hundreds) in each adaptation period to find the optimal shell property values. Per adaptation period, each iteration should use the same initial boundary conditions. In order to use the same initial boundary condition and decrease state initialization time, Hoes [67] proposed overwriting the state values of the conservation equations at the start of each simulation. This method is also applied in this study. The various steps in the simulation toolchain

are described in more detail below and are presented in Fig. 3.

The simulation starts with ESP-r. ESP-r simulates the CAGS concept and pauses just before the start of the next adaptation period. Then, ESP-r sends its state variables (as sensor values) to the controller via BCVTB and waits for an optimal set of shell properties from the greenhouse shell optimizer/controller. Matlab, which uses the same greenhouse model as the master simulation, uses the received state variables to initialize the model and starts the optimization using the GA to search for optimal shell properties for the adaptation period. In the optimization process, this research uses the Non-Sorting Genetic Algorithm-II (NSGA-II) as the GA and the


Fig. 3. Toolchain for implementation of dynamic optimization for CAGS concept.

• Location: De Bilt, The Netherlands
• Opening size [m²]: 3.25
• Opening fraction [m²/m²]: 0.0417
• U_{shell}-value [W/ m²·K]: 5.75
• ε_{shell} inside: 0.84
• ε_{shell} outside: 0.84
• τ_{shell} SW radiation: 0.85
• α_{shell} SW radiation: 0.04
• ρ_{shell} SW radiation: 0.11

Fig. 4. Simulation model of reference greenhouse for tomato growing.

Latin Hypercube Sampling (LHS) method to create the initial population. The optimization stops when the stopping criteria are met. When the optimization is finished, an optimal set of shell properties is automatically selected by means of predefined decision-making rules. These rules are based on an economic approach that calculates the 'net profit'; this approach is described in more detail in Section 3.2. Then, Matlab sends the optimal shell property values to the master simulation. Next, the master simulation continues with the received optimal values for the next adaptation period. This process continues until the end of the assessment period.

3. Case study description

The potential of the CAGS concept is demonstrated in a case study. This section first introduces the greenhouse case study model and then describes the two key performance indicators that are used to assess the performance of the greenhouse design. Furthermore, the rules for decision making in order to choose between the various shell sets is discussed.

3.1. Greenhouse case study model

The case study greenhouse is based on the widely used Venlo-type greenhouse in the Netherlands. In this case study the greenhouse grows tomato crops. The case study greenhouse was modelled in ESP-r, as shown in Fig. 4, based on properties available in the literature [54]. The boundary conditions of the four walls are set as adiabatic, since it is assumed that the optical and thermal effects from the walls are small and can be neglected for this large low-rise greenhouse [54]. Openings on the roof are available for ventilative cooling and dehumidification, and are modelled using an airflow network [70]. It is assumed that half of the openings face the south and the other half face the north. The roof appears flat in the schematic of the simulation model, but the simulation takes into account the angular dependence of a saw tooth roof for incident solar radiation.

Fig. 5, below, provides a brief overview of the assumptions of the system and controls of the greenhouse. The greenhouse is heated with a boiler with $\eta_{overall\_boiler} = 0.9$ and is cooled by natural ventilation. Indoor relative humidity is controlled by natural ventilation with $\eta_{ventilation} = 0.5$ and mechanical ventilation by fan with $\eta_{ventilation} = 1.0$. A ventilation efficiency of 0.5 means that ventilation transfers only 50% of moisture to the air exchange and this is only applicable for the dehumidification. CO_2 is supplied during day time to meet a concentration of 800 ppm at each time step, but the concentration changes depending on the ventilation. Indoor air temperature is controlled with hourly set-points commonly used by Dutch tomato growers. Two screens, one aluminized and one transparent, are used to reduce energy losses in times with low solar radiation and cold weather. All detailed control and set point of the screens and fan ventilations are described in Ref. [54].

This study used a Dutch weather file of the typical reference year of 2009 from KNMI [71]. Fig. 6 shows the hourly weather conditions regarding air temperature, global horizontal irradiance (GHI), wind speed and relative humidity.

3.2. Performance indicators and objective function

The potential of the CAGS concept is evaluated using the following two performance indicators (PI): primary energy consumption and crop production. The optimal greenhouse is determined by using these performance indicators and a decision-making strategy.

The case study uses a gas boiler for heating and fans for cooling and dehumidification. Both the gas consumption and the fan's electricity consumption are calculated in the simulation. These two


Fig. 5. Overview of control and operation of the case study greenhouse.

Fig. 6. Hourly weather condition of air temperature, global horizontal irradiance (GHI), wind speed, and relative humidity.

energy consumptions are converted into primary energy (gas) with a primary energy conversion factor of 1.1 (1/0.9) for heating (which is derived from $\eta_{overall\_boiler} = 0.9$) and 2.5 for electricity.

The simulation tool calculates the amount of fresh matter (FM) production in kilograms from dry matter (DM) production calculated using the tomato crop model implemented in ESP-r. A fresh matter conversion factor of 10 was adopted. In order to facilitate decision making with the two conflicting PIs, this case study used Pareto optimization with a 'posteriori' approach. This means that the optimal solutions (in this case, an optimal solution is a set of optimal shell properties) have to be found before the decision is made. As shown in Fig. 7, the optimal solutions from Pareto optimization are a set of non-dominated solutions.

A practical approach to decision making to select an optimal solution for greenhouse design in this context can be found in Ref. [68]. The study evaluated the results of different solutions by

investigating the resulting annual net financial results (NFR) of each option, which was complicated. However, this case study adopts a simple approach to calculates the 'net profit' and determine an optimal solution for this multi-objective optimization problem. To do this, both tomato production and primary energy consumption are converted into Euros per square meter. This conversion then allows the calculation of the net profit (Q_{net_profit}), which is used for decision making:

$$Q_{net\_profit}\left(t_f\right) = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} Q_{tomato\_yield} - Q_{p\_energy} \, dt \quad \left[\text{€}/m^2\right]$$

where t_0 and t_f are the beginning and the end of the adaptation period respectively, Q_{tomato_yield} (€/m²) is tomato production, and Q_{p_energy} (€/m²) is the primary energy consumption. The primary

Fig. 7. An example of selection of the optimum solution with maximum net profit in August.

energy consumption (Q_{p_energy}) is calculated by:

$$Q_{P\_energy} = \left\{ (E_{gas}*1.1) + \left(E_{eletricity}*2.5 \right) \right\} * q_{gas} \quad \left[€ \middle/ m^2 \right]$$

where E_{gas} (kWh/m^2) is gas consumption, $E_{eletricity}$ (kWh/m^2) is electricity energy consumption, and q_{gas} (€/kWh) is gas price. The tomato production (Q_{tomato_yield}) is calculated by:

$$Q_{tomato\_yield} = FM_{har}* q_{tomato} \quad \left[€ \middle/ m^2 \right]$$

where, FM_{har} (kg/m^2) is harvested tomato production and q_{tomato} (€/kg) is tomato price. Since the tomato price varies over the year, this study took monthly averages from Ref. [69], which is illustrated in Fig. 8.


Fig. 8. Average monthly tomato price in The Netherlands [69].

When the adaptation frequency is high, adaptation periods may occur in which no PI is considered (e.g. a CAGS concept greenhouse with passive cooling in summer). However, at least one PI, which becomes the objective function in an optimization problem, is necessary for the decision making. This study employs 'average setting temperature' to select the optimum solution. The average setting temperature is the average of the heating and cooling set points, and the optimum solution will be the set of properties that has the closest air temperature to the average setting temperature.

3.3. Design parameters for optimization

Table 1 presents the thermal and optical greenhouse parameters to be optimized with ranges also described in this table. The parameters were selected for the CAGS by sensitivity analysis [54] and ranges were set to cover the main factors affecting the primary energy consumption of the greenhouse. Note that the U-value and emissivity of the greenhouse shell are considered as two separate parameters, although the U-value varies depending on the inside and outside emissivity. The U-value and emissivity are presented in this manner since the U-value is used extensively as an indicator of thermal performance. However, calculations in ESP-r uses the thermal conductivity of the glazing rather than the U-value itself.

4. Case study results

In this section the potential of the CAGS concept was demonstrated by simulating a greenhouse shell with adaptive shell properties and comparing its performance to a reference greenhouse with fixed shell properties. The Venlo-type greenhouse was used as this reference greenhouse. Furthermore, the optimal shell property values and the sensitivity of the design parameters over the year are investigated.

4.1. Performance improvement compared to static shells

In this section the reference greenhouse was compared to an optimized static greenhouse and a greenhouse with CAGS considering two adaptation frequencies (monthly and hourly adaptation). The optimized static greenhouse represents a greenhouse with optimal shell property values for the year, i.e., no adaptation during the year. Fig. 9 shows the predicted performance of all the greenhouses. The graphs show the tomato production, the energy consumption and the net profit. The optimized design and the CAGS concept showed a higher net profit compared to the reference greenhouse. The difference in net profit between the optimized static greenhouse (7% compared to the reference greenhouse) and the monthly adaptive greenhouse (9% compared to the reference greenhouse) was small. Note that the highest profit is not necessarily associated with the maximum production nor with the minimum energy consumption. This is a result of the trade-off between the two objectives during the decision making to maximize the net profit. The hourly adaptive greenhouse showed the highest potential in terms of tomato production increase, primary energy saving and finally net profit increase (20% compared to the

Table 1
Selected greenhouse design parameters of greenhouse shell and considered ranges.

| Parameters	Range	Description
τ-PAR [−]	0.05−0.95	Transmittance of photosynthetically active radiation
τ-NIR [−]	0.05−0.95	Transmittance of near-infrared radiation
U(s)-value [W/m^2·K]	0.8−5.8	U-value of shell calculated by ISO 6946
ε-inside [−]	0.05−0.95	Inside emissivity
ε-outside [−]	0.05−0.95	Outside emissivity

**Fig. 9.** Simulated results of tomato production, energy consumption and net profit.

Fig. 10. Distribution of primary energy consumption.

greenhouse. This was caused by the used ventilation strategy, which aims to increase the tomato production by maintaining a high CO_2 concentration. This case study used two ventilation systems for dehumidification: mechanical ventilation with a ventilation efficiency of 1, and natural ventilation with a ventilation efficiency of 0.5. Therefore, in order to minimize air change, which leads to CO_2 decrease, the optimization algorithm forces the use of mechanical ventilation with high ventilation efficiency rather than natural ventilation. The difference in heating energy consumption between the reference greenhouse and the optimized static design was small; however, the adaptive greenhouses showed 23%–37% of heating energy saving compared to the reference greenhouse.

These results showed that the climate adaptive concept provides many opportunities to reduce the use of heating energy. Although little financial return was visible when comparing the optimized static design to the monthly adaptive CAGS, the monthly adaptive concept was still promising in terms of CO2 reduction. In order words, the CAGS concept showed a clear advantage over the conventional static greenhouse designs.

4.2. Optimum properties and their sensitivity

This section provides an in-depth analysis of the CAGS simulation results. This analysis presented the optimal values of the shell properties over the year together with the sensitivity of each property. The sensitivity index was calculated during the optimization process. It is important to consider the optimal value and the sensitivity at the same time in order to determine which optimal property is important for the greenhouse performance. These results could inspire the designs of future greenhouse shells; what properties should be made adaptive and what values (ranges) should these properties have?

4.2.1. Optimized static and monthly adaptive shell

The two graphs in Fig. 11 provide optimal static and monthly property values and sensitivities. For most parameters, there was a clear transition from winter to summer. In the winter, low U-values and emissivity of the inside face of the shell worked to reduce energy losses and therefore to reduce heating energy consumption. This was combined with high NIR transmittance to increase solar gains and reduce energy needed for heating. In the summer, high U-values and emissivity of the inside face of the shell worked to facilitate heat losses, reducing the need for ventilative cooling and therefore maintaining high CO_2 levels inside the greenhouse. Optimal behavior of CAGS in mid-season were in between winter and summer. Sensitivities in Fig. 11 support this analysis, as there is

reference greenhouse). It can be concluded that once the greenhouse design is optimized for this tomato crop, monthly adaptation does not lead to many advantages in financial terms, but hourly adaptation demonstrates great potential to provide significant performance improvement.

Fig. 10 shows the energy consumption over the year for dehumidification and heating. The optimized greenhouses used more energy for dehumidification compared to the reference


Fig. 11. Optimum properties (left) and their sensitivity (right) of the optimized static shell and the monthly adaptive shell.

a clear shift from positive to negative sensitivities as seasons change. PAR transmittance was always high, as expected, due to its beneficial effect on photosynthesis (or tomato production). Outside surface emissivity was the least sensitive parameter and shows erratic behavior over the year as it was not a dominating factor in the overall performance. When comparing the optimized static shell with the monthly adaptive shell, the optimized static shell showed to be a compromise of the optimal monthly adaptive shell values.

4.2.2. Hourly adaptive shell

Hourly optimal property values were not constant but varied over the day (due to the continuously changing performance requirements and weather conditions). Although the hourly variations of the optimal properties are useful to see, the fluctuations make it difficult to interpret the result visually. In order to focus on long term variations, this study showed the hourly optimal properties and sensitivity index using a 'moving average' [72]. The moving average method avoids short-term variations and highlights long-term trends in data. In addition, the analysis was divided into day and night to avoid combining the influence of the sun.

Fig. 12 showed the optimum properties and sensitivity of the hourly optimized shell during day time with a moving average of five days. The variation of U-values showed similar behavior to the monthly adaptive shell over the year: low in winter to minimize heat loss and high in summer to maximize heat elimination. The variation of U-value showed more influence in winter on net profit increase resulting from energy saving than in summer. PAR transmission was always high and was the most influential property in mid-season and in summer when tomato production begins. The trade-off between energy saving and production increase resulted in fluctuation and low sensitivity of PAR transmission in winter.

This was because increases in PAR led to increases in relative humidity that must be removed, which leads to an increase in energy demand for ventilative cooling. Optimal inside and outside emissivity showed no clear change over the year since variations of these properties were not significant in the net profit increase. This low sensitivity was likely related to the changes of shell properties every hour, which was to focus on the identification of dominating shell properties (PAR transmittance and U-values).

Fig. 13 shows optimum properties and sensitivities of the hourly optimized greenhouse shell during night time. Since the tomato crop is not engaged in photosynthesis at night, the optimization turns into a single-objective problem that only needs to minimize primary energy consumption. During night time, the optical properties are not relevant, and therefore only the three thermal properties were discussed below. All three properties showed a high influence during the winter. The optimal U-value and outside emissivity value were low to prevent heat losses to the outside. The crop also emits moisture at night time leading to an increase in humidity. For humidity control, this greenhouse used condensation or ventilation. Considering crop growth and heat preservation in winter, using condensation is a more efficient method than using ventilation since there is no air exchange required. In order to increase condensation, the greenhouse shell temperature should be low enough to result in a positive sensitivity index and a high optimal value of inside emissivity. During summer, the sensitivity index and the optimal property did not show any relation each other. This lack of connection is caused by the decision-making criteria of the average setting temperature. As defined in Section 3.1.1, there were some periods without any heating, cooling or dehumidification demand when the CAGS concept greenhouses had a high adaptive frequency. Since some values should be selected to find an optimal solution, the average setting temperature was employed to substitute primary energy consumption.


Fig. 12. Optimum properties (left) and their sensitivities (right) of the hourly adaptive greenhouse shell during day-time with five days of moving average.


Fig. 13. Optimum properties (left) and sensitivity (right) during night-time with five days of moving average.

5. Discussion towards the development of CAGS

The results in Section 4.2 showed the optimal variation of the shell properties depending on the length of the adaptation period and showed the sensitivity of each shell property with respect to the performance indicators. This information can help developers to identify which shell properties they should focus on for future development of CAGS. The future developments depending on the adaptation period are discussed in this section.

Static optimal greenhouse shell: In order to maximize net profit with a static greenhouse shell, the optical properties of the shell should maximize PAR transmission to achieve maximum photosynthesis, and should minimize NIR transmission to achieve minimum evaporative cooling, high CO2 concentration and reduced ventilation. The heat insulating performance should not be excellent (around $3.8 \, W/m^2K$) when applying both ventilative cooling and CO2 supply in summer, since maintaining high CO2 concentration returns in high net profits.

Monthly adaptive greenhouse shell: The shell should be developed so that U-value, internal emissivity and NIR transmission can be controlled per season. Control of PAR transmission is not necessary to maximize net profit over the year. The control strategies are: the shell should have low U-value and internal emissivity and high NIR transmittance in winter; in contrast, the shell should have high U-value and internal emissivity and low NIR transmittance in summer and mid-season.

Hourly adaptive greenhouse shell: The hourly optimal shell characteristics and sensitivity were shown by the moving average technique in Section 4.2.2, so that only long-term shell characteristics and sensitivity can be confirmed. From the sensitivity analysis, this study found that the greenhouse shell should be developed so as to control the U-value, the inside and outside emissivity, and the PAR transmittance. The long-term control method was shown in Figs. 12 and 13, but the hourly operating method is not determinable. Fig. 14 showed the hourly optimum shell properties during the summer, mid-season and winter. Some optimal shell properties, such as U-value in winter and PAR transmittance in summer, do not change significantly even between day and night. However, most optimal shell properties varied greatly over time depending on continuously changing external environment conditions and internal requirements.


Fig. 14. Hourly optimal properties in summer (8/Jul ~ 9/Jul), mid-season (4/Apr ~ 5/Apr and 26/Sep ~ 27/Sep) and winter (1/Dec ~ 2/Dec).

6. Conclusion

This study proposes Climate Adaptive Greenhouse Shells (CAGS) as a new, future greenhouse concept. The performance of the CAGS concept was computationally investigated in a case study. It is important to note here that the CAGS concept greenhouse differs from the typical Dutch greenhouse in the following key aspects: the CAGS greenhouse concept varies in regard to five thermal and optical properties, which were selected for the CAGS concept by sensitivity analysis. The performance of the different greenhouse concepts is compared via a calculation of the generated net profit. The net profit of an optimized static greenhouse and the CAGS concept with two adaptation periods (monthly and hourly adaptation) are compared to a reference greenhouse (a Venlo-type Dutch greenhouse) growing tomatoes. The results of the case study are described below.

- Climate adaptive greenhouse shells increase the net profit between 7% and 20% compared to the reference greenhouse.
- Monthly and hourly adaptation showed little tomato production increase, but did demonstrate considerable primary energy savings of 23% and 37%, respectively.
- The CAGS concept with the higher adaptation frequency demonstrated greater potential in terms of primary energy saving and thus net profit increase.

Next, an in-depth analysis was performed of the CAGS simulation results. This analysis presents the optimal values of the shell properties over the year together with the sensitivity of each property. The results show that optical properties (PAR and NIR transmittance) are the most influential variables in the optimized static greenhouse and the CAGS concept greenhouse with monthly adaptation. U-value and PAR transmittance at day time and U-value and inside sensitivity at night time are the most influential variables in the CAGS concept greenhouse with hourly adaptation.

The climate adaptive greenhouse concept shows a great potential for the Dutch tomato greenhouses to reduce energy use (as well as CO_2 emissions) and increase net profit. This study only focused on tomato greenhouses with a specific heating and ventilation system and the specified performance requirements for the tomato crop. The potential of the CAGS was investigated further by testing five system concepts for three crops: tomato, phalaenopsis and chrysanthemum in Ref. [54]. The study demonstrated that the potential of the CAGS concept varies depending on the greenhouse systems and crop type.

Finally, note that this study did not consider additional increases in expenses, such as investment costs and maintenance costs, etc. Therefore, the technical and financial implications and viability should be addressed by future studies, and replication studies of the CAGS concept should be performed in the real world.

References

[1] Dehnen-Schmutz K, Holdenrieder O, Jeger M, Pautasso M. Structural change in the international horticultural industry: some implications for plant health. Sci Hortic 2010;125(1). ISSN: 0304-4238:1–15.
[2] Torrellas M, Antón A, Ruijs M, Victoria N, Stanghellini C, Montero J. Environmental and economic assessment of protected crops in four European

scenarios. J Clean Prod 2012;28. ISSN: 0959-6526:45–55.

[3] Bayer P, Saner D, Bolay S, Rybach L, Blum P. Greenhouse gas emission savings of ground source heat pump systems in Europe: a review. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2012;16(2). ISSN: 1364-0321:1256–67.

[4] Eurostat. 2016. http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Agri-environmental_indicator_-_energy_use. [Accessed 29 August 2018].

[5] Peet M, Welles G. Greenhouse tomato production. In: Heuvelink E, editor. Crop production science in horticulture series: Tomatoes. CABI Publishing; 2005. p. 257–304 [Print].

[6] Delbeke J, Vis P. EU climate policy explained — European Union. Routledge; 2016. https://ec.europa.eu/clima/sites/clima/files/eu_climate_policy_explained_en.pdf. [Accessed 29 August 2018].

[7] Kurata K. Scale-model experiments of applying a Fresnel prism to greenhouse covering. Sol Energy 1991;46(1):53–7.

[8] Edmonds IR, Pearce DJ. Enhancement of crop illuminance in high latitude greenhouses with laser-cut panel glazing. Sol Energy 1999;66(4):255–65.

[9] Cemek B, Demir Y. Testing of the condensation characteristics and light transmissions of different plastic film covering materials. Polym Test 2005;24(3):284–9.

[10] Pollet IV, Pieters JG. Condensation and radiation transmittance of greenhouse cladding materials, Part 2: results for a complete condensation cycle. J Agric Eng Res 2000;75(1):65–72.

[11] Rosencrantz T, Bülow-Hübe H, Karlsson B, Roos A. Increased solar energy and daylight utilisation using anti-reflective coatings in energy-efficient windows. Sol Energy Mater Sol Cell 2005;89(2–3):249–60.

[12] Sonneveld PJ, Swinkels GLAM. New developments of energy-saving greenhouses with a high light transmittance. Acta Hortic (Wagening) 2005;691(1):589–96.

[13] Dachselt WD, Münz WD, Scherer M. Low emissivity and solar control coatings on architectural glass. Opt Coat Energy Effic Solar Appl 1982;37:37–43.

[14] Halleux D, Deltour J, Nijskens J, Nisen A, Coutisse S. Dynamic simulation of heat fluxes and temperature in horticultural and low emissivity glass-covered greenhouse. Acta Hortic (ISHS) 1985;170:91–6.

[15] Kempkes F, Stanghellini C, Hemming S, Dai J. Cover materials excluding near infrared radiation: effect on greenhouse climate and plant processes. Acta Hortic (Wagening) 2008;797:477–82.

[16] Kempkes FLK, Stanghellini C, Hemming S. Cover materials excluding near infrared radiation: what is the best strategy in mild climates? Acta Hortic (Wagening) 2009;807:67–72.

[17] Hemming S, Kempkes F, Van Der Braak N, Dueck T, Marissen N. Filtering natural light at the greenhouse covering - better greenhouse climate and higher production by filtering out NIR? Acta Hortic (Wagening) 2006;711:411–6.

[18] Hemming S, Kempkes F, Van Der Braak N, Dueck T, Marissen N. Greenhouse cooling by NIR-reflection. Acta Hortic (Wagening) 2006;719:97–105.

[19] Kempkes FLK, Hemming S. Calculation of NIR effect on greenhouse climate in various conditions. Acta Hortic (Wagening) 2012;927:543–50.

[20] Kittas C, Baille A, Giaglaras P. Influence of covering material and shading on the spectral distribution of light in greenhouses. J Agric Eng Res 1999;73:341–51.

[21] Li S, Rajapakse NC, Young RE, Oi R. Growth responses of chrysanthemum and bell pepper transplants to photoselective plastic films. Sci Hortic 2000;84(3–4):215–25.

[22] Oyaert E, Volckaert E, Debergh PC. Growth of chrysanthemum under coloured plastic films with different light qualities and quantities. Sci Hortic 1999;79(3–4):195–205.

[23] Cerny T, Faust J. Influence of photoselective films and growing season on stem growth and flowering of six plant species. Am Soc Hortic Sci 2003;128(4):486–91.

[24] Kittas C, Tchamitchian M, Katsoulas N, Karaiskou P, Papaioannou Ch. Effect of two UV-absorbing greenhouse-covering films on growth and yield of an eggplant soilless crop. Sci Hortic 2006;110(1):30–7.

[25] Tsormpatsidis E, Henbest RGC, Davis FJ, Battey NH, Hadley P, Wagstaffe A. UV irradiance as a major influence on growth, development and secondary products of commercial importance in Lollo Rosso lettuce "Revolution" grown under polyethylene films. Environ Exp Bot 2008;63(1–3):232–9.

[26] Novoplansky a, Sachs T, Cohen D, Bar R, Bodenheimer J, Reisfeld R. Increasing plant productivity by changing the solar spectrum. Sol Energy Mater 1990;21(1):17–23.

[27] Hammam M, El-Mansy MK, El-Bashir SM, El-Shaarawy MG. Performance evaluation of thin-film solar concentrators for greenhouse applications. Desalination 2007;209(1–3 Spec. Iss.):244–50.

[28] Lamnatou C, Chemisana D. Solar radiation manipulations and their role in greenhouse claddings: Fluorescent solar concentrators, photoselective and other materials. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2013a;27:175–90.

[29] Jirka V, et al. Energy flow in a greenhouse equipped with glass raster lenses. Renew Energy 1999;16(1–4):660–4.

[30] Tripanagnostopoulos Y, Souliotis M, Tonui JK, Kavga A. Irradiation aspects for energy balance in greenhouses. Acta Hortic (Wagening) 2005;691:733–40.

[31] Tsormpatsidis E, Henbest RGC, Davis FJ, Battey NH, Hadley P, Wagstaffe A. UV irradiance as a major influence on growth, development and secondary products of commercial importance in Lollo Rosso lettuce "Revolution" grown under polyethylene films. Environ Exp Bot 2008;63(1–3):232–9.

[32] Sonneveld PJ, Swinkels GLAM, Van Tuijl BAJ, Janssen HJJ, Campen J, Bot GPA. Performance of a concentrated photovoltaic energy system with static linear

[33] Fresnel lenses. Sol Energy 2011;85(3):432–42.

[33] Yano A, Onoe M, Nakata J. Prototype semi-transparent photovoltaic modules for greenhouse roof applications. Biosyst Eng 2014;122:62–73.

[34] Cossu M, Yano A, Li Z, Onoe M, Nakamura H, Matsumoto T, Nakata J. Advances on the semi-transparent modules based on micro solar cells: first integration in a greenhouse system. Appl Energy 2016;162:1042–51.

[35] Cossu M, Yano A, Murgia L, Ledda L, Deligios PA, Sirigu A, Chessa F, Pazzona A. Effects of the photovoltaic roofs on the greenhouse microclimate. Acta Hortic (Wagening) 2017;1170:461–8.

[36] Bot G, Van De Braak N, Challa H, Hemming S, Rieswijk Th, Straten GV, Verlodt I. The solar greenhouse: state of the art in energy saving and sustainable energy supply. Acta Hortic (Wagening) 2005;691:501–8.

[37] Gelder A, Dieleman JA, Bot GPA, Marcelis LFM. An overview of climate and crop yield in closed greenhouses. J Hortic Sci Biotechnol 2012;87(3):193–202 (2012).

[38] Qian T, Dieleman JA, Elings A, Marcelis LFM. Leaf photosynthetic and morphological responses to elevated CO_2 concentration and altered fruit number in the semi-closed greenhouse. Sci Hortic 2012;145:1–9.

[39] Opdam JJG, Schoonderbeek GG, Heller EMB, De Gelder A. Closed greenhouse: a starting point for sustainable entrepreneurship in horticulture. Acta Hortic (Wagening) 2005;691:517–24.

[40] Gelder a, Heuvelink E, Opdam JJG. Tomato yield in a closed greenhouse and comparison with simulated yields in closed and conventional greenhouses. Acta Hortic (Wagening) 2005;691:549–52.

[41] Qiana T, Dieleman JA, Elings A, De Gelder A, Marcelis LFM, Van Kooten O. Comparison of climate and production in closed, semi-closed and open greenhouses. Acta Hortic (Wagening) 2011;893:807–14.

[42] Bakker JC, De Zwart HF, Campen JB. Greenhouse cooling and heat recovery using fine wire heat exchangers in a closed pot plant greenhouse: design of an energy producing greenhouse. Acta Hortic (Wagening) 2006;719:263–70.

[43] Zwart HF. The sunergy greenhouse - one year of measurements in a next generation greenhouse. Acta Hortic (Wagening) 2011;893:351–8.

[44] Sonneveld PJ, Swinkels GLAM, Bot GPA, Flamand G. Feasibility study for combining cooling and high grade energy production in a solar greenhouse. Biosyst Eng 2010;105(1):51–8.

[45] Sonneveld PJ, Swinkels GLAM, Campen J, van Tuijl BAJ, Janssen HJJ, Bot GPA. Performance results of a solar greenhouse combining electrical and thermal energy production. Biosyst Eng 2010;106(1):48–57.

[46] Loonen RCGM, Trčka M, Cóstola D, Hensen JLM. Climate adaptive building shells: state-of-the-art and future challenges. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2013;25:483–93.

[47] Loonen RCGM, Favoino F, Hensen JLM, Overend M. Review of current status, requirements and opportunities for building performance simulation of adaptive facades. J Build Perform Simulat 2017;10(2):205–22.

[48] Kimber M, Clark WW, Schaefer L. Conceptual analysis and design of a partitioned multifunctional smart insulation. Appl Energy 2014;114(February):310–9.

[49] Favoino F. Assessing the performance of an advanced integrated facade by means of simulation: the ACTRESS facade case study. J Facade Des Eng 2015;Preprint:1–23.

[50] Vanthoor BHE, van Henten EJ, Stanghellini C, de Visser PHB. A methodology for model-based greenhouse design: Part 3, sensitivity analysis of a combined greenhouse climate-crop yield model. Biosyst Eng 2011;110(4):396–412.

[51] Vanthoor BHE. A model based greenhouse design method. PhD thesis. The Netherlands: Wageningen University; 2011.

[52] Clarke JA. In: Clarke JA, editor. Energy simulation in building design. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann; 2001, ISBN 9780750650823.

[53] Deb K, Pratap A, Agarwal S, Meyarivan T. A fast and elitist multiobjective genetic algorithm: NSGA-II. IEEE Trans Evol Comput 2002;6(2):182–97.

[54] Lee C. Simulation-based performance assessment of climate adaptive greenhouse shells. PhD thesis. The Netherlands: Eindhoven University of Technology; 2017.

[55] Zwart HF. Analyzing energy-saving options in greenhouse cultivation using a simulation model. PhD thesis. The Netherlands: Wageningen University; 1996.

[56] Fitz-Rodríguez E, Kubota C, Giacomelli G, Tignor M, Wilson S, McMahon M. Dynamic modeling and simulation of greenhouse environments under several scenarios: a web-based application. Comput Electron Agric 2010;70(1):105–16.

[57] Loonen RCGM, Favoino F, Hensen JLM, Overend M. Review of current status, requirements and opportunities for building performance simulation of adaptive facades. J Build Perform Simulat 2017;10(2):205–22.

[58] ESP-rSource, Retrieved August 29, 2018, from https://github.com/ESP-rCommunity/ESP-rSource

[59] Strachan PA, Kokogiannakis G, Macdonald IA. History and development of validation with the ESP-r simulation program. Build Environ 2008;43(Issue 4). ISSN: 0360-1323:601–9.

[60] Beausoleil-Morrison I, Macdonald F, Kummert M, Jost R, McDowell T. Co-simulation between ESP-r and TRNSYS: more highly resolved modelling of integrated building and energy systems. Proc Build Simulat 2013;2013:3458–65.

[61] Lee C, Costola D, Swinkels GLAM, Hensen JLM. On the use of building energy simulation programs in the performance assessment of agricultural greenhouses. IBPSA-Asia: ASim; 2012. p. 1–8.

[62] Machairas V, Tsangrassoulis A, Axarli K. Algorithms for optimization of

building design: a review. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2014;31:101—12.

[63] Nguyen A-T, Reiter S, Rigo P. A review on simulation-based optimization methods applied to building performance analysis. Appl Energy 2014;113: 1043—58.

[64] Trcka M. Co-simulation for performance prediction of innovative integrated mechanical energy systems in buildings. PhD thesis. The Netherlands: Eind-hoven University of Technology; 2008.

[65] Hoes P, Hensen JLM. The potential of lightweight low-energy houses with hybrid adaptable thermal storage: comparing the performance of promising concepts. Energy Build 2016;110:79—93.

[66] Wetter Michael. Co-simulation of building energy and control systems with the building controls virtual test bed. J Build Perform Simulat 2011;4: 185—203. https://doi.org/10.1080/19401493.2010.518631.

[67] Hoes P. Computational performance prediction of the potential of hybrid adaptable thermal storage concepts for lightweight low-energy houses. PhD thesis. The Netherlands: Eindhoven University of Technology; 2014.

[68] Vanthoor BHE, Gázquez JC, Magán JJ, Ruijs MNA, Baeza E, Stanghellini C, van Henten EJ, de Visser PHB. A methodology for model-based greenhouse design: Part 4, economic evaluation of different greenhouse designs: a Spanish case. Biosyst Eng 2012;111(4):336—49.

[69] Vermeulen PCM. Kwantitatieve informatie voor de glastuinbouw. KWIN Glastuinbouw; 2010. http://edepot.wur.nl/326466. [Accessed 29 August 2018].

[70] Hensen JLM. A comparison of coupled and de-coupled solutions for temper-ature and air flow in a building. ASHRAE Transact 1999;105(2):962—9 [American Society of Heating, Refrigerating, and Air-Conditioning Engineers].

[71] The Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute (Koninklijk Nederlands Meteorologisch Instituut, KNMI), Retrieved August 29, 2018, https://climexp. knmi.nl/start.cgi

[72] Loonen RCGM, Hensen JLM. Dynamic sensitivity analysis for performance-based building design and operation. In: Proceedings of building simulation 2013: 13th conference of the international building performance simulation association IBPSA, 26—28 August, chambery; 2013. p. 299—305.