

# Equilibria in Network Constrained Energy Markets\*

Leonardo Massai<sup>1</sup>, Giacomo Como<sup>2</sup>, Fabio Fagnani<sup>3</sup>

**Abstract**—We study the equilibrium state of an energy market composed of producers who compete to supply energy to different markets and want to maximize their profits. The energy market is modeled by means of a graph that represents a constrained power network where nodes represent the markets and links are the physical lines with a finite capacity connecting them. Producers play a networked Cournot game on such a network together with a centralized authority, called market maker, that facilitates the trade between geographically separate markets via the constrained power network and aims to maximize a certain welfare function. We study existence of uniqueness of the Nash equilibria and prove a connection between capacity bottlenecks in the power network and the emergence of price differences between different markets that are separated by bottlenecked lines.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The studying of networks in modern marketplaces has attracted a considerable amount of attention in recent years. In particular, a growing body of literature has pointed out how classical models of competition that often feature several producers operating in a single, isolated market, fail to capture the growing interconnectedness that characterize power systems, transportation and infrastructure networks and so on. These complex interconnections among different agents turn out to be crucial to properly modeling and understanding emergent features of modern marketplaces. Consequently, several works in literature are devoted to studying networked models of competition. In [1], [2] authors extend the classical model of Cournot competition by considering multiple firms operating in different markets. In this setting, a sort of bipartite graph arises, coupling producers and markets via the non separability of each producer's cost function in the markets it participates in.

Other works have focused on specific applications, for instance electricity power models where the physical network connecting different market is fundamental. In [3] and [4] a constrained power network connecting different markets and producers following a Cournot competition scheme is considered and the authors develop an iterative algorithm for finding the Nash equilibrium, which considers how the production at a certain node affects the whole network, and

consequently explains the opportunities for the producers of exercising market power. In [5] a numerical estimation of how sensitive Nash equilibria are in a networked Cournot competition in a transmission-constrained electricity market is performed, highlighting that Cournot equilibria are indeed highly sensitive to assumptions about market design. A two-settlement electricity markets with forward market and the spot market is introduced in [6], which accounts for flow congestion, demand uncertainty, system contingencies, and market power. The model assumes linear demand functions, quadratic generation cost functions, and a lossless DC power network.

Our paper fits into this growing literature on networked Cournot competition and, in particular, takes cue from the work of Cai *et al.*[7] where networked Cournot competition among multiple energy producers is studied together with the presence of an additional player called market maker, a centralized authority that moves supply between geographically separate markets via the constrained power network to achieve a desirable state of the system. Their focus is on understanding the consequences of the design of the market maker utility function and providing tools for optimal design.

We should mention that the Cournot competition tailored on energy markets usually contrasts with other popular Cournot game schemes where producers decide their production quantities (a vector) over a whole set of markets. In this latter scheme, the producers readily consider both production and distribution of a certain good in their decision-making process, and thus no market maker is introduced into the game. The aforementioned scheme is considered for example in [8], [9], [10]. However, this kind of competition without intermediaries nor market-to-market energy exchange is not realistic when modeling an energy market. The complexity and the broad impact of energy marketplaces on the whole environmental and economic policy of a government typically leads to (and often necessitates) the emergence of intermediaries. In these markets, a centralized authority typically solves a dispatch problem by utilizing the offers/bids from the generators/retailers and aims to maximize some metric of social welfare subject to the operational constraints of the grid. This is exactly the model that we want to capture by considering a market maker that plays a specific role with respect to transport and trade of energy between markets. By doing so, the market maker is also a key figure in matching the demand and supply of power and, as an independent regulated entity, it further designs rules, via the choice of its utility function, to limit the possible exercise of market power by the producers. All these aspects cannot be modeled

\*This work was supported by Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca [Grant E11G18000350001 and Research Project PRIN 2017 "Advanced Network Control of Future Smart Grids"] and the Compagnia di San Paolo.

<sup>1 2 3</sup> The authors are with the Department of Mathematical Sciences "Giuseppe Luigi Lagrange" of Politecnico di Torino, Italy. Giacomo Como is also with the Department of Automatic Control, Lund University, Sweden.  
leonardo.massai@polito.it  
giacomo.como@polito.it  
fabio.fagnani@polito.it

if producers are in charge of the total quantity supplied as well as distribution.

In this paper, we model the energy market by means of a graph that represents a constrained power network where nodes represent the markets and links are the physical lines with a finite capacity connecting them. Producers play a networked Cournot game on such a network together with a market maker that aims to procure supply from one market and transport it to a different market in order to maximize a certain welfare function. In contrast to [7], we weaken some assumptions on the price and cost functions and we do not focus on the design of the market maker's utility function as we assume it to be equal to the well studied Marshallian welfare (see [11]), but rather on the studying the Nash equilibria of the game and on highlighting the impact of the capacity constraints on such equilibria. Specifically, we prove that, under mild assumptions on the price and cost functions, the considered game is potential and admits a unique Nash equilibria that can be found efficiently solving a concave optimization problem. Moreover, we prove that at equilibrium, if there is a mismatch between prices at different markets, this implies the existence of a saturated cut in the network dividing those markets, i.e., there exists a set of link connecting markets with different price that are at full capacity at equilibrium. This result formally proves a connection between price differences and capacity constraints, a phenomenon that is often documented in real-world power networks [12], [13].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The reminder of this section is devoted to the introduction of some notational conventions used throughout the paper. In section II we present the model of networked Cournot competition on power networks that is the object of our study. In section III we present the main results concerning the existence and uniqueness of the Nash equilibria as well as the connection between price differences and capacity bottlenecks in the power network. This Section is complemented with an Example that shows our results on a simplified Italian power network model. Finally, in section IV we draw some conclusions and discuss current and future research.

Throughout the paper we shall denote vectors with lower case, matrices with upper case, and sets with calligraphic letters. We indicate with  $\mathbb{1}$  the all-1 vector and with  $I$  the identity matrix, regardless of their dimension.

## II. THE MODEL

We consider  $n$  competing producers that choose a production quantity  $q_i$  with production costs  $C_i(q_i)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $m$  markets with total consumption  $r_j$  and price function  $P_j(r_j)$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq m$ . The markets are connected by  $l$  links with finite capacity  $c_k$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq l$ . We assume that the market network forms a connected graph, in other words, there are no isolated markets. In Fig. 1 we represent the constrained power network between the markets and the producers that are linked to them as a sort of bipartite graph. We collect the production quantities in the vector  $q \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ , the capacities in

Markets set and constrained power network




Fig. 1: Representation of an energy market with a constrained power network linking different markets.

$c \in \mathbb{R}_+^l$  while the vector  $f \in \mathbb{R}^l$  is the flow of production quantity that the market maker moves around the network.

The network model can be described by means of two matrices:  $B \in \{0, \pm 1\}^{m \times l}$  is the node-link incidence matrix (arbitrary orientation) and  $H \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times m}$  is the producer-market incidence matrix. With this in mind, the total consumption vector  $d \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , i.e., the vector collecting the total quantity of energy consumed in each market, can be simply written as  $d = Bf + H^T q$  where  $r = Bf$  is the quantity moved in/out of the markets by the market maker and  $H^T q$  is the total quantity made by all producers in each market.

The competition is modeled as a game with  $n + 1$  players (the  $n$  producers plus the market maker) where: every producer  $i = 1, \dots, n$  chooses to produce a quantity of energy  $q_i \geq 0$  aiming at maximizing its utility

$$u_i(q_i, q_{-i}, f) = q_i \sum_{j=1}^m H_{ij} P_j \left( (Bf + H^T q)_j \right) - C_i(q_i), \quad (1)$$

the market maker chooses a flow vector  $f \in \mathbb{R}^l$  satisfying the capacity constraints  $|f| \leq c$  aiming at maximizing its utility.

$$w(f, q) = \sum_{j=1}^m \int_0^{(Bf + H^T q)_j} P_j(s) ds - \sum_{i=1}^n C_i(q_i). \quad (2)$$

Notice that the utility (1) of every producer represents its net profit (i.e., the difference between the total revenue  $q_i \sum_{j=1}^m H_{ij} P_j \left( (Bf + H^T q)_j \right)$  and the production cost  $C_i(q_i)$ ). On the other hand, the utility of the market maker (2) corresponds to the so-called Marshallian welfare (see [11]) and can be interpreted as the difference between the aggregate consumer surplus and the total production cost.

Throughout, we shall refer to the above as a networked Cournot game with market maker. A (Nash) equilibrium for this game is a tuple  $(q^*, f^*)$  such that

$$u_i(q_i^*, q_{-i}^*, f^*) \geq u_i(q_i, q_{-i}^*, f^*), \text{ for all } q_i \in \mathbb{R}_+ \\ w(f^*, q^*) \geq w(f, q^*), \text{ for all } f \in \mathbb{R}^l \text{ such that } |f| \leq c.$$

### III. MAIN RESULTS

The model is studied under the following reasonable assumptions on the cost/price functions and producers to markets relationships:

- Assumption 1 (A1): for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $1 \leq j \leq m$ ,  $C_i$  and  $P_j$  are  $\mathcal{C}^2$  with  $C_i' \geq 0, C_i'' \geq 0, P_j' < 0, P_j'' \leq 0$  and it exists  $\bar{q} \in (0, +\infty)$  such that  $P_j(\bar{q}) = 0$ .
- Assumption 2 (A2): each producer sells on single market:  $\sum_{j=1}^m H_{ij} = 1$ .

A few comments on assumption 2 are in order. Although having producers selling on a single market may appear quite restrictive, this is actually what happens in most energy marketplaces. In Italy for instance, there are essentially three big markets for electricity (north, center and south) and producers make offers/bids in that specific market. The actual dispatch of energy between markets is operated by a centralized authority, in this case the market maker. From a technical perspective, dropping assumption 2 makes unclear whether the resulting game remains potential (see Theorem 3.1).

The first result deals with existence and uniqueness of equilibria.

*Theorem 3.1:* Consider a networked Cournot game satisfying Assumptions 1 and 2. Then,

- There exists an equilibrium  $(q^*, f^*)$ ;
- if the price functions are affine with  $P_j' = -\beta_j < 0$  for  $1 \leq j \leq m$ , the game is potential with unique equilibrium given by

$$(q^*, f^*) = \operatorname{argmax}_{q \geq 0, |f| \leq c} \left[ w(f, q) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j (H^\top q^2)_j \right]. \quad (3)$$

*Proof:*

- By assumption 1, for all  $1 \leq j \leq m$  it exists  $\bar{r} \in (0, +\infty)$  such that  $P_j(\bar{r}) = 0$  and because  $P_j$  is a monotone decreasing function, we have that  $P_j(r_j) \leq 0 \forall r_j \geq \bar{r}$ . In our case this implies that, for a fixed  $f$  such that  $|f| \leq c$ , the utility of the generic producer  $i$  (1) becomes non-positive for  $(Bf + H^\top q)_k \geq \bar{r}$  where  $k$  is the only index such that  $H_{ik} = 1$  (assumption 2). Notice that, in particular, the utility is certainly non-positive for  $q_i \geq \bar{r} + (Bc)_k$ . This implies that we can effectively bound the action of each producers  $i$  such that  $0 \leq q_i \leq \bar{r} + (Bc)_k$  as the previous considerations guarantee that

$$\operatorname{argmax}_{0 \leq q_i \leq \bar{r} + (Bc)_k} u_i(q_i, q_{-i}, f) = \operatorname{argmax}_{q_i \geq 0} u_i(q_i, q_{-i}, f).$$

With this in mind, we can notice that the strategy sets are non-empty, convex and compact for each player (both the producers and the market maker). Under assumptions 1 and 2, we have that  $u_i$  and  $w$  are continuous for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ; moreover, for all  $q_{-i}$  and  $f$  such that  $|f| \leq c$  we have that  $q_i \mapsto u_i(q_i, q_{-i}, f)$  is concave and for all  $q$  we have that  $f \mapsto w(f, q)$  is

also concave. Hence, by Theorem 1.2 in [14] it exists a Nash equilibrium.

- We need to prove that the function  $\Phi(f, q) = w(f, q) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j (H^\top q^2)_j$  is a potential. Notice that  $w(f, q) - \Phi(f, q)$  does not depend on  $f$ . Hence, for every  $q \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$  and for each feasible  $f_1, f_2$  we have

$$\Phi(f_1, q) - \Phi(f_2, q) = w(f_1, q) - w(f_2, q). \quad (4)$$

To finish the proof, differentiate  $\Phi(f, q)$  with respect to  $q_i$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial q_i} \Phi(f, q) &= \sum_{j=1}^m H_{ij} P_j \left( (Bf + H^\top q)_j \right) \\ &\quad - C_i'(q_i) - q_i \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j H_{ij} \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial q_i} \left[ q_i \sum_{j=1}^m H_{ij} P_j \left( (Bf + H^\top q)_j \right) - C_i \right] \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial q_i} u_i(f, q). \end{aligned}$$

Where we used the fact that  $\frac{\partial}{\partial q_i} H_{ij} P_j \left( (Bf + H^\top q)_j \right) = H_{ij}^2 P_j' \left( (Bf + H^\top q)_j \right) = -\beta_j H_{ij}$ . ■

The second result establishes a connection between price differences at equilibrium and capacity bottlenecks in the power network.

*Theorem 3.2:* Consider a networked Cournot game satisfying Assumptions 1 and 2 and an equilibrium  $(q^*, f^*)$  with prices  $p_j^* = P_j(Bf^* + H^\top q^*)_j$ . If there exist  $(h, j)$  such that  $p_h^* < \bar{p}^* < p_j^*$  then it exists a saturated  $h - j$  cut, i.e., there exists  $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \{1, \dots, m\}$  such that

$$h \in \mathcal{U}, j \notin \mathcal{U} \quad f_k^* = \begin{cases} c_k & \text{if } k \text{ from } \mathcal{U} \text{ to } \mathcal{U}^c \\ -c_k & \text{if } k \text{ from } \mathcal{U}^c \text{ to } \mathcal{U} \end{cases},$$

where  $\mathcal{U}^c$  denotes the complement of the set  $\mathcal{U}$  (see Fig. 2).

*Proof:* If no capacity constraint is active, at equilibrium the projected gradient of  $w$  with respect to  $r = Bf$  onto the hyperplane  $\mathbb{1}^\top r = 0$  must be zero (otherwise we could always increase the value of  $w$  following the direction of steepest ascent given by the projected gradient). We have that

$$\nabla_r w(r^*, q^*) = P(r^* + H^\top q^*).$$

The projected gradient can be found by multiplying the gradient by the projection matrix onto the hyperplane  $\mathbb{1}^\top = 0$ , which is given by  $(I - \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{1}_{m \times m})$ , hence it must be

$$\left( I - \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{1}_{m \times m} \right) P(r^* + H^\top q^*) = 0 \quad (5)$$

$$\iff P(r^* + H^\top q^*) = \bar{p}^* \mathbb{1}, \quad \bar{p}^* \in \mathbb{R}^+. \quad (6)$$

On the other hand, if  $(I - \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{1}_{m \times m}) \nabla_r w(r^*, q^*) \neq 0 \iff \exists (h, j)$  such that  $p_h^* < \bar{p}^* < p_j^*$ , suppose that  $\forall \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \exists h \in$




Fig. 2: A cut in a network.

$U, j \in U^c$  we have that  $f_k^* < c_k$  where  $k$  is the index associated to any link of the  $h - j$  cut going from  $U$  to  $U^c$  (the same holds for links with opposite orientation). Then, we can always find  $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\hat{r}_h = r_h^* + \Delta$  and  $\hat{r}_j = r_j^* - \Delta$  where  $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}$  without violating the inactive constraint  $f_k^* < c_k$ . Because of assumptions A1, we have that  $w(r, q)$  is concave in  $r$  (it is the sum of concave functions) and hence we can always choose such  $(h, j)$  and  $\Delta$  in order to strictly increase the value of  $w$  following the direction of steepest ascent given by  $(I - \frac{1}{m} \mathbb{1}_{m \times m}) \nabla_r w(r^*, q^*)$  until  $\hat{f}_k = c_k$ . Since we were able to find a feasible point that strictly increases the utility  $w$  compared to  $w(r^*, q^*)$  and such that  $\hat{f}_k = c_k$ , this proves that, whenever the projected gradient is non-zero, it must exist a saturated cut in the graph at the equilibrium. ■

Theorem 3.2 is generalizable to different welfare, replacing  $p_j^*$  by  $\frac{\partial w}{\partial r_j}$  and, as already mentioned, it formally proves the existence of a link between capacity bottlenecks and price differences, a very well known phenomenon in real-world power networks. We show this effect in the following example.

### Example:

We consider a simplified model of the Italian power network shown in Fig. 3 consisting of 22 markets (the nodes of the network) present in different regions of the country. The blue nodes indicate the three main hubs (north, central north and central south parts of Italy). The topology of the network and the capacities of power lines are publicly available at [15]. For sake of simplicity, we consider the same affine price function for all markets and the same quadratic cost function for all producers:  $P_j = \alpha - \beta d_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq m$  (measured in Euros (€) per Mega Watts-hour (MWh)) and  $C_i = \theta q_i^2$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  (measured in Euros). Although this assumptions are of course not realistic for a real power network, it will help us isolate the specific effect of capacity bottlenecks on price differences without mixing it up with other effects due to a mismatch between the parameters characterizing the utilities of the producers. We consider a total of 31 producers that supply energy to the network and the number of producers for each market is indicated by the red digit next to each market. The capacity for each line is indicated as the weight of the corresponding link and is measured in Mega Watts (MW). For the demand and cost functions, we choose the following values:  $\alpha =$

$$120 \frac{\text{€}}{\text{MWh}}, \beta = 0.04 \frac{\text{€}}{\text{MWh}^2} \text{ and } \theta = 0.01 \frac{\text{€}}{\text{MWh}^2}.$$




Fig. 3: Italian power network with line capacities measured in MW.

Notice that assumptions 1 and 2 are satisfied and the price functions are affine; by Theorem 3.1 this means that we have a potential game with unique Nash equilibria that can be found solving (3). By doing that, we find the equilibrium prices as shown in Tab. I and in Fig. 4.




Fig. 4: Flows, equilibrium prices and capacity bottlenecks in the Italian power network. Different colors highlight groups of markets that have different prices at equilibrium. Wavy links denote saturated power lines connecting these groups and the arrows indicate the actual direction of the energy flow.

Eq. Prices $\frac{\text{€}}{\text{MWh}}$	Markets
72	20,21,22
68	1,6
64	2,3,4,5,7,8,9,13,14,16,17,18,19
62.4	16
49.7	11
48	12,15

TABLE I: Price groups at equilibrium in the Italian power network.

Notice that a total of 6 price groups of markets arise, each characterized by a different price at equilibrium. By Theorem 3.2, we know that the power lines connecting these different groups must be saturated and this is exactly what we observe numerically. In Fig 4 we show the groups with different colors and the indication of the corresponding equilibrium price next to each node while the wavy links denote saturated lines. The weights on links denote the flow going through that line and arrows give the actual direction of it.

From the equilibrium state we observe that higher prices are found in those markets with few producers and that are also sufficiently far from the main distribution hubs or directly cut out by severe capacity bottlenecks. Interestingly, we observe that even by choosing the same price and cost functions, price groups do not need to be connected components of the corresponding graph: in other words there might be markets with same price at equilibrium but not directly connected by a power line (see node 1 and 6 in this example). This is an effect due to the homogeneity of the parameters chosen for this example and we do not expect it to happen with fully general price and cost functions.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have studied the equilibrium state of a networked Cournot competition involving producers and a market maker competing on multiple markets connected by links with finite capacity. This model is suited to describe energy marketplaces where the links connecting the markets represent physical power lines. We have studied existence and uniqueness of the Nash equilibria of this game as well as the implication of capacity bottlenecks in the power network on the emergence of price differences between different markets.

Ongoing research is focused on exploiting this result to develop optimal network intervention/design policies. Possible problems involve finding the critical cut and how to optimally create new lines or allocate additional capacity among the lines of the power network in order to level price differences or maximize certain welfare functions.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Melika Abolhassani, Mohammad Hossein Bateni, Mohammad Taghi Hajiaghayi, Hamid Mahini, and Anshul Sawant. Network Cournot competition. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)*, 8877:15–29, 2014.
- [2] Kostas Bimpikis, Shayan Ehsani, and Rahmi Ilkiliç. Cournot competition in networked markets. *EC 2014 - Proceedings of the 15th ACM Conference on Economics and Computation*, (1999):733, 2014.
- [3] Julián Barquín and Miguel Vázquez. Cournot equilibrium in power networks. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, (April):1–8, 2005.
- [4] Juliá Barquin and Miguel Vazquez. Cournot equilibrium calculation in power networks: An optimization approach with price response computation. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 23(2):317–326, 2008.
- [5] Karsten Neuhoff, Julian Barquin, Maroeska G. Boots, Andreas Ehrenmann, Benjamin F. Hobbs, Fieke A.M. Rijkers, and Miguel Vázquez. Network-constrained Cournot models of liberalized electricity markets: The devil is in the details. *Energy Economics*, 27(3):495–525, 2005.
- [6] Jian Yao, Ilan Adler, and Shmuel S. Oren. Modeling and computing two-settlement oligopolistic equilibrium in a congested electricity network. *Operations Research*, 56(1):34–47, 2008.
- [7] Desmond Cai, Subhonmesh Bose, and Adam Wierman. On the role of a market maker in networked cournot competition. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 44(3):1122–1144, 2019.
- [8] Lacra Pavel. Distributed gne seeking under partial-decision information over networks via a doubly-augmented operator splitting approach. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 65(4):1584–1597, 2020.
- [9] Mattia Bianchi and Sergio Grammatico. Fully distributed nash equilibrium seeking over time-varying communication networks with linear convergence rate. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 5(2):499–504, 2021.
- [10] Giuseppe Belgioioso, Angelia Nedić, and Sergio Grammatico. Distributed generalized nash equilibrium seeking in aggregative games on time-varying networks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 66(5):2061–2075, 2021.
- [11] John N. Tsitsiklis and Yunjian Xu. Efficiency loss in a cournot oligopoly with convex market demand. In *Game Theory for Networks*, pages 63–76, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012.
- [12] Wholesale power price maps reflect real-time constraints on transmission of electricity. <https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=3150/>.
- [13] Locational marginal pricing. <https://energyknowledgebase.com/topics/locational-marginal-pricing-lmp.asp>.
- [14] Christophe Dutang. Existence theorems for generalized nash equilibrium problems: an analysis of assumptions. *Journal of Nonlinear Analysis and Optimization*, 2013.
- [15] Italian Electric Market. <https://www.mercatoelettrico.org/it/>.