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Abstract—Increasing integration of renewable generation and flexible resources poses significant challenges to ensure robustness guarantees in real-time power system decision-making. This work aims to develop a robust optimal transmission switching (OTS) framework that can relieve grid congestion via judicious line switching. We formulate a two-stage distributionally robust chance-constrained (DRCC) problem that can ensure limited constraint violations for any uncertainty distribution within an ambiguity set. The second-stage recourse variables are first represented as linear functions of uncertainty, yielding an equivalent reformulation of linear constraints only. Furthermore, both moment-based (mean-mean absolute deviation) and distance-based (∞-Wasserstein distance) ambiguity sets lead to equivalent mixed-integer linear program (MILP) formulations. Numerical experiments on the IEEE 14-bus and 118-bus systems have demonstrated the performance improvements of the proposed DRCC-OTS approaches over two CC-OTS counterparts, in terms of guaranteed constraint violations. In particular, the computational efficiency of the moment-based MILP approach, which is scenario-free with fixed problem dimensions, has been confirmed, making it suitable for real-time grid operations.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Rising renewable penetration in recent years greatly challenges the efficient and reliable operations of power systems. Under this increasing uncertainty, robust decision-making, such as grid topology optimization [1], is of crucial importance for power grids. Judicious line switching along with generation dispatch could effectively reduce the total generation costs and relieve network congestion, yet at possibly more frequent violations of operational limits (e.g., line power flows). Thus, it is imperative to design optimal transmission switching (OTS) algorithms that can provide guaranteed robustness under the resource uncertainty.

The OTS problem has attracted high interest in recent years on its algorithm design and practical implementations (e.g., [2–6]). The switching of transmission lines can potentially expand the feasible region for generation dispatch decisions and thus reduce the total costs. As OTS includes additional integer decision variables compared to the optimal power flow (OPF) problem, it is more difficult to extend the former to a stochastic/robust optimization framework under uncertainty. Similar to OPF, scenario-based approaches have been largely used to deal with the two-stage OTS problem under uncertainty. For example, stochastic topology optimization has been considered in [7], [8] based on wind uncertainty scenarios from known probabilistic models. In addition, the chance-constrained (CC) framework has been developed for the OTS problem in [9], aiming to attain guaranteed constraint violation for a given uncertainty distribution using sample average approximation (SAA). Nonetheless, constructing the accurate distribution for the uncertainty in energy resources could be very challenging in practice. Moreover, these approaches typically lead to a mixed-integer program (MIP) with the problem dimension quickly growing with the number of samples. Thus, this scalability issue results in high computational complexity and makes these scenario-based approaches sub-par for real-time OTS decision-making.

To tackle this issue, our earlier work [10] has leveraged the scenario-free framework to develop a robust OTS algorithm [10]. It has utilized the linear decision rule (LDR) to approximate the second-stage variables, seeking to maintain the operation limits for any uncertainty within a compact support set. Albeit a linear approximation, the resultant mixed-integer linear program (MILP) has a fixed problem dimension and is efficient to solve. Nonetheless, its robustness under all possible uncertainty scenarios could make the solution unnecessarily conservative. Recently, a distributionally robust chance-constrained (DRCC-) OTS approach has been considered in [11], which allows for the ambiguity of uncertainty distribution. However, the linear OTS model therein builds upon the sensitivity factors for line outages that cannot represent the effects of multiple, simultaneous topology changes.

The goal of this paper is to develop computationally efficient algorithms for solving the DRCC-OTS problem. A notable feature of our proposed DRCC-OTS framework is an equivalent linear reformulation for the integer line status and dc power flow variables. Specifically, we have analytically established that for the two-stage OTS problem with the automatic generation control (AGC) mechanism, the recourse actions (line flows and phase angles) can be effectively represented as linear functions of the uncertainty. Compared with [10] and most LDR-based affine approximations, our two-stage OTS reformulation is exact thanks to the linearity of power flow. This linear OTS model is crucial for the tractable DRCC reformulations later on based on the dualization technique. Compared to CC-OTS, the DRCC framework seeks dispatch and switching decisions that are robust to the worst-case uncertainty distribution within an ambiguity set. The latter greatly expands the possible probabilistic models, where variations of uncertainty distributions are pretty common in real-world
problems due to lack of data samples or high variability. To provide tractable DRCC-OTS solutions, this work considers moment-based (mean-mean absolute deviation) and distance-based (Wasserstein distance) ambiguity sets for the resource uncertainty, both of which are amenable to linear reformulations. The contribution of our work is three-fold.

- We put forth a two-stage DRCC-OTS problem under resource uncertainty which models real-time generation adjustment using AGC.
- For the proposed two-stage OTS problem, we analytically establish an equivalent LDR-based reformulation by recognizing that recourse actions are exactly linear in the uncertainty for given first-stage decision variables.
- We are the first to construct scalable DRCC-OTS problems using the mean dispersion and the infinity-Wasserstein ambiguity sets, both leading to MILP reformulations through dualization-based analysis.

Numerical tests demonstrate that the proposed DRCC-OTS solutions can effectively limit the constraint violations in face of actual uncertainty realizations, and thus improve the robustness guarantees over CC-OTS. Furthermore, the moment-based DRCC-OTS approach is scenario-free and efficient to solve, thus very suitable for real-time grid operations.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II formulates the OTS problem based on the dc power flow model. Section III introduces the linear equivalent reformulation of the two-stage robust OTS problem. The CC-OTS variations are further considered, along with two benchmark approaches with conic reformulations. Section IV presents the DRCC-OTS algorithms using both moment-based and distance-based ambiguity sets. Numerical experiments using the IEEE 14-bus and 118-bus systems are presented in Section V to demonstrate the improvements of the proposed DRCC-OTS algorithms in terms of guaranteed robustness and computational efficiency. The paper is wrapped up in Section VI.

Notation: Bold symbols stand for matrices/vector and unbolded symbols stand for scalars; $(\cdot)^T$ stands for transposition; $|\cdot|$ denotes the absolute value; $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the vector norm; $\odot$ denotes the Hadamard product; $e_i$ denotes the vector of all ones; $e_i$ denotes the standard basis vector with all entries being 0 except for the $i$-th entry equals to 1; $\mathbb{I}$ denotes the indicator function; $\mathcal{M}_+$ denotes the set of nonnegative measures.

II. System Modeling

We first present the dc power flow based optimal transmission switching (OTS) formulation [2]. Consider a transmission system with $N$ buses collected in the set $\mathcal{N} := \{1, \ldots, N\}$ and $L$ lines in $\mathcal{L} := \{(i,j)\} \subseteq \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}$. Let $\theta_i$ denote the voltage angle per bus $i$ and vector $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^N$ collect all $\theta_i$'s. Similarly, let $g, d \in \mathbb{R}^N$ denote the vectors of nodal generation and load, respectively. The line flow $f := \{f_{ij}\} \in \mathbb{R}^L$ becomes

$$f = K\theta$$

where matrix $K \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times N}$ is formed by the topology and line parameters. Specifically, its row for line $(i, j)$ equals to $b_{ij}(e_i - e_j)^T$, with $b_{ij}$ being the inverse of line reactance and $e_i$ the $i$-th standard basis vector. Furthermore, the nodal power balance leads to the total injection $p := g - d$ as:

$$p = Af$$

where $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{N \times L}$ is the graph incidence matrix for $(\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{L})$, with the column for line $(i, j)$ equal to $(e_i - e_j)$.

The OTS problem aims to determine the connectivity of transmission lines so as to minimize the total generation cost for given load $d$. For simplicity, we consider a linear generation cost (as in [1], [2], [12]) and use $c \in \mathbb{R}^N$ to denote the vector of (known) linear cost coefficients. In addition to the dispatch $g$, the OTS’s decision variables include a binary vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^L$ to indicate the transmission line status (1: closed, 0: open). The OTS problem is formulated as a mixed-integer linear program (MILP), given by

$$\min \ c^T g$$

s.t.

- $g \in \mathbb{R}^N, \theta \in \mathbb{R}^N, f \in \mathbb{R}^L, z \in \mathbb{Z}^L$ (3a)
- $g \leq \bar{g}$ (3b)
- $\bar{\theta} \leq \theta \leq \bar{\theta}$ (3c)
- $f \circ z \leq f \leq \bar{f} \circ z$ (3d)
- $A f = g - d$ (3e)
- $K\theta - f + M \circ (e - z) \geq 0$ (3f)
- $K \theta - f - M \circ (e - z) \leq 0$ (3g)
- $e^T z \geq L - L_o$ (3h)

where constraints on generation, angle and line flow in (3c)-(3h) ensure the system operating limits. We use $\odot$ to denote the element-wise product (or Hadamard product), which is used in (3e) to enforce the limits on closed lines only according to $z$. For any open line $(z_{ij} = 0)$, its flow $f_{ij}$ becomes zero under (3c). Additionally, constraint (3f) enforces network power balance as in (2). As for constraints (3g) and (3h), they jointly represent the line flow model in (1) where vector $M$ has each entry $M_{ij}$ for each line $(i, j)$ to be a sufficiently large constant. For any closed line $(z_{ij} = 1)$, the two inequalities exactly lead to the equality constraint as in (1). Otherwise, under $z_{ij} = 0$ and thus $f_{ij} = 0$ [cf. (3g)], the two constraints respectively become $b_{ij}(\theta_i - \theta_j) + M_{ij} \geq 0$ and $b_{ij}(\theta_i - \theta_j) - M_{ij} \leq 0$. Accordingly, both conditions trivially hold under a large enough $M_{ij}$ and does not affect the OTS problem. This technique is known as the Big-M method [13], which is powerful for handling constraints with binary variables. For each line $(i, j)$, we can set $M_{ij} := b_{ij}d_{ij}^{\text{max}}$ with a maximum limit $d_{ij}^{\text{max}}$ according to angle stability [cf. (5d)]. Last, for system stability concerns, we use constraint (3i) to restrict the total number of lines that can be switched off not to exceed the given limit $L_o$. In fact, this restriction can also reduce the computational complexity in solving the resultant MILP. In addition, earlier studies (see e.g., [1], [9], [12]) have shown that the incremental reduction of total generation cost diminishes rapidly when $L_o$ reaches a certain level. Practical choices of $L_o$ are relatively small (e.g., $L_o \leq 5$) for large systems.

Remark 1 (power flow modeling). This paper adopts the dc power flow model for formulating the OTS problem. Albeit
simple, it does not include voltage limits or other ac flow considerations. To address this, it is possible to extend to the ac power flow by using the relaxation-based formulation in [3]. In addition, one can perform the post-selection ac flow analysis and verify the ac feasibility of the resultant solution to [3], as introduced in [3].

III. OTS Under Uncertainty

This section formally presents the OTS problem under uncertainty as well as its chance-constrained solutions. We first discuss the model of uncertainty due to e.g., renewable generation or flexible demand. Let ξ ∈ R^K stand for the uncertainty vector of the full system with its samples denoted by {ξ^s}_s=1^S. We assume that ξ is bounded with a certain support set. In a data-driven setting, the support set can be estimated with high confidence from the samples under mild assumptions on the distribution (e.g., sub-Gaussian). For example, it can be the polytope formed by the convex hull of the samples. In general, we consider the support to be a compact, full-dimensional polytope.

AS1. The support set for ξ is assumed to be compact as represented by a full-dimensional polytope Ξ := {ξ ∈ R^K : Uξ ≤ t}.

This assumption turns out to be useful for representing OTS decision variables under uncertainty. To incorporate the uncertainty into [3], we resort to a two-stage robust optimization by making a here-and-now decision while taking recourse or wait-and-see actions once the realizations of ξ are observed. Recourse functions need to be defined for the generation, angle, and line flow variables upon observing ξ. In practice, power system generation adjustment follows the classical design of automatic generation control (AGC) to quickly maintain power balance [15, Ch. 9], as detailed here.

AS2. The generation recourse actions follow the AGC mechanism that adjusts each dispatchable generator by a fixed percentage of instantaneous network-wide power imbalance. As the latter equals to e^Tξ = ξ + ⋯ + ξ_K, the AGC-based generation adjustment becomes g^′(ξ) = γ(e^Tξ) with vector γ ∈ R^N collecting the AGC coefficients to be determined.

The flexibility of generation output is also limited by the committed reserves, and we use r, s ∈ R^N to denote the upper/lower reserve limits. In addition, changes of angle and line flows are respectively denoted by θ^*(ξ) : R^K → R^N and f^*(ξ) : R^K → R^L, both as recourse functions of ξ. Inspired by the linearity of dc power flow, we will model them as linear functions; i.e., we have θ^*(ξ) = Y_θ ξ and f^*(ξ) = Y_f ξ with matrices Y_θ ∈ R^{N×K} and Y_f ∈ R^{L×K} as decision variables. This approach is well known as the linear decision rules (LDRs) in two-stage robust optimization [16], which approximates the recourse variables as affine functions of uncertainty. Interestingly, under (AS1)-(AS2) this linearized model turns out to be exact in representing the actual changes of angles and line flows at no modeling error, as detailed soon. With vector q collecting the linear cost coefficients for generation adjustment, the OTS problem under uncertain ξ is cast as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\min \quad & c^T g + E[q^T γe^T ξ] \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & (3b) - (3i), \gamma ∈ [0, 1]^N, e^T γ = 1 \quad (4a) \\
& Y_θ ∈ R^{N×K}, Y_f ∈ R^{L×K} \quad (4b) \\
& r ≤ γe^T ξ ≤ s \quad ∀ ξ ∈ Ξ \quad (4c) \\
& g ≤ g + γe^T ξ ≤ g \quad ∀ ξ ∈ Ξ \quad (4d) \\
& θ ≤ y^0 \quad ∀ ξ ∈ Ξ \quad (4e) \\
& f \circ ξ ≤ f \quad ∀ ξ ∈ Ξ \quad (4f) \\
& A(f + Y_f ξ) = g + γe^T ξ - d - Fξ \quad ∀ ξ ∈ Ξ \quad (4g) \\
& K(θ + Y_θ ξ) - f - Y_f ξ + M ⊙ (e - z) ≥ 0 \quad ∀ ξ ∈ Ξ \quad (4h) \\
& K(θ + Y_θ ξ) - f - Y_f ξ - M ⊙ (e - z) ≤ 0 \quad ∀ ξ ∈ Ξ \quad (4i)
\end{align*}
\]

The decision variables are denoted as x, consisting of first-stage decisions \{g, θ, f, z, γ\}. Note that the AGC coefficients are also included for reducing the total cost. Furthermore, the second-stage decisions Y_θ and Y_f relate the angle and line flow adjustments to ξ. Moreover, the transformation matrix P ∈ R^{N×K} in (4i) is a known mapping from ξ ∈ R^K to the system dimension N. Basically, problem (4) aims to minimize the sum of total generation cost at the first-stage and the expected cost during real-time recourse adjustment. Constraint (4h) imposes the operating reserve limits while the remaining ones (4a)-(4g) ensure system operating limits as in the OTS problem (3) would still hold after recourse actions are taken [cf. (3c)-(3d)]. With the mean of uncertainty E(ξ) = μ known, the term E[q^T γe^T ξ] in (4a) equivalently becomes (q^T γe^T μ) which is a linear function of the unknown γ.

By recognizing the linearity of AGC, we can establish the exactness of the linearized modeling on θ^*(ξ) = Y_θ ξ and f^*(ξ) = Y_f ξ as follows.

Lemma 1. Under (AS1)-(AS2), the adjustments on angle and line flow for fixed grid topology z and AGC coefficients γ become exactly linear functions of ξ with both matrices Y_θ and Y_f uniquely determined by z and γ.

Proof: Under (AS2), the change of full network injection due to uncertainty is (γe^Tξ − Fξ) [cf. (3i)]. Under the fixed topology of no islanding, the dc linear flow model [15, Ch. 4] states that changes of angle and line flow, namely θ^′ and f^′, are linearly related to the change of injection, and thus to ξ as well. The full-dimensional support set Ξ in (AS1) can further guarantee the uniqueness of Y_θ and Y_f.

Lemma 1 ensures that the linear models in problem (4) can yield the exact recourse values of angle and line flow under any given first-stage decision variables of z and γ. This is also the case under the optimal solutions of z and γ. Hence, the LDR-based approximations of f^′(ξ) = Y_θ ξ and f^′(ξ) = Y_f ξ become valid and exact models for these recourse variables, and problem (4) provides an exact formulation of two-stage OTS. This equivalence is different from most LDR-based approaches, which attain approximate modeling only [16].
A. Chance-Constrained (CC-) OTS

The chance-constrained (CC) formulation is popularly used to deal with inequality constraints under uncertainty. The relevant constraints from problem (4) can be collected in the following set:

\[ I = \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\xi \leq \gamma e^T \xi \leq \mathbb{r}, \\
g \leq g + \gamma e^T \xi \leq \bar{g}, \\
\theta \leq \theta + Y_0 \xi \leq \bar{\theta}, \\
f \circ z \leq f + Y_j \xi \leq \bar{f} \circ z.
\end{array} \right\}. \tag{5} \]

These constraints correspond to the limits on reserve, generation, phase angle, and line flow as in (4d) - (4g), all of which are linear in \( \xi \). Note that the network power balance in (4h) and line flow relations in (4i) - (4j) are not included by (5). This is because they are used to determine the power flow and thus need to strictly hold. Interestingly, they can be effectively reformulated by linear constraints without \( \xi \). For the equality (4h), it becomes a simple linear one, as stated in the following proposition based on [16].

**Proposition 1.** Under (A.1), constraint (4h) is equivalent to:

\[ AY_f = \gamma e^T - F. \tag{6} \]

**Proof:** Recalling \( Af = g - d \) [cf. (3)], we can rewrite (4h) as \( (AY_f - \gamma e^T + F) \xi = 0 \), \( \forall \xi \in \Xi \). This implies that the linear hull of \( \Xi \) should belong to the null space of the linear operator \( (AY_f - \gamma e^T + F) \). As \( \Xi \) spans the whole sample space under (A.1), the associated null space is empty and (6) holds accordingly. \( \Box \)

For inequality constraints (4i) and (4j), a well-known equivalence result in robust optimization [16] can lead to the following equivalent constraints.

**Proposition 2.** Under (A.1), constraints (4i) and (4j) are respectively equivalent to:

\[ \begin{align*}
Y_f &= K \Psi \theta + \Phi_1^T U_2, \quad M \circ (e - z) - \Phi_2^T t \geq 0 \quad \text{(7a)} \\
Y_f &= K \Psi \theta + \Phi_2^T U_2, \quad M \circ (e - z) - \Phi_1^T t \geq 0 \quad \text{(7b)}
\end{align*} \]

where matrices \( \Phi_1, \Phi_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{L \times W} \geq 0 \) collect the dual variables for constraints in (4i) and (4j), respectively.

**Proof:** This proposition can be viewed as a special case of [17] Thm. 3.2. For any constraint in the form of \( h^T \xi + m \geq 0, \forall \xi \in \Xi \), under (A.1) it is equivalent to \( 0 \leq \min \{ h^T \xi + m : U \xi \leq t \} \). The right-hand side expression is essentially a linear program, for which the equivalent dual problem under Slater’s conditions becomes \( 0 \leq \max_{\varphi, \varphi \geq 0} \{ -t^T \varphi + m : \varphi \geq 0, -U^T \varphi = h \} \), where \( \varphi \) is the vector of dual variables. For the maximum of dual problem to be non-negative, the dual vector \( \varphi \geq 0 \) has to satisfy that \( U^T \varphi = h \) and \( t^T \varphi \leq m \). Thus, constraints (4i) and (4j) can be rewritten as (7) based on this equivalence result. \( \Box \)

Using Propositions 1 and 2 we can convert the remaining constraints in (4) to deterministic ones without \( \xi \) and accordingly cast the CC-OTS problem as follows:

\[ \min \ c^T g + \mathbb{E}[q^T \gamma e^T \xi] \tag{8a} \]

\[ \mathbb{P}\{a_i(x)^T \xi \leq b_i(x)\} \geq 1 - \epsilon_i, \forall i \in I. \tag{8b} \]

where (8c) represents the chance constraints for each inequality in (4), which is guaranteed to satisfy with a probability of at least \( 1 - \epsilon_i \) for a pre-specified tolerance level \( \epsilon_i \).

B. Benchmark Methods for CC-OTS

We present two benchmark methods of approximating (8c), which is the most critical step in solving (8). These two approximation methods give rise to mixed-integer problems and will be used to numerically compare with the proposed DRCC methods later on.

1) Sample Average Approximation (SAA): Given independently and identically distributed (i.i.d.) uncertainty samples \( \{\xi^j\} \) with \( j \in \mathcal{J} := \{1, \cdots, S\} \), the SAA aims to replace the CC constraints in (8c) with the sample-based empirical distribution \( \hat{\mathbb{P}} \).

Basically, the empirical distribution \( \hat{\mathbb{P}} \) assigns equal mass to all samples, by replacing (8c) with the following mixed-integer linear constraints [13]:

\[ w_i^j \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall i \in I, \quad j \in \mathcal{J}. \tag{9a} \]

\[ b_i(x) - a_i(x)^T \xi^j + M w_i^j \geq 0, \quad \forall i, j. \tag{9b} \]

\[ \sum_{j=1}^{S} w_i^j \leq S \epsilon_i, \quad \forall i. \tag{9c} \]

where \( M \) is a sufficiently large number. The binary decision variable \( w_i^j \) indicates whether the constraint \( a_i(x)^T \xi^j \leq b_i(x) \) holds or not. If \( w_i^j = 0 \), (9b) is equivalent to \( a_i(x)^T \xi^j \leq b_i(x) \) and the constraint holds; otherwise, (9b) becomes redundant for a large enough \( M \). If each \( \xi^j \) is randomly sampled with an equal probability (i.e., \( \mathbb{P}(\xi^j) = 1/S \)), constraint (9c) guarantees that the sample-based probability of violation \( (S/S) \sum_{j=1}^{S} w_i^j \) is not greater than the threshold \( \epsilon_i \). Under SAA, the resulting approximation of (8) is an MILP which can be solved by mathematical optimization solvers such as MOSEK and Gurobi. Notice that the number of constraints can grow quickly with the sample size \( S \). Due to this scalability issue, the SAA approach will be mainly used for the small test case in numerical studies.

2) Gaussian Approximation: This method assumes that \( \xi \) is a Gaussian random vector with mean \( \mu \) and covariance \( \Sigma \). For the chance constraint (8c) with a typical threshold of \( \epsilon_i \leq 0.5 \), the Gaussian distribution leads to an equivalent second-order cone (SOC) constraint [19 Sec. 4.4.2]. This approach has been popularly used for solving CC-OPF problems (e.g., [20], [21]), thanks to the tractability of the resultant SOC program (SOCP) problems.

To briefly introduce the basic idea of this method, we consider the variance of \( a_i(x)^T \xi \) as denoted by \( \sigma^2 \) and constraint \( i \in I \) in (8c) now becomes

\[ \mathbb{P}\left( \frac{a_i(x)^T \xi - a_i(x)^T \mu}{\sigma} \leq \frac{b_i(x) - a_i(x)^T \mu}{\sigma} \right) \geq 1 - \epsilon_i. \tag{10} \]

With \( \Phi^{-1}(\epsilon_i) \) denoting \( \epsilon_i \)-quantile of the standard normal distribution, the condition in (10) is equivalent to

\[ \mu^T a_i(x) - \Phi^{-1}(\epsilon_i) \sigma \leq b_i(x). \tag{11} \]
As \( \sigma = \sqrt{a_i(x)^T \Sigma a_i(x)} \), this is equivalent to the following SOC constraint:
\[
\mu^T a_i(x) + \Phi^{-1}(1 - \epsilon_i) \| \Sigma^{1/2} a_i(x) \|_2 \leq b_i(x) \tag{12}
\]
Under Gaussian approximation, the CC-OTS problem [8] becomes a mixed-integer SOCP (MISOCP) for which off-the-shelf solvers such as Gurobi and CPLEX are very powerful. Compared with SAA, this method requires no sampling, yet its uncertainty model can be too restrictive for the renewable/load perturbations in practice.

IV. DISTRIBUTIONALLY ROBUST
CHANCE-CONSTRAINED OTS

A distributionally robust optimization (DRO) framework has been recognized as an increasingly powerful yet tractable approach to deal with uncertainty in power system operations. The DRO framework does not rely on a particular probability distribution. Instead, it constructs an ambiguity set of plausible distributions that are consistent with statistical and structural information on uncertainty. A safe decision is then sought within the ambiguity set. Hence, the framework mitigates data overfitting issues and yields superior performance in out-of-sample tests.

To develop the DRO-based OTS formulation, consider the distributionally robust chance constraints (DRCC) for [9] as
\[
\inf_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{P}\{a_i(x)^T \xi \leq b_i(x)\} \geq 1 - \epsilon_i \quad \forall i \in I, \tag{13}
\]
which requires each chance constraint to be satisfied under all probability distributions \( \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P} \). Typical ambiguity sets studied in related DRO-based power system decision-making problems fall into the following categories: i) moment-based ambiguity set [22]–[24], ii) distance-based ambiguity set [25]–[28] and iii) structural-based ambiguity set [29]–[31]. We consider the DRCC reformulations using the moment-based ambiguity set (mean and mean absolute deviation) and the distance-based ambiguity set (Wasserstein distance). Both of them are amenable to mixed-integer linear programming reformulations.

A. Mean and Mean Absolute Deviation Ambiguity Set

The mean and mean absolute deviation (mean-MAD) ambiguity set is defined as
\[
\mathcal{P}_1 := \{ \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_0(\Xi) : \mathbb{E}[\xi] = \mu, \ \mathbb{E}[|\xi - \mu|] \leq \sigma \}, \tag{14}
\]
which includes all distributions with the mean equal to \( \mu \in \mathbb{R}^K \) and mean absolute deviation bounded by \( \sigma \in \mathbb{R}^+_K \). Note that the absolute value and its inequality are both component-wise. One can also impose certain dependence structures when building the ambiguity set (see e.g., [32]). Each worst-case probability in (14) over the ambiguity set \( \mathcal{P}_1 \) boils down to the following optimization problem [33]:
\[
\begin{align}
Z_{\mathcal{P}_1} &= \inf \int \mathbb{1}\{a_i(x)^T \xi \leq b_i(x)\} v(d\xi) \tag{15a} \\
&\quad \text{s.t.} \quad v(\cdot) \in \mathcal{M}_+, \tag{15b} \\
&\quad \int v(d\xi) = 1 \tag{15c}
\end{align}
\]
where \( \mathbb{1}(\cdot) \) denotes the indicator function for the inequality constraint, while \( \mathcal{M}_+ \) defines the set of nonnegative measures. Constraints (15c) – (15e) are basically the integral forms of (14). As the objective and constraint functions are all linear in the unknown measure \( v(\cdot) \), the problem (15) is a convex semi-infinite linear program (SILP). If the DRCC (13) is feasible under \( \mathcal{P}_1 \), then we have \( Z_{\mathcal{P}_1} \geq 1 - \epsilon_i \) for constraint \( i \in I \). By denoting \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^K, \) and \( \kappa \in \mathbb{R}^+_K \) as dual variables for constraints (15c)-(15e), respectively, we can formulate the dual problem of (15) as:
\[
\begin{align}
\sup \quad &\alpha + \beta^T \mu - \kappa^T \sigma \\
\text{s.t.} \quad &\alpha \in \mathbb{R}, \beta \in \mathbb{R}^K, \kappa \in \mathbb{R}^+_K, \tag{16a} \\
&\mathbb{1}\{a_i(x)^T \xi \leq b_i(x)\} \geq \alpha + \beta^T \xi - \kappa^T |\xi - \mu|, \ \forall \xi \in \Xi \tag{16b} \\
&\xi^T \Xi = \psi \tag{16c}
\end{align}
\]
Strong duality holds as the ambiguity set \( \mathcal{P}_1 \) satisfies the Slater’s condition [34] for the SILP (15). The semi-infinite constraint for the dual problem (16) boils down to two cases according to the indicator \( \mathbb{1}(\cdot) \) in (16c). Basically, it equals to 0 for any \( \xi \) such that \( a_i(x)^T \xi > b_i(x) \), or 1 for any other choice of \( \xi \). These two cases can be reformulated using standard convex duality theory to arrive at the following equivalent linear constraints [35]:
\[
\begin{align}
\alpha' + \beta'^T \mu - \kappa'^T \sigma &\geq (1 - \epsilon_i) \lambda' \tag{17a} \\
\lambda' &\geq \pi_1^T \lambda + \psi_1^T t \tag{17b} \\
\beta'^T + \tau_1^T &\geq \pi_1^T + \psi_1^T U \tag{17c} \\
\pi_1^T + \tau_1^T &\geq \kappa'^T \tag{17d} \\
\beta' + a_i(x)^T + \tau_2^T &\geq \pi_2^T + \psi_2^T U \tag{17e} \\
\pi_2^T + \tau_2^T &\geq \kappa'^T \tag{17f}
\end{align}
\]
The dual variables \( \pi' \in \mathbb{R}^+_K \) and \( \tau' \in \mathbb{R}^+_K \) are introduced for the epigraph based constraints \( \rho \geq \xi - \mu \) and \( \rho \leq \xi - \mu \), respectively, while \( \psi' \in \mathbb{R}^+_W \) for the linear constraints of the support set \( \Xi \). Note that the dual variable \( \lambda > 0 \) corresponding to the new constraint \( a_i(x)^T \xi > b_i(x) \) introduces bilinearity in the original decision variables \( x \). We address this by dividing all constraints with \( \lambda \) and performing the change of variables for the primal variables in (16) as \( \alpha' = \frac{\alpha}{\lambda'}, \beta' = \lambda' \beta, \) and \( \kappa' = \lambda' \kappa \), and the dual variables as \( \lambda' = \frac{\lambda}{\lambda'} \) (similarly for the aforementioned \( \pi' \) and \( \tau' \)).

Proposition 3. The DRCC-OTS problem under ambiguity set \( \mathcal{P}_1 \) is equivalent to the following optimization problem:
\[
\begin{align}
\min \quad &c^T g + \mathbb{E}[q^T g e^T \xi] \tag{18a} \\
\text{s.t.} \quad &\alpha' \in \mathbb{R}, \beta' \in \mathbb{R}^K, \kappa' \in \mathbb{R}^+_K \tag{18b} \\
&\lambda' \in \mathbb{R}^+_+, \pi' \in \mathbb{R}^+_K, \tau' \in \mathbb{R}^+_K, \psi' \in \mathbb{R}^+_W \tag{18c} \\
&\text{(8b), (17a) – (17g).} \tag{18d}
\end{align}
\]
Thanks to all the linear constraints, the DRCC-OTS problem in (18) is an MILP. The DRCC-OTS significantly improves the scalability over the SAA-based MILP problem though, as the former effectively uses dualization techniques to attain a fixed set of linear constraints such that (13) holds for any distribution in \( \mathcal{P}_1 \). Therefore, the resulting problem (18) is scenario-free and of low computational complexity for efficient implementations in real time.

B. Wasserstein Ambiguity Set

This ambiguity set essentially ensures the robustness under all probability distributions within a prescribed Wasserstein distance from the empirical distribution. Compared with the mean-MAD criterion, the Wasserstein metric is purely data-driven and constructed using actual data samples. With more samples available, the latter better reveals the actual uncertainty distribution and thus can lead to less conservative DRCC solutions.

We adopt the \( \infty \)-Wasserstein ambiguity set which is known to enjoy a more tractable reformulation [35, 36]. The \( \infty \)-Wasserstein ambiguity set is defined as

\[
\mathcal{P}_2 := \{ \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_0(\Xi) : d_\infty(\mathbb{P}, \hat{\mathbb{P}}) \leq \delta \},
\]

where \( \delta > 0 \) is a given Wasserstein radius that determines the finite-sample performance guarantee of the DRCC problem; see e.g., [37, Cor. 1]. The \( \infty \)-Wasserstein distance for two distributions is defined by

\[
d_\infty(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2) := \inf_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_0(\mathbb{R}^K \times \mathbb{R}^K)} \text{ess sup} \|\tilde{\xi}_1 - \tilde{\xi}_2\|,
\]

where \( \mathbb{P} \) is the joint distribution of \( \tilde{\xi}_1 \) and \( \tilde{\xi}_2 \) with marginals \( \mathbb{P}_1 \) and \( \mathbb{P}_2 \), respectively. We use \( \text{ess sup} \) to denote the essential supremum of a function and \( \| \cdot \| \) can be any norm in \( \mathbb{R}^K \). For each constraint \( i \in I \), suppose a big-M coefficient \( M_j \) exists to bound

\[
M_j \geq \max_x \{ a_i(x)^T \xi_j + \delta \|a_i(x)\|_\infty - b_i(x) \}, \forall j \in \mathcal{J},
\]

where \( \| \cdot \|_\infty \) denotes the corresponding dual norm. This way, the DRCC in (13) under \( \mathcal{P}_2 \) can be represented as the following mixed-integer constraints [35, Cor. 4]:

\[
\begin{align*}
(9a) & \quad \delta \|a_i(x)\|_\infty \leq b_i(x) - a_i(x)^T \xi_j + M_j w_j, \forall i, j.
\end{align*}
\]

Note that this reformulation mimics the SAA-based one in (9), by changing the lower bound of the right-hand side (RHS) of (22b) from 0 to \( \|a_i(x)\|_\infty \), which acts as a regularizer. Intuitively, a smaller radius \( \delta \) implies the expansion to distributions more similar to the empirical one \( \hat{\mathbb{P}} \). Accordingly, the constraint (22b) becomes less restrictive. As \( \delta \) decreases to 0, \( \mathcal{P}_2 \) reduces to the singleton \( \hat{\mathbb{P}} \) itself and (22) becomes equivalent to the SAA approach.

Proposition 4. The DRCC-OTS problem under ambiguity set \( \mathcal{P}_2 \) is equivalent to the following optimization problem:

\[
\begin{align*}
(23a) & \quad \min c^T g + \mathbb{E}[q^T \gamma e^T \xi],
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(23b) & \quad \text{s.t. (8b), (22a), (22b),}
\end{align*}
\]

For better numerical tractability, we have picked the \( L_\infty \)-norm as the ground metric for Wasserstein distance in (20), for which the dual norm is \( L_1 \) in (22b) and the problem (23) becomes an MILP. Due to the similarity to SAA, the DRCC-OTS under the Wasserstein metric also incurs the same complexity issue as the number of constraints grows with sample size \( |\mathcal{J}| \). Nonetheless, the choice of \( \infty \)-Wasserstein ambiguity set already improves the tractability over the traditional Wasserstein metric as in [25–28]. Compared to the mean-MAD ambiguity set, the DRCC-OTS problem under the Wasserstein ambiguity set takes more computation time especially for large systems, but its data-driven feature makes the resulting solutions less conservative with sufficient number of data samples.

V. Numerical Results

In this section, we present the numerical results on validating the proposed DRCC-OTS methods using the IEEE 14-bus and 118-bus test cases. Other benchmark approaches are implemented too for performance comparisons in terms of robustness. For ease of exposition, we refer to all the tested approaches as the following:

\begin{itemize}
  \item A1: Sample average approximation benchmark (MILP)
  \item A2: Gaussian approximation benchmark (MISOCP)
  \item A3: DRCC under mean-MAD ambiguity set (MILP)
  \item A4: DRCC under \( \infty \)-Wasserstein ambiguity set (MILP)
  \item A5: Robust optimization benchmark (MILP)
\end{itemize}

Note that the additional benchmark A5 for the two-stage problem (4) is included to demonstrate the improvements using CC approaches. As detailed in [10], it can be solved by dualizing constraints (40–41) over the support set \( \Xi \) to produce a scenario-free MILP. In this sense, its complexity order is on par with A3 with a slight reduction due to fewer variables/constraints in A5. As A5 incorporates all scenarios in \( \Xi \) at no violation of constraints, it provides an upper bound of the total cost to all CC approaches.

We have used the hourly wind power data from the ERCOT market [38] from 2018-2020 by scaling it according to the size and load demand of the test systems. Due to the seasonal wind patterns, the wind uncertainty may also vary throughout the year. Thus, we have used all-season data samples to build the ambiguity set and generate scenarios. To better compare the performance, we have conducted an out-of-sample (OOS) experiment by partitioning the dataset into training and testing samples. The optimal solutions are produced using the in-sample training dataset, while the costs and constraint violations are evaluated on the OOS testing dataset. The 14-bus case is used to test and compare all the CC approaches (A1, A2, A3 and A4). Due to the tractability issues of the scenario-based approaches, for the larger 118-bus case we mainly evaluate (A2), (A3), and (A5), all of which are scenario-free. All CC tolerance levels \( \epsilon_i \)'s have been set to be the same value \( \epsilon \) for simplicity.

The test case parameters are obtained from MATPOWER [39], and the OTS problems (MILP, MISOCP) have been solved by Gurobi. The solver was set up to utilize up to 12...
TABLE I: Performance of Approaches A1-A4 in the IEEE 14-bus System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$L_o = 1$</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>[16]</td>
<td>[16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_o = 2$</td>
<td>[9;18]</td>
<td>[9;18]</td>
<td>[9;18]</td>
<td>[9;20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$L_o = 3$</td>
<td>[9;18;19]</td>
<td>[9;18;19]</td>
<td>[9;19;20]</td>
<td>[9;12;20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run Time (sec)</td>
<td>$L_o = 1$</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L_o = 2$</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L_o = 3$</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-sample Costs ($/h$)</td>
<td>$L_o = 1$</td>
<td>545.34</td>
<td>542.10</td>
<td>546.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L_o = 2$</td>
<td>518.95</td>
<td>516.57</td>
<td>519.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L_o = 3$</td>
<td>515.89</td>
<td>512.50</td>
<td>518.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Violation Rates</td>
<td>$L_o = 1$</td>
<td>0.0616</td>
<td>0.0896</td>
<td>0.0402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L_o = 2$</td>
<td>0.1054</td>
<td>0.1058</td>
<td>0.0472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L_o = 3$</td>
<td>0.1070</td>
<td>0.1184</td>
<td>0.0648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

available tests with a solution tolerance of $1e−02$. All the numerical tests have been implemented on a regular laptop equipped with Intel® CPU @ 2.60 GHz and 16 GB of RAM using the MATLAB® R2020b simulator.

A. IEEE 14-Bus System Tests

The original IEEE 14-bus system consists of 20 lines and 5 conventional generators. We add 3 wind farms to the case, located at buses 3, 6 and 13, respectively. Given that the marginal gain reduces with more lines to switch, we have used a maximum of $L_o = 3$ opening lines. For the sample-based approaches (A1 and A4), increasing the sample size can lead to more accurate results at the cost of increased problem dimension and computation time [40]. Therefore, a fixed of $S = 200$ samples have been chosen for both A1 and A4.

By setting $1 − \epsilon = 0.95$ or $1 − \epsilon = 0.90$, we have compared the optimal switching decisions, run time, OOS costs and constraint violation rates for A1-A4, with the results listed in Table I. To evaluate the OOS testing performance, we have used 5,000 random samples from the actual wind data and recorded the percentage of violated constraints by averaging over all testing samples. To avoid the cases where the majority of line flow constraints are non-binding under uncertainty, we have slightly adjusted the line flow limits to increase the transmission congestion level as in [41].

The switching decisions tend to vary among the four approaches when $L_o = 2$ or 3. Interestingly, the switching decisions largely remain the same as the tolerance $\epsilon$ changes except for A2. Note that the tolerance $\epsilon$ more significantly affects the other decisions, namely the generation dispatch $g$ and AGC coefficients $\gamma$. This becomes clear when comparing the OOS costs, as discussed soon. By and large, the run time for all approaches is very reasonable. Sample-based approaches (A1 and A4) take more time, while the scenario-free ones (A2 and A3) are much faster (within 1 second). For the sample-based A4, the infinite-Wasserstein metric makes its run time comparable to A1, while offering better DRO guarantees.

In terms of OOS testing performance, the DRCC approaches (A3 and A4) incur slightly higher total costs than the other two. This is expected as the DRCC approaches are designed to account for a variety of distributions in the ambiguity set. Between A3 and A4, the Wasserstein metric has lower OOS costs as its solutions are more data-driven and less conservative, as mentioned earlier. Note that although A3 and A4 produce exactly the same switching decisions, their OOS costs still differ due to their differences in the $g$ and $\gamma$ decisions. This difference can be also observed for all approaches with $L_o = 1$. In general, under fixed $(1 − \epsilon)$, the OOS costs are reduced as $L_o$ increases. When $L_o$ is fixed, a smaller $(1 − \epsilon)$ allows for more violations of constraints and thus lowers the total costs.

The comparisons of constraint violation rates in OOS testing are very important for evaluating the CC guarantees of all the approaches. Ideally, the OOS violation rates should not exceed the pre-specified threshold $\epsilon$. However, this is rarely the case for A1, because the SAA design relies on the approximation by the empirical distribution and cannot strictly enforce the CC guarantees. In addition, A2 has one instance of exceeding $\epsilon = 0.05$ for the case of $L_o = 3$, which speaks to its disadvantage of solely relying on the assumption on Gaussian distributed uncertainty. Compared to A1 and A2, the proposed A3 and A4 have nicely maintained very low constraint violation rates for all choices of $L_o$, thanks to their DRCC based design principle. This is especially important for a smaller value of $\epsilon$, where the CC guarantees are more difficult to enforce. Overall speaking, the proposed DRCC approaches demonstrate the trade-offs between the total costs and the guarantees on operational limits. The DRCC approaches can reliably limit the occurrences of constraint violations and thus provide better robustness guarantees, at the price of slightly increased costs.

B. IEEE 118-Bus System Tests

We have also tested on the IEEE 118-bus system, consisting of 186 lines and 19 conventional generators. Five wind farms have been added, which are located at buses 10, 23, 57, 62 and 86, respectively. Chance constraints have been applied on half of the line flow constraints with the other half strictly enforced. Due to the scalability issue of the sample-based methods (A1 and A4), we have only compared the scenario-free approaches A2, A3, and A5.

First, we use the CC tolerance $1 − \epsilon = 0.95$ to compare the OOS performance under different $L_o$, as plotted in Fig. [14]. Overall speaking, the OOS costs increases slightly from A2 to A3, with A5 having the highest costs. This is because the constraint violations would gradually decrease among these three approaches with no violations in A5, as shown in Fig. [18]. Compared with the A5 benchmark, A3 achieves 1.0% cost reduction on average, while A2 achieves 1.8%. Notably, the
constraint violation rates for the proposed A3 are nicely maintained around $0.02 < \epsilon = 0.05$, while A2’s rates go up to roughly 0.09 and exceed this tolerance level. This large-system test again confirms the aforementioned disadvantage of A2 due to the restrictive Gaussian assumption, while corroborating the effectiveness of the proposed DRCC-OTS design in terms of reliably limiting the constraint violations.

Moreover, we have compared the average run time for the three approaches, as shown in Fig. 1c. In general, the run time of the proposed A3 is on par with the other two, with a moderate increase for larger $L_o$ values. In addition, the optimal switching decisions of these approaches are listed in Table II. Some critical lines (e.g., lines 96, 118, 131, and 149) have been commonly selected by different approaches. When $L_o \leq 2$, the switching decisions are the same for all approaches. As $L_o \geq 3$, the decisions of A2 and A5 are very similar while A3 has picked a few different lines for better CC guarantees.

Last, we compare the OOS costs of the proposed A3 for different tolerance levels, by varying $\epsilon$ in the range of $2\% - 30\%$, as shown in Fig. 2. With fixed $L_o$, a larger $\epsilon$ value leads to gradually decreasing costs, by allowing for higher occurrences of constraint violations. If we compare to the OOS costs of the benchmark A5 with no constraint violations, the proposed DRCC-based A3 can attain lower costs with a roughly 1.1% reduction on average. Notice that the marginal gain of cost reduction is minimal at higher tolerance levels ($\epsilon$ increasing from 20% to 30%). Generally speaking, the range of [5%, 20%] is deemed appropriate for $\epsilon$ in practical operations [27], [41], [42].

In summary, the proposed DRCC approaches can effectively limit the occurrences of violating line flow constraints by accounting for the distributional ambiguity of uncertainty. In particular, the mean-MAD ambiguity criterion leads to a scenario-free, tractable MILP reformulation, with comparable complexity to the CC and robust benchmarks.

### VI. Conclusions

This paper considered the chance-constrained optimal transmission switching (CC-OTS) problem to account for resource uncertainty in power systems. We proposed to simplify the two-stage OTS problem by demonstrating that the linear decision rules (LDR) can attain exact reformulation. Due to the lack of knowledge on the uncertainty, we pursued a distributionally robust chance-constrained (DRCC) OTS paradigm.
that can ensure the guarantees over an ambiguity set of uncertainty distributions. Both moment-based and distance-based ambiguity sets have been considered, leading to scalable MILP problems through dualization. Numerical tests validated the performance improvements of the proposed DRCC approaches over the CC alternatives in terms of guaranteed constraint violation rates. Between the two proposed DRCC-OTS approaches, the one using mean-MAD ambiguity set incurred lower computation complexity on par with other scenario-free CC and robust approaches, while the one using the Wasserstein ambiguity led to less conservative solutions by adapting to the actual data samples. Future work includes reducing the complexity of scenario-based DRCC-OTS by simplifying the Wasserstein ambiguity set and developing machine learning approaches for accelerated OTS computations in real-time.
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