Energy Sources for Integrated Communities (ERIC)

Dedicated website – Yes

Organisation webpage – No

Centralised portal – No

Objectives/Success Criteria – Limited

Closedown/final report – Yes

Open-source data – No

Peer-reviewed academic output (Primary Subject / Referenced) - 0 / 0

Brochures/Case Studies/Videos – Yes

On-line major conference/event presentations - 0

Dissemination Event / Output available – 0 / 0

Follow-on project – No

Consumer Engagement

Consumer Participation – Yes

Consumer Feedback – Yes

Output Summary

Progress reports – No

Detailed and objective final report – Yes

Project method detailed – Limited

Performance to objectives detailed – Yes

Lessons learned identified – Yes

Policy/Regulation implications reviewed – No

Simpler report format than LCNF or NIA projects but covers key aspects. Less objective reporting than LCNF and NIA projects.

Outcomes vs. Objectives/Targets

Performance to objectives – Not defined.

Lack of specific measurable objectives but project appears to have been broadly successful.

Key Findings

- Manage customer expectations and ensure fair access across social housing populations.
- Baseline energy audits are required to ensure suitability of batteries.
- Ideal household has medium-high consumption but low daytime use. Very limited benefit for some consumers.
- Remote data communication is a challenge.
- Leave sufficient time for customer recruitment and use simple language.
- Batteries increased self-consumption by 5.8% and reduced peak demand by 8%.
- Annual bill savings averaged £15.

- The technology worked effectively.