

A Probabilistic Forecast-Driven Strategy for a Risk-Aware Participation in the Capacity Firming Market

Jonathan Dumas, Colin Cointe, Antoine Wehenkel, Antonio Sutura, Xavier Fettweis, and Bertrand Cornélusse

Abstract—This paper addresses the energy management of a grid-connected renewable generation plant coupled with a battery energy storage device in the capacity firming market, designed to promote renewable power generation facilities in small non-interconnected grids. A recently developed deep learning model known as normalizing flows is used to generate quantile forecasts of renewable generation. They provide a general mechanism for defining expressive probability distributions, only requiring the specification of a base distribution and a series of bijective transformations. Then, a probabilistic forecast-driven strategy is designed, modeled as a min-max-min robust optimization problem with recourse, and solved using a Benders decomposition. The convergence is improved by building an initial set of cuts derived from domain knowledge. Robust optimization models the generation randomness using an uncertainty set that includes the worst-case generation scenario and protects this scenario under the minimal increment of costs. This approach improves the results over a deterministic approach with nominal point forecasts by finding a trade-off between conservative and risk-seeking policies. Finally, a dynamic risk-averse parameters selection strategy based on the quantile forecasts distribution provides an additional gain. The case study uses the photovoltaic generation monitored on-site at the University of Liège (ULiège), Belgium.

Index Terms—Deep learning, normalizing flows, capacity firming, electricity market, robust optimization, energy management, renewable generation uncertainty.

I. NOTATION

Sets and indices

Name	Description
t	Time period index.
T	Number of time periods per day.
$\mathcal{T}$	Set of time periods, $\mathcal{T} = \{1, 2, \dots, T\}$.
$\mathcal{P}$	Renewable generation uncertainty set.

Variables

Name	Range	Description
x_t	$[X_t^{min}, X_t^{max}]$	Engagement, kW.
y_t	$[Y_t^{min}, Y_t^{max}]$	Net power, kW.
y_t^G	$[0, P_c]$	Renewable generation, kW.
y_t^{cha}	$[0, S^c]$	Charging power, kW.
y_t^{dis}	$[0, S^d]$	Discharging power, kW.
y_t^s	$[S^{min}, S^{max}]$	BESS state of charge, kWh.

The authors are with the Departments of Computer Science and Electrical Engineering and Geography, University of Liège, 4000 Liège, Belgium, (e-mail: {jdumas, antoine.wehenkel, a.sutura, xavier.fettweis, bertrand.cornelusse}@uliege.be, colin.cointe@mines-paristech.fr).

$\delta x_t^-, \delta x_t^+$	$\mathbb{R}_+$	Under/overproduction, kW.
y_t^b	$\{0, 1\}$	BESS binary variable.
z_t	$\{0, 1\}$	Uncertainty set binary variable.
α_t	$[M_t^-, M_t^+]$	Variables to linearize $z_t \phi_t^y$.

Dual variables, and Corresponding Constraints

Dual variables of constraints are indicated with brackets $[\cdot]$.

Name	Range	Description
$\phi_t^{cha}, \phi_t^{dis}$	$\mathbb{R}^-$	Maximum (dis)charging. storage
$\phi_t^{S^{min}}, \phi_t^{S^{max}}$	$\mathbb{R}^-$	Minimum/maximum storage capacity.
ϕ_t^y	$\mathbb{R}$	Net power balance.
$\phi_t^{Y^{min}}, \phi_t^{Y^{max}}$	$\mathbb{R}^-$	Minimum/maximum net power.
$\phi_t^{S^i}, \phi_t^{S^f}$	$\mathbb{R}^-$	Initial/final state of charge.
$\phi_t^{y^s}$	$\mathbb{R}^-$	BESS dynamics.
$\phi_t^{\delta x^-}, \phi_t^{\delta x^+}$	$\mathbb{R}^-$	Underproduction/overproduction.
ϕ_t^y	$\mathbb{R}^-$	Renewable generation.

Parameters

Name	Description
X_t^{min}, X_t^{max}	Minimum/maximum engagement, kW.
ΔX_t	Ramping-up and down limits for the engagement, kW.
pP_c	Engagement tolerance, $0 \leq p \leq 1$, kW.
y_t^m	Net measured power, kW.
Y_t^{min}, Y_t^{max}	Minimum/maximum net power, kW.
P_c	Total installed capacity, kWp.
$\hat{p}_t, \hat{p}_t^{(q)}$	Point/quantile q forecast, kW.
p_t^{min}, p_t^{max}	Uncertainty set lower/upper bounds, kW.
S^d, S^c	BESS maximum (dis)charging power, kW.
η^d, η^c	BESS (dis)charging efficiency.
S^{min}, S^{max}	BESS minimum/maximum capacity, kWh.
S^i, S^f	BESS initial/final state of charge, kWh.
π_t	Contracted selling price, €/kWh.
Δt	Duration of a time period, minutes.
Γ	Uncertainty budget.

β	Penalty factor.
d_q	Uncertainty depth.
d_Γ	Budget depth.
M_t^-, M_t^+	Big-M's values.

II. INTRODUCTION

THE capacity firming framework is mainly designed for isolated markets, such as the Overseas France islands. For instance, the French Energy Regulatory Commission (CRE) publishes capacity firming tenders and specifications. The system considered is a grid-connected renewable energy power plant (e.g. photovoltaic or wind-based) with a battery energy storage system (BESS) for firming the renewable generation. At the tendering stage, offers are selected on the electricity selling price. Then, the successful tenderer builds its plant and sells the electricity exported to the grid at the contracted selling price, but according to a well-defined daily engagement and penalization scheme. The electricity to be injected in or withdrawn from the grid must be nominated the day-ahead, and engagements must satisfy ramping power constraints. The remuneration is calculated a posteriori by multiplying the realized exports by the contracted selling price minus a penalty. The deviations of the realized exports from the engagements are penalized through a function specified in the tender. A peak option can be activated in the contract for a significant selling price increase during a short period defined a priori. Therefore, the BESS is required to shift the renewable generation during peak hours to maximize revenue and to manage renewable energy uncertainty.

The problem of modeling a two-phase engagement/control with an approach dealing with uncertainty in the context of the CRE capacity framework is still an open issue. This framework has received less attention in the literature than more traditional energy markets such as day-ahead and intraday markets of European countries. There are several approaches to deal with renewable energy uncertainty. One way is to consider a two-stage stochastic programming approach [1]. It has already been applied to the capacity firming framework [2]–[6]. The generation uncertainty is captured by a set of scenarios modeling possible realizations of the power output. However, there are several difficulties to this approach: (1) the problem size and computational requirement increase with the number of scenarios, and a large number of scenarios are often required to ensure the good quality of the solution; (2) the accuracy of the algorithm is sensitive to the scenario generation technique. Another option is to consider robust optimization (RO) [7], [8]. RO has been applied to the unit commitment problem [9], [10] and once in the capacity firming context [4]. RO accounts for the worst scenario of generation to hedge the power output uncertainty, where the uncertainty model is deterministic and set-based. Indeed, the RO approach puts the random problem parameters in a predetermined uncertainty set containing the worst-case scenario. However, the RO version of a tractable optimization problem may not itself be tractable, and some care must be taken in the choice of the uncertainty set to ensure that tractability is preserved.

This paper proposes a reliable and computationally tractable probabilistic forecast-driven robust optimization strategy in

the capacity firming framework. Probabilistic forecasts are obtained by using Normalizing Flows (NFs), a new advanced deep learning method. NFs operate by pushing an initial density (e.g. a standard Gaussian) through a series of transformations to produce a richer, multi-modal distribution. NFs are an increasingly active and promising area of machine learning research [11]–[13]. More precisely, a new deep learning-based multi-output quantile forecaster using NFs is used to compute day-ahead quantiles of renewable generation for the robust planner. Then, an encoder-decoder architecture forecasting model [14], [15] is used to compute intraday point forecasts for the controller. The two-phase engagement/control problem is modeled with a RO planner using the quantile forecasts, and a controller using the day-ahead engagements and the intraday point forecasts. The non-linear robust optimization problem is solved using a Benders decomposition. The convergence is improved by building an initial set of cuts based on renewable generation trajectories assumed to be close to the worst trajectory. The results of the RO planner are compared to the deterministic planner using perfect knowledge of the future, the nominal point forecasts, i.e. the baseline to outperform, and the quantiles (a conservative approach). The case study is the photovoltaic (PV) generation monitored on-site at the University of Liège (ULiège), Belgium. Finally, a dynamic risk-averse parameters selection taking advantage of the quantile forecast distribution is investigated and compared to a strategy with fixed risk-averse parameters.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section III describes the capacity firming framework. Section IV introduces the NFs technique used to compute quantiles. Section V provides the mathematical formulations of the robust and deterministic planners. Section VI develops the Benders decomposition algorithm used to solve the robust formulation. The case study and computational results are shown in Section VII. Section VIII concludes our research and draws some perspectives of future works.

III. THE CAPACITY FIRMING FRAMEWORK

The capacity firming framework can be decomposed into a day-ahead engagement process (Section III-A) and a real-time control process (Section III-B). Each day is discretized in T time periods of duration Δt . In the sequel the time period duration is the same for day-ahead engagement and the real-time control, t is used as a time period index, and $\mathcal{T}$ is the set of time periods in a day.

A. Day-Ahead Engagement

Each day, the operator of the renewable generation plant is asked to provide the generation profile to be followed the next day to the grid operator, based on renewable generation forecasts. More formally, a planner computes on a day-ahead basis, before a deadline, a vector of engagements composed of T values $\{x_1, \dots, x_T\}$. The engagements are accepted by the grid operator if they satisfy the constraints

$$|x_t - x_{t-1}| \leq \Delta X_t, \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \{1\} \quad (1a)$$

$$-x_t \leq -X_t^{\min}, \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (1b)$$

$$x_t \leq X_t^{\max}, \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad (1c)$$

with ΔX_t a power ramping constraint, that is a fraction of the total installed capacity P_c determined at the tendering stage and imposed by the grid operator.

B. Real-Time Control

Then, in real-time, a receding-horizon controller computes at each period the generation level and the charge or discharge set-points from t to T , based on forecasts of renewable generation and the engagements. Only the set-points of the first period are applied to the system. The remuneration is calculated ex-post based on the realized power y_t^m at the grid coupling point. For a given control period, the net remuneration r_t of the plant is the gross revenue $\Delta t \pi_t y_t^m$ minus a penalty $c(x_t, y_t^m)$, with π_t the contracted selling price set at the tendering stage

$$r_t = \Delta t \pi_t y_t^m - c(x_t, y_t^m), \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}. \quad (2)$$

The penalty function c depends on the specifications of the tender. For the sake of simplicity in the rest of the paper, c is assumed to be symmetric, convex, and piecewise-linear.

IV. NORMALIZING FLOWS

The processes described in the previous section obviously require top-quality forecasts. Anticipating in the next sections, as we propose a robust optimization-based approach, a quantification of forecast uncertainty is also needed. To this end, we investigate the use of normalizing flows, a recent evolution from the deep learning community. Deep Learning (DL) methods take advantage of increases in the amount of available computation power and data. In recent years, DL made major advances in solving problems that have resisted the best attempts of the artificial intelligence community for many years [16]. Various DL techniques have been adopted in energy forecasting such as recurrent neural networks [14], [17]. In this community, NFs are a promising method for modeling stochastic generative processes. They have proven to be an effective way to model complex data distributions with neural networks in real-world applications such as image, video, and audio generation [11]–[13]. A normalizing flow is a transformation of a simple probability distribution (e.g. a normal distribution) into a more complex distribution by a sequence of invertible and differentiable mappings. NFs provide access to the exact likelihood of the model's parameters, hence offering a sound and direct way to optimize the network parameters. There are many possible implementations of NFs, see [11] and [18] for a comprehensive review. In this paper, the class of Affine Autoregressive flows is used. Renewable generation scenarios are generated by the NFs and quantiles are derived.

V. OPTIMIZATION PROBLEMS FORMULATION

A two-stage robust optimization formulation is built to deal with the engagement for the uncertain renewable generation that is modeled with an uncertainty set. The deterministic and robust formulations of the planner are presented in Sections V-A and V-B. The robust optimization problem with recourse

has the general form of a min-max-min optimization problem. The uncertainty set is defined by quantiles forecasts and a budget of uncertainty Γ . Section V-C uses the dual of the inner problem to formulate a min-max optimization problem. Finally, Section V-D presents the formulation of the controller.

A. Deterministic Planner Formulation

The objective function J to minimize is the opposite of the net revenue

$$J(x_t, y_t) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \pi_t \Delta t [-y_t + \beta(\delta x_t^- + \delta x_t^+)], \quad (3)$$

with β a penalty factor. The deterministic formulation is the following Mixed-Integer Linear Program (MILP)

$$\min_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}, y_t \in \Omega(x_t, \hat{p}_t)} J(x_t, y_t), \quad (4)$$

where

$$\mathcal{X} = \{x_t : (5)\}$$

and

$$\Omega(x_t, \hat{p}_t) = \{y_t : (6) - (10)\}$$

are the sets of feasible engagements x_t and dispatch solutions y_t for a fixed engagement x_t and renewable generation point forecast $\hat{p}_t$. The optimization variables of (4) are the engagement variables x_t , the dispatch variables y_t (the net power at the grid connection point), y_t^{dis} (discharging power), y_t^{cha} (charging power), y_t^s (BESS state of charge), y_t^b (BESS binary variables), y_t^G (renewable generation), and $\delta x_t^-, \delta x_t^+$ (threshold-linear penalty variables) (cf. Section I). From (1), the engagement constraints are¹

$$x_t - x_{t-1} \leq \Delta X_t, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \{1\} \quad (5a)$$

$$x_{t-1} - x_t \leq \Delta X_t, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \{1\} \quad (5b)$$

$$-x_t \leq -X_t^{min}, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (5c)$$

$$x_t \leq X_t^{max}, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}. \quad (5d)$$

The set of constraints that bound y_t^{cha} , y_t^{dis} , and y_t^s variables are $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}$

$$y_t^{cha} \leq y_t^b S^c \quad [\phi_t^{cha}] \quad (6a)$$

$$y_t^{dis} \leq (1 - y_t^b) S^d \quad [\phi_t^{dis}] \quad (6b)$$

$$-y_t^s \leq -S^{min} \quad [\phi_t^{S^{min}}] \quad (6c)$$

$$y_t^s \leq S^{max}, \quad [\phi_t^{S^{max}}] \quad (6d)$$

where y_t^b are binary variables that prevent the simultaneous charge and discharge of the BESS. The power balance equation and the constraints on the net power at the grid connection point are $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}$

$$y_t - y_t^G - (y_t^{dis} - y_t^{cha}) = 0 \quad [\phi_t^y] \quad (7a)$$

$$-y_t \leq -Y_t^{min} \quad [\phi_t^{Y^{min}}] \quad (7b)$$

$$y_t \leq Y_t^{max}. \quad [\phi_t^{Y^{max}}] \quad (7c)$$

¹The ramping constraint on x_1 is deactivated to decouple consecutive days of simulation. In reality, the updated value of the last engagement of the previous day would be taken to satisfy the constraint.

The dynamics of the BESS state of charge are ²

$$y_1^s - \Delta t \left(\eta^c y_1^{cha} - \frac{y_1^{dis}}{\eta^d} \right) = S^i \quad [\phi^{S^i}] \quad (8a)$$

$$y_t^s - y_{t-1}^s - \Delta t \left(\eta^c y_t^{cha} - \frac{y_t^{dis}}{\eta^d} \right) = 0, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \{1\} \quad [\phi_t^{y^s}] \quad (8b)$$

$$y_T^s = S^f = S^i. \quad [\phi^{S^f}] \quad (8c)$$

The variables $\delta x_t^-, \delta x_t^+$ are defined $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}$ to model the symmetric threshold-linear penalty:

$$-\delta x_t^- \leq \left(y_t - (x_t - pP_c) \right) \quad [\phi_t^{\delta x^-}] \quad (9a)$$

$$-\delta x_t^+ \leq \left((x_t + pP_c) - y_t \right) \quad [\phi_t^{\delta x^+}] \quad (9b)$$

with $0 \leq p \leq 1$. Finally, the renewable generation is bounded by the point forecast $\hat{p}_t \forall t \in \mathcal{T}$

$$y_t^G \leq \hat{p}_t. \quad [\phi_t^{y^G}] \quad (10)$$

B. Robust Planner Formulation

The uncertain renewable generation $\hat{p}_t$ of (10) is assumed to be within an interval $[p_t^{min}, p_t^{max}]$ that can be obtained based on the historical data or an interval forecast composed of quantiles. In the capacity firming framework, where curtailment is allowed, the worst case is when the uncertain renewable generation $\hat{p}_t$ reaches the lower bound p_t^{min} of the uncertainty set [4]. Indeed, for a given engagement plan, a higher renewable generation than expected results in a higher or equal profit. However, a smaller renewable generation results in a loss of profit. Thus, the uncertainty interval consists only in short deviation and is reduced to $[p_t^{min}, \hat{p}_t^{(0.5)}]$, with $\hat{p}_t^{(0.5)}$ the 50 % quantile. To adjust the degree of conservatism, a budget of uncertainty parameter Γ [19] taking integer values between 0 and 95 is employed to restrict the number of time periods that allow $\hat{p}_t$ to be far away from its nominal value (i.e., deviations are very large). Therefore, the uncertainty set of renewable generation $\mathcal{P}$ is defined as follows

$$\mathcal{P} = \left\{ p_t \in \mathbb{R}^T : \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} z_t \leq \Gamma, z_t \in \{0, 1\} \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \right. \\ \left. p_t = \hat{p}_t^{(0.5)} - z_t p_t^{min} \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \right\}. \quad (11)$$

where $p_t^{min} = \hat{p}_t^{(0.5)} - \hat{p}_t^{(q)}$, with $0 \leq q \leq 0.5$. When $\Gamma = 0$, the uncertainty set $\mathcal{P} = \{\hat{p}_t^{(0.5)}\}$ is a singleton, corresponding to the nominal deterministic case. As Γ increases the size of $\mathcal{P}$ enlarges. This means that a larger total deviation from the expected renewable generation is considered, so that the resulting robust solutions are more conservative and the system is protected against a higher degree of uncertainty. When $\Gamma = T$, $\mathcal{P}$ spans the entire hypercube defined by the intervals for each p_t . With this uncertainty set description, the proposed

²The parameters S^f and S^i are introduced to decouple consecutive days of simulation. In reality, S^i would be the updated value of the last measured state of charge of the previous day.

two-stage robust formulation of the capacity firming problem consists of minimizing the objective function over the worst renewable generation trajectory

$$\max_{\hat{p}_t \in \mathcal{P}} \left[\min_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}, y_t \in \Omega(x_t, \hat{p}_t)} J(x_t, y_t) \right], \quad (12)$$

that is equivalent to

$$\min_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}} \left[\max_{\hat{p}_t \in \mathcal{P}} \min_{y_t \in \Omega(x_t, \hat{p}_t)} J(x_t, y_t) \right]. \quad (13)$$

The worst-case dispatch cost has a max-min form, where

$$\min_{y_t \in \Omega(x_t, \hat{p}_t)} J(x_t, y_t)$$

determines the economic dispatch cost for a fixed engagement and a renewable generation trajectory, which is then maximized over the uncertainty set $\mathcal{P}$.

C. Second-Stage Planner Transformation

The proposed formulation (13) consists of solving a min-max-min problem, which cannot be solved directly by a commercial software such as CPLEX or GUROBI. A scenario-based approach, e.g., enumerating all possible outcomes of $\hat{p}_t$ that could lead to the worst-case scenario for the problem, results in at least 2^Γ possible trajectories³. Thus, to deal with the huge size of the problem a decomposition algorithm is used to solve the problem [9], [10], [20].

Constraints (6a)-(6b) make the dispatch problem a MILP, for which a dual formulation cannot be derived. In view of this, following [10], the constraints (6a)-(6b) are relaxed⁴. By applying standard tools of duality theory in linear programming, the constraints and the objective function of the dual of the dispatch problem are derived. The dual of the feasible set $\Omega(x_t, \hat{p}_t)$, with (6a)-(6b) relaxed, provides the dual variables ϕ_t and the following objective

$$G(x_t, \hat{p}_t, \phi_t) = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \left[\phi_t^{cha} S^c + \phi_t^{dis} S^d - \phi_t^{S^{min}} S^{min} \right. \\ \left. + \phi_t^{S^{max}} S^{max} - \phi_t^{Y^{min}} Y^{min} + \phi_t^{Y^{max}} Y^{max} \right. \\ \left. + \phi^{S^i} S^i + \phi^{S^f} S^f - \phi_t^{\delta x^-} (x_t - pP_c) \right. \\ \left. + \phi_t^{\delta x^+} (x_t + pP_c) + \phi_t^{y^G} \hat{p}_t \right]. \quad (14)$$

Then, the dual of the dispatch problem $\min_{y_t \in \Omega(x_t, \hat{p}_t)} J(x_t, y_t)$ is

$$\max_{\phi_t \in \Phi} G(x_t, \hat{p}_t, \phi_t), \quad (15)$$

³There are $n = \sum_{k=0}^{\Gamma} \binom{96}{k}$ possible trajectories where n is within the interval $[2^\Gamma, 2^{96}]$ as $(1+1)^\Gamma = \sum_{k=0}^{\Gamma} \binom{\Gamma}{k}$ and $(1+1)^{96} = \sum_{k=0}^{96} \binom{96}{k}$ by using the binomial formula.

⁴The solution is checked to ensure there is no simultaneous charge and discharge, that never happens when the (dis)charge efficiencies are smaller than 1.

with the set of constraints Φ defined by

$$\phi_t^y - \phi_t^{Y^{min}} + \phi_t^{Y^{max}} - \phi_t^{\delta x^-} + \phi_t^{\delta x^+} = -\pi_t \Delta t, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \quad [y_t] \quad (16a)$$

$$-\phi_t^{\delta x^-} \leq \beta \pi_t \Delta t, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \quad [\delta x_t^-] \quad (16b)$$

$$-\phi_t^{\delta x^+} \leq \beta \pi_t \Delta t, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \quad [\delta x_t^+] \quad (16c)$$

$$\phi_1^{dis} - \phi_1^y + \phi_1^{S^i} \frac{\Delta t}{\eta^d} \leq 0 \quad [y_1^{dis}] \quad (16d)$$

$$\phi_t^{dis} - \phi_t^y + \phi_t^{y^s} \frac{\Delta t}{\eta^d} \leq 0, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \{1\} \quad [y_t^{dis}] \quad (16e)$$

$$\phi_1^{cha} + \phi_1^y - \phi_1^{S^i} \eta^c \Delta t \leq 0 \quad [y_1^{cha}] \quad (16f)$$

$$\phi_t^{cha} + \phi_t^y - \phi_t^{y^s} \eta^c \Delta t \leq 0, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \{1\} \quad [y_t^{cha}] \quad (16g)$$

$$-\phi_1^{S^{min}} + \phi_1^{S^{max}} + \phi_1^{S^i} - \phi_2^{y^s} \leq 0 \quad [y_1^s] \quad (16h)$$

$$-\phi_t^{S^{min}} + \phi_t^{S^{max}} + \phi_{t-1}^{y^s} - \phi_t^{y^s} \leq 0, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \{1, 2, T\} \quad [y_t^s] \quad (16i)$$

$$-\phi_T^{S^{min}} + \phi_T^{S^{max}} + \phi_T^{S^f} + \phi_T^{y^s} \leq 0 \quad [y_T^s] \quad (16j)$$

$$-\phi_t^y + \phi_t^{y^G} \leq 0, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \quad [y_t^G]. \quad (16k)$$

The worst-case dispatch problem $\max_{\hat{p}_t \in \mathcal{P}} [\min_{y_t \in \Omega(x_t, \hat{p}_t)} J(x_t, y_t)]$ is equivalent to

$$R(x_t) = \max_{\hat{p}_t \in \mathcal{P}, \phi_t \in \Phi} G(x_t, \hat{p}_t, \phi_t). \quad (17)$$

Overall, (13) becomes a min-max problem

$$\min_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}} \left[\max_{\hat{p}_t \in \mathcal{P}, \phi_t \in \Phi} G(x_t, \hat{p}_t, \phi_t) \right], \quad (18)$$

that can be solved using a Benders decomposition [9], [10], between a master problem, that is linear, and a sub-problem, that is bilinear. Indeed, G has the following bilinear terms $\phi_t^{y^G} \hat{p}_t = \phi_t^{y^G} \hat{p}_t^{(0.5)} - \phi_t^{y^G} z_t p_t^{min}$. It is possible to linearize the products of the binary and continuous variables $z_t \phi_t^{y^G}$ of G by using a standard integer algebra trick [21] with the following constraints $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}$

$$-M_t^- z_t \leq \alpha_t \leq M_t^+ z_t \quad (19a)$$

$$-M_t^-(1 - z_t) \leq \phi_t^{y^G} - \alpha_t \leq M_t^+(1 - z_t), \quad (19b)$$

where $M_t^\pm$ are the big-M's values of $\phi_t^{y^G}$ and α_t is an auxiliary continuous variable.

D. Controller Formulation

The controller uses as parameters the engagements x_t , the system last measured values, and renewable generation intraday point forecasts. It computes at each time period t the setpoints from t to the last period T of the day. The formulation is the following Mixed-Integer Linear Programming (MILP)

$$\min_{y_t \in \Omega(x_t, \hat{p}_t)} J(x_t, y_t). \quad (20)$$

VI. SOLUTION METHODOLOGY

Following the methodology described by [9], [10], a two-level algorithm can be used to solve the RO problem with a Benders decomposition type cutting plane algorithm. The following master problem (MP) is solved iteratively by adding new constraints to cut off the infeasible or non-optimal solutions

$$\min_{x_t \in \mathcal{X}, \theta} \theta \quad (21a)$$

$$\theta \geq G(x_t, \alpha_{t,l}, \phi_{t,l}), \quad l = 1 \dots L \quad (21b)$$

$$G(x_t, \tilde{\alpha}_{t,k}, \tilde{\phi}_{t,k}) \leq 0, \quad k = 1 \dots K, \quad (21c)$$

where constraints (21b) represent the optimality cuts, generated by retrieving the optimal values $\alpha_{t,l}, \phi_{t,l}$ of (17), while constraints (21c) represent the feasibility cuts, generated by retrieving the extreme rays $\tilde{\alpha}_{t,k}, \tilde{\phi}_{t,k}$ of (17), and θ is the optimal value of the second-stage problem.

A. Convergence Warm Start

A warm start algorithm is used to improve the Benders convergence by building an initial set of cuts $\{\theta_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq I}$ for the master problem (21). It consists of sampling renewable generation trajectories that are assumed to be close to the worst trajectory of $\mathcal{P}$. Let t_1 and t_f be the time periods corresponding to the first and last non null 50 % quantile values. If $m = t_f - (t_1 + \Gamma - 1) > 0$, m trajectories are sampled. The m^{th} sampled trajectory is built by setting the Γ values of the 50 % quantile to the p_t^{min} lower bound for time periods $t_1 + (m - 1) \leq t \leq t_1 + \Gamma - 1 + (m - 1)$. An additional trajectory is built by setting the Γ maximum values of the 50 % quantile to p_t^{min} lower bound. Then, for each sampled trajectory $p_{t,i}$, the MILP formulation (4) is used to compute the related engagement plan $x_{t,i}$. Finally, the cut θ_i is built by solving (17) where the uncertainty set is a singleton $\mathcal{P} = \{p_{t,i}\}$, and the engagement plan is $x_{t,i}$ to retrieve the optimal values with (21b): $\theta_i = G(x_{t,i}, \alpha_{t,i}, \phi_{t,i})$, $i = 1 \dots I$.

B. Convergence Check

The objective of the master problem at the last Benders iteration J is compared to the objective of the MILP formulation (4), using the generation worst-case trajectory of the last Benders iteration as parameters. If the absolute gap is higher than a convergence threshold then larger big-M's values are set, and the Benders algorithm is executed until convergence.

C. Algorithm Framework

The Benders decomposition algorithm, provided by Figure (1), consists of solving (18) without constraints [(6a)-(6b)] following the procedure previously described, and to obtain a day-ahead robust schedule $x_{t,J}$. The initialization step consists of setting the initial big-M's values $M_t^- = 1$ and $M_t^+ = 0 \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}$, the time limit resolution of the subproblem (17) to 10 s, and the threshold convergence ϵ to 0.5 €. Let MP^j , SP^j , be the MP and SP objective values at iteration j , and $MILP^J$ the MILP objective value using the worst renewable generation trajectory $p_{t,J}$ at the last Benders algorithm iteration J .

Initialization

Build the initial set of cuts $\{\theta_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq I}$ **while** $|MILP^J - MP^J| > \epsilon$ **do**Initialize $j = 0$ Solve the MP (21) and retrieve $x_{t,0}$ **while** the 10 last $|MP^j - SP^j|$ are not $< \epsilon$ **do**

Solve the SP (17)

if The SP is unbounded **then**Retrieve the extreme rays $\tilde{\alpha}_{t,k}, \tilde{\phi}_{t,k}, 0 \leq k \leq j$ Add the k^{th} feasibility cut:

$$G(x_{t,j}, \tilde{\alpha}_{t,k}, \tilde{\phi}_{t,k}) \leq 0$$

elseRetrieve the optimal values $\alpha_{t,l}, \phi_{t,l}, 0 \leq l \leq j$ Add the l^{th} optimality cut:

$$\theta \geq G(x_{t,j}, \alpha_{t,l}, \phi_{t,l})$$

Update $SP^j = R(x_{t,j})$ **end if**

Solve the MP (21)

Retrieve the optimal values $\theta_j, x_{t,j}$ Update $MP^j = \theta_j$ Update the engagement $x_{t,j+1} = x_{t,j}$ **end while**Convergence checking at the last Benders iteration J **if** $|MILP^J - MP^J| > \epsilon$ **then**Update big-M's values $M_t^- = 10 + M_t^- \forall t \in \mathcal{T}$ **end if****end while**

Fig. 1: Benders decomposition algorithm.

VII. CASE STUDY


The ULiège case study is composed of a PV generation plant with an installed capacity $P_c = 466.4$ kWp. The PV generation is monitored on a minute basis and the data are resampled to 15 minutes. The dataset is composed of 350 days from August 2019 to November 2020 (missing data during March 2020), where 30 random days are selected to compose the testing set. The results of the RO planner, using the Benders decomposition algorithm, are compared to the deterministic planner using perfect knowledge of the future (the reference), the PV nominal point forecasts, and the PV quantiles. The set of PV quantiles considered is $\mathcal{Q} = \{10\%, 20\%, \dots, 50\%\}$. The NFs approach is compared to a widely used neural architecture, referred to as Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) using quantile regression to compute PV quantiles [15]. Both NFs and LSTM models use the weather forecasts of the MAR (Regional Atmosphere Model) climate regional model provided by the Laboratory of Climatology of the University of Liège [22]. Section VII-A presents the numerical settings. Section VII-B provides the results of the sensitivity analysis for several risk-averse pairs $[\hat{p}_t^{(q)}, \Gamma]$, with $q = 10, 20, 30, 40\%$, and $\Gamma = 12, 24, 36, 48$. Section VII-C investigates a dynamic risk-averse parameter selection. Finally, Section VII-D presents the improvement in terms of computation time provided by the initial set of cuts. The profits are normalized by the profit of the deterministic planner using perfect knowledge of the future and expressed

in %.

A. Numerical Settings

The simulation parameters of the planners and the controller are identical. The planning and controlling time periods duration are $\Delta t = 15$ minutes. The peak hours are set between 7 pm and 9 pm (UTC+0). The ramping power constraint on the engagements are $\Delta X_t = 7.5\%P_c$ ($15\%P_c$) during off-peak (peak) hours. The lower bounds on the engagement X_t^{min} and the net power Y_t^{min} are set to 0 kW. The upper bound on the engagement X_t^{max} and the net power Y_t^{max} are set to P_c . Finally, the engagement tolerance is $pP_c = 1\%P_c$, and the penalty factor $\beta = 5$. The BESS minimum S^{min} and maximum capacity are 0 kWh and 466.4 kWh, respectively. It is assumed to be capable of fully charging or discharging in one hour $S^d = S^c = S^{max}/1$ with charging and discharging efficiencies $\eta^d = \eta^c = 95\%$. Each simulation day is independent with a fully discharged battery at the first and last period $S^i = S^f = 0$ kWh. The python Gurobi library is used to implement the algorithms in python 3.7. Gurobi⁵ 9.0.2 is used to solve all the optimization problems. Numerical experiments are performed on an Intel Core i7-8700 3.20 GHz based computer with 12 threads and 32 GB of RAM running on Ubuntu 18.04 LTS.

Figures 2a and 2b illustrate the LSTM and NFs PV quantile forecasts, observation, and nominal point forecasts on *September 14, 2019*. Figures 2c and 2d provide the engagement plan (x) and the BESS state of charge (s) computed with the RO planner, the deterministic planner with the nominal point forecasts, and the perfect knowledge of the future.

Fig. 2: Results illustration on *September 14, 2019*.

B. Constant Risk-Averse Parameters Strategy

The risk-averse parameters of the RO approach $[\hat{p}^{(q)}, \Gamma]$ are fixed over the dataset. One way to identify the optimal pair

⁵<https://www.gurobi.com/>




Fig. 3: Normalized profit (%) of RO ($[\Gamma, q]$) and deterministic ($[\Gamma, q]$) and planners with fixed risk-averse parameters.

is to perform a sensitivity analysis [23]. Figure 3 provides the normalized profits of the RO and deterministic planners using PV quantiles (left with LSTM and right with NFs), and nominal point forecasts. Both using the LSTM and NFs quantiles, the RO and deterministic planners outperform by a large margin the deterministic planner with nominal point forecasts that cannot deal with PV uncertainty and achieved only 53.3 %. Then, the planners using NFs quantiles significantly outperform the planners with LSTM quantiles. The highest profits achieved by the RO and deterministic planners using NFs quantiles are 73.4 % and 74.1 %, respectively, with the pair $[q = 20\%, \Gamma = 48]$ and the quantile 30 %. It should be possible to improve the RO results by tuning the risk-averse parameters $[\hat{p}^{(q)}, \Gamma]$. However, these results emphasize the interest to consider a deterministic planner with the relevant PV quantile as point forecasts, that is easy to implement, fast to compute (a few seconds), and less prone to convergence issues than the RO approach.

C. Dynamic Risk-Averse Parameters Strategy

In this section, the risk-averse parameters $[p_t^{min}, \Gamma]$ of the RO approach are dynamically set based on the day-ahead quantile forecasts distribution, and p_t^{min} is not necessarily equal to the same quantile $\hat{p}^{(q)} \forall t \in \mathcal{T}$. The motivation of this strategy is to assume that the sharper the quantile forecast distribution around the median is, the more risk-averse the RO approach should be.

Two parameters are designed to this end: the PV uncertainty set max depth d_q to control p_t^{min} , and the budget depth d_Γ to control Γ . d_q is a percentage of the distance between the median and the 10 % quantile d_{50-10} , and d_Γ is a percentage of the total installed capacity P_c . Then, two rules are designed to dynamically set the risk-averse parameters $[p_t^{min}, \Gamma]$ for each day of the dataset. For a given day, and the set of time periods where the PV median is non null, the distances between the PV median and the PV quantiles 20, 30, and 40 % are computed: d_{50-20} , d_{50-30} , d_{50-40} . p_t^{min} is dynamically set at each time period t based on the following rule

$$p_t^{min} = \begin{cases} \hat{p}_t^{(0.1)} & \text{if } d_t^{50-20/30/40} > d_q d_t^{50-10} \\ \hat{p}_t^{(0.2)} & \text{if } d_t^{50-20/30} > d_q d_t^{50-10} \\ \hat{p}_t^{(0.3)} & \text{if } d_t^{50-20} > d_q d_t^{50-10} \\ \hat{p}_t^{(0.4)} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (22)$$




Fig. 4: Normalized profit (%) of RO ($[d_\Gamma, d_q]$) and deterministic ($[d_\Gamma, d_q]$) and planners with dynamic risk-averse parameters.




Fig. 5: Benders convergence without (left) and with (right) an initial set of cuts on September 14, 2019.

For a given day, the the budget of uncertainty Γ is dynamically set based on the following rule

$$\Gamma = \# \left\{ t : d_t^{50-10} > d_\Gamma P_c \right\}. \quad (23)$$

Figure 4 provides the normalized profits of the RO and deterministic planners for several pairs $[d_\Gamma, d_q]$ using both the LSTM and NFs quantiles. When considering the LSTM quantiles, the results are improved in comparison with fixed risk-averse parameters. The RO approach achieved the highest profit of 67.0 % and the deterministic planner of 66.7 %, with $[d_\Gamma, d_q] = [10, 10]$ and $d_q = 10\%$, respectively. When considering the NFs quantiles, only the deterministic planner achieved a higher profit of 75.0 % than with fixed risk-averse parameters.

D. Convergence Warm Start Improvement

The initial set of cuts impact on the convergence is assessed by considering the dynamic risk-averse parameters strategy with $[d_\Gamma, d_q] = [10, 10]$. Figure 5 illustrates the reduction of the total number of iteration J required to converge below the threshold ϵ , on a specific day of the dataset, that is divided by 3.6 from 159 to 44. The computation time is divided by 4.1 from 7.4 min to 1.8 min. Table I provides the computation times (min) statistics over the entire dataset with and without warm start. The averaged t^{av} and total t^{tot} computation times are reduced significantly when using the initial set of cuts.

$\{\theta_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq I}$	t^{av}	$t^{50\%}$	t^{min}	t^{max}	t^{tot}
False	3.5	2.0	< 0.1	34.1	105.4
True	2.0	0.7	< 0.1	30.4	61.3

TABLE I: Computation times (min) statistics.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we addressed the two-phase engagement/control problem in the context of the capacity firming framework. We developed an integrated forecast-driven strategy modeled as a min-max-min robust optimization problem with recourse and solved the resulting optimization problem using a Benders decomposition algorithm. A new deep learning technique, known as Normalizing Flows (NFs), that is a transformation of a simple probability distribution (e.g. a normal distribution) into a more complex distribution by a sequence of invertible and differentiable mappings, is introduced to compute PV quantiles. It is compared to a more classic neural architecture, referred to as Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM). The Benders convergence is improved by warm starting the algorithm with an initial set of cuts, and the convergence is checked by ensuring a gap below a threshold between the final objective and the corresponding deterministic objective value. A risk-averse parameter assessment is conducted to select the optimal robust parameters and the optimal conservative quantile for the deterministic planner. Both approaches outperformed the deterministic planner with nominal point PV forecasts. The planners using the NFs quantiles outperform largely the planners with LSTM quantiles. The RO approach allows finding a trade-off between conservative and risk-seeking policies by selecting the optimal robust optimization parameters, leading to improved economic benefits in comparison with the baseline. Therefore, offering a probabilistic guarantee for the robust solution. However, the deterministic planner with the relevant PV quantile achieved interesting results. It emphasizes the interest to consider a well-calibrated deterministic approach, easy to implement, computationally tractable for large scale problem, and less prone to convergence issues, that is not considered in [4]. Finally, a dynamic risk-averse parameter selection strategy is built by taking advantage of the PV quantile forecast distribution.

Several extensions are under investigation: a stochastic formulation of the planner with improved PV scenarios based on Gaussian copula methodology [2], [3] or generated by a deep learning tool such as NFs, and an improved dynamic risk-averse parameter selection strategy based on a machine learning tool capable of better-taking advantage of the PV quantiles distribution.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Antoine Wehenkel, recipient of a F.R.S.- FNRS fellowship, and Xavier Fettweis, FNRS research associate, acknowledge the financial support of the FNRS (Belgium). Antonio Sutera is supported via the Energy Transition Funds project EPOC 2030-2050 organized by the FPS economy, S.M.E.s, Self-employed and Energy.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. R. Birge and F. Louveaux, *Introduction to stochastic programming*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- [2] J. Dumas, B. Cornélusse, A. Giannitrapani, S. Paoletti, and A. Vicino, "Stochastic and deterministic formulations for capacity firming nominations," in *2020 International Conference on Probabilistic Methods Applied to Power Systems (PMAPS)*, 2020, pp. 1–7.
- [3] J. Dumas, B. Cornélusse, X. Fettweis, A. Giannitrapani, S. Paoletti, and A. Vicino, "Probabilistic forecasting for sizing in the capacity firming framework," submitted to 2021 IEEE Madrid PowerTech.
- [4] A. N'Goran, "Contrôle optimal et gestion énergétique d'une station d'énergie autonome par optimisation robuste," Ph.D. dissertation, MINES ParisTech, 2020.
- [5] P. Haessig, "Dimensionnement et gestion d'un stockage d'énergie pour l'atténuation des incertitudes de production éolienne," Ph.D. dissertation, Cachan, Ecole normale supérieure, 2014.
- [6] A. Parisio, E. Rikos, and L. Glielmo, "Stochastic model predictive control for economic/environmental operation management of microgrids: An experimental case study," *Journal of Process Control*, vol. 43, pp. 24–37, 2016.
- [7] A. Ben-Tal, L. El Ghaoui, and A. Nemirovski, *Robust optimization*. Princeton University Press, 2009, vol. 28.
- [8] D. Bertsimas, D. B. Brown, and C. Caramanis, "Theory and applications of robust optimization," *SIAM review*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 464–501, 2011.
- [9] D. Bertsimas, E. Litvinov, X. A. Sun, J. Zhao, and T. Zheng, "Adaptive robust optimization for the security constrained unit commitment problem," *IEEE transactions on power systems*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 52–63, 2012.
- [10] R. Jiang, J. Wang, and Y. Guan, "Robust unit commitment with wind power and pumped storage hydro," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 800–810, 2011.
- [11] G. Papamakarios, E. Nalisnick, D. J. Rezende, S. Mohamed, and B. Lakshminarayanan, "Normalizing flows for probabilistic modeling and inference," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.02762*, 2019.
- [12] G. Papamakarios, T. Pavlakou, and I. Murray, "Masked autoregressive flow for density estimation," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017, pp. 2338–2347.
- [13] A. Wehenkel and G. Louppe, "Unconstrained monotonic neural networks," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019, pp. 1545–1555.
- [14] J. Bottieau, L. Hubert, Z. De Grève, F. Vallée, and J.-F. Toubeau, "Very-short-term probabilistic forecasting for a risk-aware participation in the single price imbalance settlement," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 1218–1230, 2019.
- [15] J. Dumas, X. Fettweis, B. Cornélusse *et al.*, "Deep learning-based multi-output quantile forecasting of pv generation," submitted to 2021 IEEE Madrid PowerTech.
- [16] Y. LeCun, Y. Bengio, and G. Hinton, "Deep learning," *nature*, vol. 521, no. 7553, pp. 436–444, 2015.
- [17] T. Hong, P. Pinson, Y. Wang, R. Weron, D. Yang, H. Zareipour *et al.*, "Energy forecasting: A review and outlook," Department of Operations Research and Business Intelligence, Wroclaw . . . , Tech. Rep., 2020.
- [18] I. Kobyzev, S. Prince, and M. Brubaker, "Normalizing flows: An introduction and review of current methods," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2020.
- [19] D. Bertsimas and M. Sim, "The price of robustness," *Operations research*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 35–53, 2004.
- [20] J. M. Morales, A. J. Conejo, H. Madsen, P. Pinson, and M. Zugno, *Integrating renewables in electricity markets: operational problems*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013, vol. 205.
- [21] I. Savelli, B. Cornélusse, A. Giannitrapani, S. Paoletti, and A. Vicino, "A new approach to electricity market clearing with uniform purchase price and curtailable block orders," *Applied energy*, vol. 226, pp. 618–630, 2018.
- [22] X. Fettweis, J. Box, C. Agosta, C. Amory, C. Kittel, C. Lang, D. van As, H. Machguth, and H. Gallée, "Reconstructions of the 1900–2015 greenland ice sheet surface mass balance using the regional climate MAR model," *Cryosphere (The)*, vol. 11, pp. 1015–1033, 2017.
- [23] R. Wang, P. Wang, and G. Xiao, "A robust optimization approach for energy generation scheduling in microgrids," *Energy Conversion and Management*, vol. 106, pp. 597–607, 2015.