

Co-optimizing Consumption and EV Charging under Net Energy Metering

Minjae Jeon, *Student Member, IEEE*, Lang Tong, *Fellow, IEEE*, Qing Zhao, *Fellow, IEEE*

Abstract—We consider the co-optimization of flexible household consumption, electric vehicle charging, and behind-the-meter distributed energy resources under the net energy metering tariff. Using a stochastic dynamic programming formulation, we show that the solution to the dynamic programming co-optimization is a procrastination threshold policy that delays and minimizes electricity purchasing for EV charging in each time interval. The policy thresholds can be computed off-line, simplifying the continuous action space dynamic optimization to decoupled closed-form charging and consumption decisions. Empirical studies using renewable, consumption, and EV data demonstrate the benefits of co-optimization.

Index Terms—EV charging, distributed energy resources, stochastic dynamic programming, net energy metering

I. INTRODUCTION

We address the problem of co-optimizing electric vehicle (EV) charging and flexible consumption decisions of a prosumer in a household with behind-the-meter (BTM) renewable generations. Because EV charging represents a substantial part of the total energy consumption and is deferrable, coordinating EV charging with available BTM renewables and other flexible demands can reduce the energy cost and increase the overall economic benefits for the prosumer.

Fig.1 illustrates a generic smart home where a home energy management system (EMS) schedules EV charging and flexible demands such as HVAC¹ and major appliances based on the available BTM DER generation and the price of electricity.

We assume that the household is under its utility’s net energy metering (NEM) tariff, where the customer is billed for its *net consumption* based on the reading of the revenue meter. The BTM renewables are stochastic, and the EMS has access to the renewable generation up to the time of scheduling decision such that EV charging and consumption can be scheduled based on the available renewables. The co-optimization objective of the EMS is to schedule in real-time EV charging and (flexible) household demand to satisfy charging demand of EV and maximize the expected accumulative prosumer surplus over a specific scheduling horizon over a day, a week, or longer.

The co-optimization problem considered here falls in the general category of stochastic dynamic programming (DP) in a continuous action space that defines the EV charging and household consumption decisions. In general, such an infinite-dimensional optimization is intractable unless the problem has

Minjae Jeon, Lang Tong, and Qing Zhao({mj444, lt35, qz16}@cornell.edu) are with the School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Cornell University, USA.

¹Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning




Fig. 1: NEM scheme for the household with EV. Direction of arrow indicates positive direction of energy flow.

particular structures that admit simple decision policies. To this end, we examine the structure of time-of-use NEM pricing that has been shown to offer highly structured optimal decisions for certain utility maximization problems [1]. Our aim is to find a low-complexity solution that achieves optimality under mild assumptions.

A. Related works

The literature on home EMS with EV charging is vast. To our best knowledge, however, no existing literature tackles co-optimizing EV charging, household consumption, and BTM renewables under the NEM tariffs. Here we review some closely related work on EV charging and consumption co-optimization and the use of DP for co-optimizing EV charging with DER.

Most relevant to our approach is the co-optimization of EV charging and consumption within a single household [2]–[4]. In [2], authors formulated a mixed integer linear programming (MILP) problem with perfect forecast of renewables to minimize energy and discomfort costs that can be interpreted as the consumption utility in our work. Model predictive control (MPC) algorithm has been adopted for co-optimization with uncertainties on renewables [5]–[8]. In [6], authors formulated stochastic MPC to minimize energy cost under time varying prices with random renewables. MPC has been applied for home EMS EV scheduling with random household consumption and renewables in [7], [8]. Co-optimization using reinforcement learning is studied in [9], [10]. In [10], authors used a neural network and Q-learning algorithm to learn uncertainties with the electricity prices and BTM solar generation. Models introduced in [2]–[10] did not give an explicit deferrable demand model of EV involving a deadline for completion.

There is substantial literature on using DP for co-optimizing EV charging with stochastic renewables under various settings [11]–[14], although most do not address consumption co-optimization under NEM pricing models. In [11]–[14], coordinated scheduling of EV with stochastic renewables is for-

mulated as a stochastic DP. In particular, [12]–[14] developed simple decision rules to tackle the curse of dimensionality on scheduling multiple EVs. The authors of [12] proposed priority rules based on the less-laxity longer-remaining-processing-time principle. The Whittle’s index policy and its asymptotic optimality were derived for the deadline scheduling problem in [13].

B. Summary of results and contributions

The main contribution of our work is threefold

- We show that the optimal scheduling policy is a *procrastination threshold policy* where the optimal EV charging policy in every interval is to delay if possible and charge minimal amount if necessary. This policy is characterized by the procrastination thresholds that can be computed offline when the BTM DER is modeled as a sequence of independent random variables.
- We show that, similar to the consumption scheduling problem without EV charging [1], the optimal net consumption from the EV-charging and demand co-optimization has three zones on the axis of the available BTM DER, specified by two thresholds.
- The empirical study using actual data sets demonstrates the optimality and the benefits of the procrastination policy, achieving 5-120% gains over the renewable un-coordinated charging policy depending on the horizon length, and NEM tariff parameters.

The notations used in the paper are standard. Vectors are boldface, with $[x_1, \dots, x_N]$ a row vector and (x_1, \dots, x_N) a column vector. We use $\mathbf{1}$ for a column of ones with appropriate size. $\mathbb{1}_A(\cdot)$ is a indicator function that maps element of set A to one and all other elements to zero.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

We consider a sequential EV charging (v_t) and consumption (d_t) decision problem over a discrete-time and finite horizon $\mathcal{T} = \{0, \dots, T-1\}$. Without loss of generality, we assume that T is the completion deadline for EV charging. Once EV charging is completed, the co-optimization problem has a simple threshold policy [1].

A. EV charging and consumption model

a) *BTM DER* (r_t): BTM DER generation in interval t is an exogenous variable modeled as a sequence of independent random variables with the distribution $f_t(\cdot)$. The maximum generation capacity of BTM DER is R , $r_t \in [0, R]$. We assume that R is sufficiently large.

b) *Remaining charging demand* (y_t) and constraints: At the beginning of each interval, the remaining charging demand (y_t) is measured. In a time slot, a charger with maximum capacity \bar{v} and charging efficiency η supplies v_t . EV is not allowed to discharge and EV is not charged beyond what’s requested at the beginning of charging session (for all t , $y_t \geq 0$).

$$y_{t+1} = y_t - \eta v_t, \quad t \in \mathcal{T}. \quad (1)$$

$$v_t \in [0, \min\{y_t/\eta, \bar{v}\}], \quad t \in \mathcal{T}. \quad (2)$$




Fig. 2: TOU scheme and decision horizon

Without loss of generality we assume that $\eta = 1$ (Rescale y_t by $1/\eta$).

c) *Household Consumption* (\mathbf{d}_t): We model flexible consumption of K controllable devices in interval t by a consumption vector $\mathbf{d}_t = [d_t^{(1)}, \dots, d_t^{(K)}]^\top$ where the consumption of device i is constrained by $0 \leq d_t^{(i)} \leq \bar{d}^{(i)}$.

Utility $U_t(\mathbf{d}_t)$ of consuming \mathbf{d}_t in interval t is linearly separable concave function with marginal utility $L_t(\mathbf{d}_t)$ for $t \in \mathcal{T}$

$$U_t(\mathbf{d}_t) = \sum_{i=1}^K U_t^{(i)}(d_t^{(i)}), \quad L_t(\mathbf{d}_t) := \nabla U_t = [L_t^{(1)}, \dots, L_t^{(K)}].$$

d) *Net consumption* (z_t): Household net energy consumption in interval t is total consumption including EV charging deducted by BTM DER generation.

$$z_t := v_t + \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{d}_t - r_t, \quad t \in \mathcal{T}.$$

We say household is *net consuming* when $z_t > 0$, and *net producing* when $z_t < 0$.

B. NEM TOU tariff model

a) *NEM payment* ($P^{\pi_t}(z_t)$): A household enrolled in the NEM tariff program is billed or credited by the net energy consumption in each billing period. As the length of the billing period is variable, we match the decision period with the billing period which allows us to index the billing period with t . The following NEM model was proposed in [1].

In interval t given NEM tariff parameters $(\pi_t^0, \pi_t^-, \pi_t^+)$, payment of the household with net consumption z_t is

$$P^{\pi_t}(z_t) := \mathbb{1}_{z_t \geq 0} \pi_t^+ + \mathbb{1}_{z_t < 0} \pi_t^- + \pi_t^0. \quad (3)$$

where π_t^+ is a *retail rate* for the net consumption, π_t^- is a *sell rate* for the net generation to the grid and π_t^0 is the fixed charge (e.g. connection charge)².

b) *NEM TOU tariff model*: TOU tariff divides 24 hours into blocks of different prices. We adopt TOU tariff with 2 periods, off-peak and on-peak period, as depicted in Fig.2 [15]. We assume that all the intervals in the same period has the same NEM parameters. Hence, π_t is either $\pi_{\text{on}} := [\pi_{\text{on}}^-, \pi_{\text{on}}^+]$ or $\pi_{\text{off}} := [\pi_{\text{off}}^-, \pi_{\text{off}}^+]$. We assume that NEM parameters satisfy $\pi_{\text{off}}^- < \pi_{\text{on}}^- < \pi_{\text{off}}^+ < \pi_{\text{on}}^+$.

A typical TOU tariff sets the on-peak hours to the six hour period in late afternoon and early evening. We assume that EV demand falls within the first set of off-periods, the on-periods,

²Fixed charge doesn’t affect the optimal decision, so we assume $\pi_t^0 = 0$.

and the second set of off-periods as shown in Fig.2. The case that the EV charging can be completed entirely in the off period becomes a special case.

Once the starting time for the EV charging and the deadline of completion are known, the scheduling horizon is well defined: $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_{\text{off},1} \cup \mathcal{T}_{\text{on}} \cup \mathcal{T}_{\text{off},2}$, with $T = |\mathcal{T}_{\text{off},1}| + |\mathcal{T}_{\text{on}}| + |\mathcal{T}_{\text{off},2}|$.

C. EV charging consumption co-optimization

We formulate the co-optimization problem as a stochastic DP. The state of the DP $x_t = (y_t, r_t, \pi_t)$ is defined by the remaining charging demand y_t , the available renewable r_t , and the NEM pricing π_t with $y_0 = s_{\text{req}}$.

Policy $\mu := (\mu_0, \dots, \mu_{T-1})$ is a sequence of functions that maps state to charging and consumption: $\mu_t(x_t) := (v_t, \mathbf{d}_t)$.

The stage reward is a household surplus under NEM and terminal reward is a penalty modeled as linear function of incomplete charging demand at the deadline.

$$g_t(x_t, v_t, \mathbf{d}_t) := \begin{cases} U_t(\mathbf{d}_t) - P^{\pi_t}(z_t), & t = 0, \dots, T-1. \\ -\gamma y_T, & t = T. \end{cases}$$

Charging and consumption co-optimization is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P} : \max_{\mu} \quad & \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{r}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{T-1} g_t(x_t, v_t, \mathbf{d}_t) - \gamma y_T \right] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mu_t(x_t) = (v_t, \mathbf{d}_t) \in \mathcal{U}(x_t), \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \\ & y_{t+1} = y_t - v_t, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \\ & y_t \in [0, s_{\text{req}}], \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T} \\ & y_0 = s_{\text{req}} \\ & \pi_t = \pi_{\text{off}}, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{off},1} \cup \mathcal{T}_{\text{off},2} \\ & \pi_t = \pi_{\text{on}}, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{on}} \\ & r_t \in [0, R] \sim f_t(\cdot), \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{U}(x_t)$ represents the set of feasible actions.

Denote the optimal value function as $V_t(x_t)$ which satisfies the following Bellman Equation:

$$V_t(x_t) = \max_{v, \mathbf{d}} \{g_t(x_t, v, \mathbf{d}) + \mathbb{E}[V_{t+1}(x_{t+1})]\} \quad (5)$$

D. Model Assumption

A1. *High penalty*: Assume that penalty satisfies

$$\pi_{\text{off}}^- < \pi_{\text{on}}^- < \pi_{\text{off}}^+ < \pi_{\text{on}}^+ < \gamma$$

A1 reflects the purpose of minimizing incomplete charging demand.

III. OPTIMAL EV OWNER DECISION

We now present the optimal EV owner's decision and off-line computation method of the procrastination thresholds.

A. Optimal EV charging policy and consumption policy

We first present the structural properties of the optimal net consumption, and EV charging and consumption decisions.

Theorem 1 (Optimal net consumption). *NEM TOU tariff parameters satisfying A1, and r_t is a sequence of independent random variables, optimal net consumption z_t^* is a piecewise linear function of r_t and partitioned into 3 zones, for $t \in \mathcal{T}$*

$$z_t^* = \begin{cases} \Delta_t^+(y_t) - r_t, & r_t \in [0, \Delta_t^+(y_t)) \\ 0, & r_t \in [\Delta_t^+(y_t), \Delta_t^-(y_t)] \\ \Delta_t^-(y_t) - r_t, & r_t \in (\Delta_t^-(y_t), R], \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

$$\text{where } \Delta_t^+(y_t) = \sum_{i=1}^K f_t^{(i)}(\pi_t^+) + v_t^+(y_t),$$

$$\Delta_t^-(y_t) = \sum_{i=1}^K f_t^{(i)}(\pi_t^-) + v_t^-(y_t),$$

$$f_t^{(i)}(\pi) := \min\{L_t^{(i)-1}(\pi), \bar{d}^{(i)}\},$$

$$v_t^+(y_t) := \min\{\bar{v}, y_t, \max\{y_t - \tau_t, 0\}\},$$

$$v_t^-(y_t) := \min\{\bar{v}, y_t, \max\{y_t - \delta_t, 0\}\}.$$

EV charging and consumption decisions are:

If $r_t \in [0, \Delta_t^+(y_t))$ for all $i = 1, \dots, K$

$$v_t^* = v_t^+(y_t), \quad (7)$$

$$d_t^{(i)*} = f_t^{(i)}(\pi_t^+). \quad (8)$$

If $r_t \in (\Delta_t^-(y_t), R]$ for all $i = 1, \dots, K$

$$v_t^* = v_t^-(y_t), \quad (9)$$

$$d_t^{(i)*} = f_t^{(i)}(\pi_t^-). \quad (10)$$

If $r_t \in [\Delta_t^+(y_t), \Delta_t^-(y_t)]$ for all $i = 1, \dots, K$

$$h_{t+1}(y) := \mathbb{E}_{r_{t+1}} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{t+1}} V_{t+1}(y, r_{t+1}, \pi_{t+1}) \right]$$

$$d_t^{(i)*} = f_t^{(i)}(\nu) \quad (11)$$

$$v_t^* = \min\{\bar{v}, y_t, \max\{y_t - h_{t+1}^{-1}(-\nu), 0\}\} \quad (12)$$

$$r_t = v_t^* + \sum_{i=1}^K d_t^{(i)}, \quad (13)$$

where $\nu \in [\pi_t^-, \pi_t^+]$. \square

State space of y_t and r_t is divided into 3 zones by $\Delta_t^+(y_t)$ and $\Delta_t^-(y_t)$ as depicted in the Fig.3a, 3b. Blue and red boundary lines in the figure represent $\Delta_t^-(y_t)$ and $\Delta_t^+(y_t)$, respectively. The theorem suggests that the consumption decisions are constant within the colored region. Charging decisions are constant within the colored region for fixed y_t .

Optimal charging decision is the *procrastination threshold policy* which is characterized by the two procrastination thresholds, τ_t, δ_t , which are the limit of procrastination in which controller starts charging EV. The procrastination threshold for charging EV with excess DER generation is δ_t and with energy from the grid is τ_t .




Fig. 3: Net consumption regions in the state space

We consider a special case, a charging session that starts and ends within the off-peak period, to gain insight into the procrastination threshold policy. Under the procrastination threshold policy, if current DER generation is low ($r_t < \Delta_t^+(y_t)$) and it's possible to finish charging requirement in remaining intervals ($y_t \leq (T - t - 1)\bar{v}$), the controller will delay purchasing for charging. Otherwise, the controller purchases energy from the grid but a minimal amount that allows completion of charging request in the remaining intervals. Procrastination behavior is optimal because purchasing now is indifferent to purchasing in later intervals, and there is a chance of completing the remaining charging request using the DER generation which is a cheaper charging option.

The expected marginal value of charging at the interval t with remaining charging demand y is $h_{t+1}(y)$. Expected marginal value of charging is the expected price of energy we can save by charging at current interval. At net-zero zone, charging decision is made so that expected marginal value is matched to the marginal utility of consumption.

B. Computation of procrastination thresholds

We now present an off-line computation method and properties of the procrastination threshold. We first present the recursive relation of the thresholds.

Proposition 1 (Recursive relation of procrastination threshold). *NEM TOU tariff parameters satisfying A1, and DER modeled as a sequence of independent random variables, within the same period, τ_t, τ_{t+1} and δ_t, δ_{t+1} satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_t &= \tau_{t+1} + \bar{v} \\ \delta_t &= \delta_{t+1}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

The proposition implies that it suffices to find procrastination thresholds at the last interval of every period to find procrastination thresholds at every interval.

Theorem 2 (Optimal procrastination threshold). *NEM TOU tariff parameter satisfying A1, and DER modeled as a sequence of independent random variables, τ_t and δ_t are*

$$\tau_t : \begin{aligned} \tau_t &= (T - t - 1)\bar{v} & t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{off},2} \cup \mathcal{T}_{\text{on}} \\ \tau_t \text{ s.t. } \pi_{\text{off}}^+ &= -h_{t+1}(\tau_t) & t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{off},1} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

$$\delta_t : \begin{aligned} \delta_t &= 0 & t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{off},1} \cup \mathcal{T}_{\text{off},2} \\ \delta_t &= 0 & t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{on}} \wedge \mathcal{T}_{\text{off},2} = \emptyset \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

$$\delta_t \text{ s.t. } \pi_{\text{on}}^- = -h_{t+1}(\delta_t) \quad t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{on}} \wedge \mathcal{T}_{\text{off},2} \neq \emptyset$$

For $\tau_t = (T - t - 1)\bar{v}$ energy is purchased for charging only if purchase is necessary to complete charging requirement. The theorem also implies that under the procrastination threshold policy, completion of charging demand is guaranteed whenever it's possible ($s_{\text{req}} \leq T\bar{v}$).

For $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{off},1}$, τ_t depends on the distribution of future DER generation and τ_t is y_t such that expected marginal value of charging is equal to the off-peak retail rate.

Procrastination thresholds for the net producing region can be explained using the similar argument.

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

We conducted simulations involving stochastic EV charging and consumption co-optimization with random renewable trajectories, initial charging demands, and connection time.

A. Simulation setting

We used the average accumulated reward gap between the two policies (in percentage) as the performance measure. Two policies compared are the optimal policy based on Theorem 1-2 and price aware renewable independent open-loop policy. Under the open-loop policy, there is no procrastination for charging but the EV is primarily charged in the off-peak period and consumption decision is not optimized.

We conducted 2 different Monte Carlo simulations. 1) Varying the length of the decision horizon from 1 to 14 hours. 2) Varying the price gap between the retail rate and sell rate from 0.1\$/kWh to 0.25\$/kWh.

TOU retail rate is from the Pacific Gas and Electronic (PG&E) TOU tariff data³. The on-peak period is 4-9 PM.

BTM DER is modeled as a sequence of independent random variables with rectified normal distribution. The distribution parameters are estimated using the New York residential solar generation data from the Pecan Street Data [16]. We used charging request data from the Adaptive Charging Network to model the distribution of initial charging demand [17]. We assume that plug-in time is uniformly distributed.

For simplicity, we considered single flexible consumption and assumed the utility is a stationary quadratic function, $U(d) = \alpha d - 1/2\beta d^2$. The coefficients of the utility function is estimated using PG&E TOU tariff data and Pecan street consumption data [1], [16], [18]. The maximum charging capacity of the EV charger is 3.6kW, which is the typical power output of the Level 2 EV charger.

B. Influence of T

Fig.4 shows the influence of the length of the decision horizon on the performance gain. The procrastination threshold policy performs better the longer the charging session is. For the same level of charging demand, the longer charging session provides more flexibility. Hence, it's possible to further procrastinate and complete charging demand using the DER in the future intervals.

³PG&E TOU tariff data can be found at PGE E TOU-B




Fig. 4: Impact of T on the performance




Fig. 5: Impact of $\pi_t^+ - \pi_t^-$ on the performance of the optimal policy

C. Influence of $\pi_t^+ - \pi_t^-$

Assuming $\pi_t^+ - \pi_t^-$ is preserved for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$, we fixed the π_t^+ and varied the price gap. Decision horizons are 10 hours. There are 2 reasons behind the increasing performance gap as the price gap increases in Fig.5. First, as the price gap enlarges, the value of renewable declines. This leads to the increased utilization of DER for charging in the on-peak intervals. Second, price responsive consumption under the optimal policy gives a higher consumer surplus. This suggests the procrastination threshold policy can provide greater household surplus when the price gap is large.

V. CONCLUSION

EV charging and flexible demand co-optimization is a multi-interval dynamic programming problem that generally has exponentially growing computation costs. We show that, under the widely deployed NEM pricing policy, the co-optimization involved has a particular procrastination threshold structure that can be solved easily with predetermined policy thresholds.

A limitation of our approach is the assumption that the consumption utility function and the underlying probability distribution of renewables are known. To this end, inverse reinforcement learning and other machine-learning techniques can be applied in conjunction with the policy structure developed in this work.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. S. Alahmed and L. Tong, "On net energy metering x: Optimal prosumer decisions, social welfare, and cross-subsidies," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, 2022.
- [2] Y. Kwon, T. Kim, K. Baek, and J. Kim, "Multi-objective optimization of home appliances and electric vehicle considering customer's benefits and offsite shared photovoltaic curtailment," *Energies*, vol. 13, no. 11, p. 2852, 2020.
- [3] D. T. Nguyen and L. B. Le, "Joint optimization of electric vehicle and home energy scheduling considering user comfort preference," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 188–199, 2013.
- [4] A. Aoun, H. Ibrahim, M. Ghandour, and A. Ilinca, "Supply side management vs. demand side management of a residential microgrid equipped with an electric vehicle in a dual tariff scheme," *Energies*, vol. 12, no. 22, p. 4351, 2019.
- [5] C. Chen, J. Wang, Y. Heo, and S. Kishore, "Mpc-based appliance scheduling for residential building energy management controller," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 1401–1410, 2013.
- [6] M. Yousefi, A. Hajizadeh, M. N. Soltani, and B. Hredzak, "Predictive home energy management system with photovoltaic array, heat pump, and plug-in electric vehicle," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 430–440, 2020.
- [7] Y.-M. Wi, J.-U. Lee, and S.-K. Joo, "Electric vehicle charging method for smart homes/buildings with a photovoltaic system," *IEEE Transactions on Consumer Electronics*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 323–328, 2013.
- [8] C. Sun, F. Sun, and S. J. Moura, "Nonlinear predictive energy management of residential buildings with photovoltaics & batteries," *Journal of Power Sources*, vol. 325, pp. 723–731, 2016.
- [9] D. Wu, G. Rabusseau, V. François-lavet, D. Precup, and B. Boulet, "Optimizing home energy management and electric vehicle charging with reinforcement learning," *Proceedings of the 16th Adaptive Learning Agents*, 2018.
- [10] X. Xu, Y. Jia, Y. Xu, Z. Xu, S. Chai, and C. S. Lai, "A multi-agent reinforcement learning-based data-driven method for home energy management," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 3201–3211, 2020.
- [11] Q. Huang, Q.-S. Jia, Z. Qiu, X. Guan, and G. Deconinck, "Matching ev charging load with uncertain wind: A simulation-based policy improvement approach," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 1425–1433, 2015.
- [12] Y. Xu, F. Pan, and L. Tong, "Dynamic scheduling for charging electric vehicles: A priority rule," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 61, no. 12, pp. 4094–4099, 2016.
- [13] Z. Yu, Y. Xu, and L. Tong, "Deadline scheduling as restless bandits," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 63, no. 8, pp. 2343–2358, 2018.
- [14] J. Jin and Y. Xu, "Priority rules on the charging of electric vehicles with energy storage," in *2019 IEEE Innovative Smart Grid Technologies - Asia (ISGT Asia)*, 2019, pp. 3447–3451.
- [15] A. Faruqui, R. Hledik, and S. Sergici, "A survey of residential time-of-use (tou) rates," Available at <https://www.brattle.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/17904-a-survey-of-residential-time-of-use-tou-rates.pdf> (2022/11/01).
- [16] "Pecan street dataset," Available at <https://www.pecanstreet.org/dataport/> (2022/11/01).
- [17] Z. J. Lee, T. Li, and S. H. Low, "ACN-Data: Analysis and Applications of an Open EV Charging Dataset," in *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Future Energy Systems*, ser. e-Energy '19, Jun. 2019.
- [18] C. Campaigne, M. Balandat, and L. Ratliff, "Welfare effects of dynamic electricity pricing," Available at [https://www.ocf.berkeley.edu/~sim\\$clay/file/SimulatingDynamicTariffs.pdf](https://www.ocf.berkeley.edu/~sim$clay/file/SimulatingDynamicTariffs.pdf) (2022/11/01).

APPENDIX A
PROOFS

In the rest of the proofs, for the ease of notations, let's denote $V_t(x_t + \epsilon) = V_t(y_t + \epsilon, r_t, \pi_t)$

Optimal consumption decision without EV charging has been studied in [1]. The theorem that describes two thresholds structure of optimal consumption is shown in [1].

Theorem 3 (Prosumer consumption decision under NEM X). *When $\bar{v} = 0$, the optimal prosumer policy under assumption A1, for every $t \in \mathcal{T}$ is given by two thresholds Δ_t^+, Δ_t^-*

$$\Delta_t^+ = \sum_{i=1}^K f_t^{(i)}(\pi_t^+), \quad \Delta_t^- = \sum_{i=1}^K f_t^{(i)}(\pi_t^-)$$

that divides axis of r_t into 3 zones :

1) *Net consumption zone : $r_t < \Delta_t^+$. Optimal consumption decision is*

$$d_t^{(i)*} = f_t^{(i)}(\pi_t^+), \quad i = 1, \dots, K$$

2) *Net producing zone : $r_t > \Delta_t^-$. Optimal consumption decision is*

$$d_t^{(i)*} = f_t^{(i)}(\pi_t^-), \quad i = 1, \dots, K$$

3) *Net zero zone : $\Delta_t^+ \leq r_t \leq \Delta_t^-$. Optimal consumption decision is for $\nu \in [\pi_t^-, \pi_t^+]$*

$$d_t^{(i)*} = f_t^{(i)}(\nu), \quad i = 1, \dots, K$$

A. *Propositions to prove theorems*

Proposition 2. *Under NEM TOU parameters satisfying A1, $V_t(x_t)$ is monotone decreasing function of y_t and for $\epsilon > 0$,*

$$-\gamma\epsilon \leq V_t(x_t + \epsilon) - V_t(x_t) \leq -\pi_{\text{off}}^-\epsilon,$$

and for $y_t \geq (T-t)\bar{v}$,

$$V_t(x_t + \epsilon) = V_t(x_t) - \gamma\epsilon,$$

for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$.

Proof. We will prove the proposition using the induction. At $t = T-1$, Bellman equation is

$$V_{T-1}(x_{T-1}) = \max_{v, \mathbf{d}} \{g_{T-1}(x_{T-1}, v, \mathbf{d}) - \gamma(y_{T-1} - v)\}.$$

By A1, $V_{T-1}(x_{T-1} + \epsilon)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} V_{T-1}(x_{T-1} + \epsilon) &\leq V_{T-1}(x_{T-1}) - \pi_{T-1}^-\epsilon \\ &\leq V_{T-1}(x_{T-1}) - \pi_{\text{off}}^-\epsilon < V_{T-1}(x_{T-1}), \\ V_{T-1}(x_{T-1}) - \gamma\epsilon &\leq V_{T-1}(x_{T-1} + \epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

For $y_{T-1} \geq \bar{v}$, as $\gamma > \pi_{T-1}^+ > \pi_{T-1}^-$, optimal solution of the Bellman equation is $v^* = \bar{v}$ and $V_{T-1}(x_{T-1})$ satisfies

$$V_{T-1}(x_{T-1} + \epsilon) = V_{T-1}(x_{T-1}) - \gamma\epsilon.$$

Assuming proposition holds for $t+1$, using linearity and monotonicity of expectation,

$$V_t(x_t) - \gamma\epsilon \leq V_t(x_t + \epsilon) \leq V_t(x_t) - \pi_{\text{off}}^-\epsilon.$$

For $y_t \geq (T-t)\bar{v}$, $y_t - v + \epsilon \geq (T-t-1)\bar{v}$ for all $v \in [0, \bar{v}]$,

$$V_t(x_t + \epsilon) = V_t(x_t) - \gamma\epsilon. \quad \square$$

Proposition 3. *Under NEM TOU parameters satisfying A1, for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$, if $\mathbb{E}[V_t(x_t)]$ is concave and \mathcal{C}^1 with respect to $y_t \leq (T-t)\bar{v}$, optimal charging and consumption decisions are (7) - (13).*

Proof. We will divide the Bellman equation (5) into 3 convex optimization problems : $\mathcal{P}^+, \mathcal{P}^-, \mathcal{P}^0$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}^+ : \max_{v, \mathbf{d}} \quad & \{U_t(\mathbf{d}) - \pi_t^+(v + \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{d} - r_t) + \mathbb{E}[V_{t+1}(x_t - v)]\} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & v + \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{d} \geq r_t \\ & \mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D} \end{aligned}$$

$$v \in [0, \min\{\bar{v}, y_t\}]$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}^- : \max_{v, \mathbf{d}} \quad & \{U_t(\mathbf{d}) - \pi_t^-(v + \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{d} - r_t) + \mathbb{E}[V_{t+1}(x_t - v)]\} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & v + \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{d} \leq r_t \\ & \mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D} \end{aligned}$$

$$v \in [0, \min\{\bar{v}, y_t\}]$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}^0 : \max_{v, \mathbf{d}} \quad & \{U_t(\mathbf{d}) + \mathbb{E}[V_{t+1}(x_t - v)]\} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & v + \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{d} = r_t \\ & \mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{D} \end{aligned}$$

$$v \in [0, \min\{\bar{v}, y_t\}]$$

Given (y_t, r_t, π_t) , $\mathcal{P}^+, \mathcal{P}^-, \mathcal{P}^0$ satisfy Slater's condition. Hence, KKT conditions are the necessary and sufficient condition for the optimality. It suffices to show that (7)-(13) satisfy KKT conditions of the convex optimizations depending on the net consumption region.

Lagrangian of $\mathcal{P}^+, \mathcal{P}^-$, and \mathcal{P}^0 are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^+ &= U_t(\mathbf{d}) + (\nu^+ - \pi_t^+)(v + \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{d} - r_t) + \mathbb{E}[V_{t+1}(x_t - v)] \\ &\quad + \underline{\lambda}_v^+ v + \bar{\lambda}_v^+ (\min\{\bar{v}, y_t\} - v) + \underline{\lambda}_d^+ \mathbf{d} + \bar{\lambda}_d^+ (\bar{\mathbf{d}} - \mathbf{d}), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^- &= U_t(\mathbf{d}) + (\nu^- - \pi_t^-)(v + \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{d} - r_t) + \mathbb{E}[V_{t+1}(x_t - v)] \\ &\quad + \underline{\lambda}_v^- v + \bar{\lambda}_v^- (\min\{\bar{v}, y_t\} - v) + \underline{\lambda}_d^- \mathbf{d} + \bar{\lambda}_d^- (\bar{\mathbf{d}} - \mathbf{d}), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^0 &= U_t(\mathbf{d}) + \nu^0(v + \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{d} - r_t) + \mathbb{E}[V_{t+1}(x_t - v)] \\ &\quad + \underline{\lambda}_v^0 v + \bar{\lambda}_v^0 (\min\{\bar{v}, y_t\} - v) + \underline{\lambda}_d^0 \mathbf{d} + \bar{\lambda}_d^0 (\bar{\mathbf{d}} - \mathbf{d}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\nu, \underline{\lambda}_d, \bar{\lambda}_d, \bar{\lambda}_v, \underline{\lambda}_v \geq 0$ are dual variables of the \mathcal{P} .

Let's first verify the optimality of (8) and (10).

For $r_t < \Delta_t^+(y_t)$ and $r_t > \Delta_t^-(y_t)$, $\nu^+ = \nu^- = 0$.

$$\pi_t^+ - \underline{\lambda}_d^{+(i)} + \bar{\lambda}_d^{+(i)} = L_t^{(i)}(d^{(i)}). \quad (16)$$

$$\pi_t^- - \underline{\lambda}_d^{-(i)} + \bar{\lambda}_d^{-(i)} = L_t^{(i)}(d^{(i)}). \quad (17)$$

Then, (8) and (10) satisfy (16) and (17) for all $i = 1, \dots, K$.

From the Proposition 2, $h_{t+1}(y_t - v) \in [-\gamma, -\pi_{\text{off}}^-]$. Depending on the range of $h_{t+1}(y_{t+1})$ different δ_t, τ_t satisfy the KKT conditions of $\mathcal{P}^+, \mathcal{P}^-, \mathcal{P}^0$.

Case 1) $h_{t+1}(y_{t+1}) < -\pi_t^+$ for all $y_t \in [0, (T-t-1)\bar{v}]$: In this case, for $r_t < \Delta_t^+(y_t) = \sum_{i=1}^K f_t^{(i)}(\pi_t^+) + \min\{y_t, \bar{v}\}$,

v^+ with $\tau_t = 0$ and for $r_t > \Delta_t^-(y_t) = \sum_{i=1}^K f_t^{(i)}(\pi_t^-) + \min\{y_t, \bar{v}\}$, v^- with $\delta_t = 0$ satisfy the KKT conditions of \mathcal{P}^+ and \mathcal{P}^- , respectively.

As $\mathbb{E}[V_{t+1}(x_t - v)]$ is continuously differentiable on $[0, (T-t-1)\bar{v}]$ and support of r_{t+1} is bounded, for $y_t - v \in [0, (T-t-1)\bar{v}]$

$$\pi_t^+ - \underline{\lambda}_v^+ + \bar{\lambda}_v^+ = \frac{\partial}{\partial v} \mathbb{E}[V_{t+1}(x_t - v)] = -h_{t+1}(y_t - v), \quad (18)$$

$$\pi_t^- - \underline{\lambda}_v^- + \bar{\lambda}_v^- = -h_{t+1}(y_t - v). \quad (19)$$

Then for $y_t \in [0, (T-t)\bar{v}]$, $v^+ = v^- = \min\{\bar{v}, y_t\}$ satisfy (18), (19), respectively.

For $r_t \in [\Delta_t^+(y_t), \Delta_t^-(y_t)]$

$$\begin{aligned} v^* &= \min\{\bar{v}, y_t\} \\ d^{(i)*} &= f_t^{(i)}(\nu^0), \quad i = 1, \dots, K, \end{aligned}$$

where $\sum_{i=1}^K d^{(i)*} + v^* = r_t$, satisfy

$$\nu^0 - \underline{\lambda}_d^{0(i)} + \bar{\lambda}_d^{0(i)} = L_t^{(i)}(d^{(i)}), \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, K, \quad (20)$$

$$\nu^0 - \underline{\lambda}_v^0 + \bar{\lambda}_v^0 = -h_{t+1}(y_t - v), \quad (21)$$

$$\mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{d} + v = r. \quad (22)$$

Such ν^0 exists in $[\pi_t^-, \pi_t^+]$ because of the continuity and monomoiicity of $L_t^{(i)}$. Hence, (7)-(13) is the optimal solution of (5).

Case 2) $h_{t+1}(\tau_t) = -\pi_t^+$ for $\tau_t \in [0, (T-t-1)\bar{v}]$ and $h_{t+1}(y_{t+1}) < -\pi_t^-$ for all $y_{t+1} \in [0, (T-t-1)\bar{v}]$: Similarly, for $r_t < \Delta_t^+(y_t)$, $v^+ = \min\{\bar{v}, y_t, \max\{y_t - \tau_t, 0\}\}$, and for $r_t > \Delta_t^-(y_t)$, $v^- = \min\{\bar{v}, y_t\}$ satisfy the (18) and (19).

For $r_t \in [\Delta_t^+(y_t), \Delta_t^-(y_t)]$ and $\nu_0 \in [\pi_t^-, \pi_t^+]$, (11)-(13) satisfy (20)-(22). Here $h_{t+1}^{-1}(-\nu^0)$ is defined as

$$h_{t+1}^{-1}(-\nu^0) = \begin{cases} 0, & -\nu^0 > h_{t+1}(0), \\ h_{t+1}^{-1}(-\nu^0) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Case 3) $h_{t+1}(\tau_t) = -\pi_t^+$ and $h_{t+1}(\delta_t) = -\pi_t^-$ for $\tau_t, \delta_t \in [0, (T-t-1)\bar{v}]$:

Similarly, for $r_t < \Delta_t^+(y_t)$, $v^+ = \min\{\bar{v}, y_t, \max\{y_t - \tau_t, 0\}\}$, and for $r_t > \Delta_t^-(y_t)$, $v^- = \min\{\bar{v}, y_t, \min\{y_t - \delta_t, 0\}\}$ satisfy (18) and (19).

For $r_t \in [\Delta_t^+(y_t), \Delta_t^-(y_t)]$ and $\nu_0 \in [\pi_t^-, \pi_t^+]$, (11)-(13) satisfy (20)-(22).

Case 4) $h_{t+1}(y_{t+1}) > -\pi_t^+$ for all $y_t \in [0, (T-t-1)\bar{v}]$ and $h_{t+1}(\delta_t) = -\pi_t^-$ for $\delta_t \in [0, (T-t-1)\bar{v}]$:

Similarly, for $r_t < \Delta_t^+(y_t)$, v^+ with $\tau_t = (T-t-1)\bar{v}$, and for $r_t > \Delta_t^-(y_t)$, $v^- = \min\{\bar{v}, y_t, \min\{y_t - \delta_t, 0\}\}$ satisfy (18) and (19).

For $r_t \in [\Delta_t^+(y_t), \Delta_t^-(y_t)]$ and $\nu_0 \in [\pi_t^-, \pi_t^+]$, (11)-(13) satisfy (20)-(22). Here $h_{t+1}^{-1}(-\nu^0)$ is defined as

$$h_{t+1}^{-1}(-\nu^0) = \begin{cases} (T-t-1)\bar{v}, & -\nu^0 < h_{t+1}((T-t-1)\bar{v}), \\ h_{t+1}^{-1}(-\nu^0) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Case 5) $h_{t+1}(y_{t+1}) > -\pi_t^-$ for all $y_{t+1} \in [0, (T-t-1)\bar{v}]$: Similarly, for $r_t < \Delta_t^+(y_t)$, v^+ with $\tau_t = (T-t-1)\bar{v}$, and for $r_t > \Delta_t^-(y_t)$, v^- with $\delta_t = (T-t-1)\bar{v}$ satisfy (18) and (19).

For $r_t \in [\Delta_t^+(y_t), \Delta_t^-(y_t)]$ and $\nu_0 \in [\pi_t^-, \pi_t^+]$

$$\begin{aligned} v^* &= \min\{\bar{v}, y_t, \max\{y_t - (T-t-1)\bar{v}, 0\}\}, \\ d^{(i)*} &= f_t^{(i)}(\nu^0), \quad i = 1, \dots, K, \end{aligned}$$

where $\sum_{i=1}^K d^{(i)*} + v^* = r_t$, satisfy the KKT conditions of \mathcal{P}^0 .

Case 6) $h_{t+1}(y_{t+1}) \in (-\pi_t^+, -\pi_t^-)$ for all $y_{t+1} \in [0, (T-t-1)\bar{v}]$:

Similarly, for $r_t < \Delta_t^+(y_t)$, v^+ with $\tau_t = (T-t-1)\bar{v}$, and for $r_t > \Delta_t^-(y_t)$, v^- with $\delta_t = 0$ satisfy (18) and (19).

For $r_t \in [\Delta_t^+(y_t), \Delta_t^-(y_t)]$ and $\nu_0 \in [\pi_t^-, \pi_t^+]$, (11)-(13) satisfy (20)-(22). Here $h_{t+1}^{-1}(-\nu^0)$ is defined as

$$h_{t+1}^{-1}(-\nu^0) = \begin{cases} 0, & -\nu^0 > h_{t+1}(0), \\ (T-t-1)\bar{v}, & -\nu^0 < h_{t+1}((T-t-1)\bar{v}), \\ h_{t+1}^{-1}(-\nu^0) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

From the proof if we denote optimal charging action at net zero zone as v^0 , for fixed y_t , due to the monotonicity of $h_{t+1}(y_{t+1})$, we can find out that $v^+ \leq v^0 \leq v^-$. \square

Lemma 1. Under NEM TOU parameters satisfying A1, for $y_t \geq (T-t)\bar{v}$, $v_t^* = \bar{v}$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$ and d_t^* are defined by Theorem 3 with adjusted renewable $\tilde{r}_t = \max\{r_t - \bar{v}, 0\}$.

Proof. We will prove Lemma by contradiction. Suppose $v_t^* < \bar{v}$. Then, value function is

$$V_t(x_t) = U(\mathbf{d}_t^*) - P^{\pi_t}(z_t^*) + \mathbb{E}[V_{t+1}(x_t - v_t^*)]$$

For $\epsilon > 0$ such that $v_t^* + \epsilon < \bar{v}$, let value function $\tilde{V}_t(x_t)$ with same \mathbf{d}_t^* and v_t^* replaced with $v_t^* + \epsilon$.

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V}_t(x_t) &= U(\mathbf{d}_t^*) - P^{\pi_t}(z_t^* + \epsilon) + \mathbb{E}[V_{t+1}(x_t - v_t^* - \epsilon)] \\ &= U(\mathbf{d}_t^*) - P^{\pi_t}(z_t^* + \epsilon) + \mathbb{E}[V_{t+1}(x_t - v_t^*)] + \gamma\epsilon \\ &\geq U(\mathbf{d}_t^*) - P^{\pi_t}(z_t^*) + \mathbb{E}[V_{t+1}(x_t - v_t^*)] + (\gamma - \pi_t^+)\epsilon \\ &> V_t(x_t), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, $v_t^* = \bar{v}$. As $v_t^* = \bar{v}$ is independent to the consumption, optimal consumption is defined by BTM DER what's left after charging \bar{v} . The result of optimal consumption decision without EV charging is from Theorem 3. \square

In the rest of the proof, denote $\mathbf{d}^+, \mathbf{d}^-, \mathbf{d}^0$ and v^+, v^-, v^0 as the optimal solution of $\mathcal{P}^+, \mathcal{P}^-, \mathcal{P}^0$, respectively.

B. Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. From Proposition 4, it suffices to show that $\mathbb{E}[V_t(x_t)]$ is concave and \mathcal{C}^1 function of $y_t \in [0, (T-t)\bar{v}]$ for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$. We will prove using the induction.

At $t = T-1$, $\mathbb{E}[V_T(x_T)] = -\gamma y_T$ is a concave function. Hence, (7)-(13) are the optimal solution of (5). In particular, as $\frac{\partial}{\partial y_T} \mathbb{E}[V_T(x_T)] = -\gamma$, v_t^* and d_t^* of Case 1) in the proof of Proposition 4 is optimal.

$$\begin{aligned} V_{T-1}(x_{T-1}) &= \\ &\begin{cases} U_{T-1}(\mathbf{d}_{T-1}^+) - \pi_{T-1}^+ z_{T-1}, & r_{T-1} < \Delta_{T-1}^+(y_{T-1}), \\ U_{T-1}(\mathbf{d}_{T-1}^-) - \pi_{T-1}^- z_{T-1}, & r_{T-1} > \Delta_{T-1}^-(y_{T-1}), \\ U_{T-1}(\mathbf{d}_{T-1}^0), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \\ &\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{T-1}} V_{T-1}(x_{T-1}) = \\ &\begin{cases} -\pi_{T-1}^+, & r_{T-1} < \Delta_{T-1}^+(y_{T-1}), \\ -\pi_{T-1}^-, & r_{T-1} > \Delta_{T-1}^-(y_{T-1}), \\ -\nu(y_{T-1}^0), & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where $\nu^0(y_{T-1}) \in [\pi_{T-1}^-, \pi_{T-1}^+]$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{T-1}} V_{T-1}(x_{T-1}) \right] &= -\Pr(r_{T-1} < \Delta_{T-1}^+(y_{T-1})) \pi_{T-1}^+ \\ &\quad - \Pr(r_{T-1} > \Delta_{T-1}^-(y_{T-1})) \pi_{T-1}^- \\ &\quad - \Pr(\Delta_{T-1}^+(y_{T-1}) \leq y_{T-1} \leq \Delta_{T-1}^-(y_{T-1})) \nu^0(y_{T-1}) \\ &= -\{(\pi_{T-1}^+ - \nu^0(y_{T-1})) \Pr(r_{T-1} \leq \Delta_{T-1}^+(y_{T-1})) \\ &\quad + (\nu^0(y_{T-1}) - \pi_{T-1}^-) \Pr(r_{T-1} \leq \Delta_{T-1}^-(y_{T-1})) + \pi_{T-1}^-\}. \end{aligned}$$

By continuity and monotonicity of the cumulative distribution function of r_t , $\mathbb{E}[V_{T-1}(x_{T-1})]$ is a concave and \mathcal{C}^1 function of $y_{T-1} \in [0, \bar{v}]$.

Assume that $\mathbb{E}[V_{t+1}(x_{t+1})]$ is a concave and \mathcal{C}_1 function of $y_t \in [0, (T-t-1)\bar{v}]$. Then, by Proposition 4, (7)-(13) is the optimal solution of (5).

$$V_t(x_t) = \begin{cases} U(\mathbf{d}^+) - \pi_t^+(v^+ + \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{d}^+ - r_t) & (r_t < \Delta_t^+(y_t)), \\ \quad + \mathbb{E}[V_{t+1}(x_t - v^+)], \\ U(\mathbf{d}^-) - \pi_t^-(v^- + \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{d}^- - r_t) & (r_t > \Delta_t^-(y_t)), \\ \quad + \mathbb{E}[V_{t+1}(x_t - v^-)], \\ U(\mathbf{d}^0) + \mathbb{E}[V_{t+1}(x_t - v^0)], & (\Delta_t^+(y_t) \leq r_t \\ \quad \leq \Delta_t^-(y_t)). \end{cases}$$

v^+ , v^- , v^0 are determined by value of y_t .

1) For $y_t < \delta_t < \tau_t$: $v^+ = v^- = 0$ and by monotonicity v_t with respect to r_t , $v^0 = 0$. Then,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y_t} V_t(x_t) = h_{t+1}(x_t).$$

Hence, $\mathbb{E}[V_t(x_t)]$ is a concave and \mathcal{C}^1 function of $y_t < \delta_t$.

2) For $\delta_t \leq y_t < \delta_t + \bar{v}$, $y_t < \tau_t$: $v^+ = 0$ and $v^- = y_t - \delta_t$.

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y_t} V_t(x_t) = \begin{cases} h_{t+1}(y_t), & (r_t < \Delta_t^+(y_t)), \\ -\pi_t^-, & (r_t > \Delta_t^-(y_t)), \\ -\nu^0(y_t), & (\Delta_t^+(y_t) \leq r_t \leq \Delta_t^-(y_t)). \end{cases}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} h_t(y_t) &= h_{t+1}(y_t) \Pr(r_t < \Delta_t^+(y_t)) - \pi_t^- \Pr(r_t > \Delta_t^-(y_t)) \\ &\quad - \nu_0(y_t) \Pr(\Delta_t^+(y_t) \leq r_t \leq \Delta_t^-(y_t)) \\ &= -\pi_t^- + \Pr(r_t < \Delta_t^+(y_t)) (h_{t+1}(y_t) + \nu_0(y_t)) \\ &\quad + \Pr(r_t < \Delta_t^-(y_t)) (\pi_t^- - \nu_0(y_t)). \end{aligned}$$

As $\nu^0(y_t)$ is $-h_{t+1}(y_{t+1})$ at $y_t - v^0 \leq y_t$, by the monotonicity of $h_{t+1}(y_{t+1})$, $h_{t+1}(y_t) + \nu^0(y_t) \leq 0$. And $\pi_t^- \leq \nu^0(y_t)$. Then, by the monotonicity of $\nu^0(y_t)$ and inductive assumptions, $h_t(y_t)$ is a monotone decreasing function, and $\mathbb{E}[V_t(x_t)]$ is concave.

By continuity of cumulative distribution of r_t , $h_{t+1}(y_{t+1})$, and $\nu_0(y_t)$, $h_t(y_t)$ is continuous on $y_t \in (\delta_t, \delta_t + \bar{v})$. And for the $y_t = \delta_t$, $v^- = 0$, and $v^0 = 0$. Hence, $h_t(y_t)$ is continuous on δ_t .

If $\delta_t + \bar{v} < \tau_t$, we can prove the continuity of $h_t(y_t)$ on 3) $\delta_t + \bar{v} \leq y_t < \tau_t$, 4) $\tau_t \leq y_t < \tau_t + \bar{v}$ 5) $\tau_t + \bar{v} \leq y_t$ using the same argument.

Otherwise, we can also prove the continuity of $h_t(y_t)$ for 3) $\tau_t \leq y_t < \delta_t + \bar{v}$, 4) $\delta_t + \bar{v} \leq y_t < \tau_t + \bar{v}$, 5) $\tau_t + \bar{v} \leq y_t$ using the same argument. \square

C. Proof of Theorem 2

Proof. Let's first show that for sufficiently large R , $t = 1, \dots, T-1$, $y_t \in [0, (T-t)\bar{v}]$,

$$-\max_{k \geq t} \{\pi_k^+\} < h_t(y_t) < -\min_{k \geq t} \{\pi_k^-\}. \quad (23)$$

For $t = T-1$, from the proof of Theorem 1, $h_{T-1}(y_{T-1})$ is the convex combination of π_{T-1}^+ , π_{T-1}^- and $\nu^0(y_{T-1}) \in [\pi_{T-1}^-, \pi_{T-1}^+]$ with nonzero coefficients. Hence, (23) holds for $t = T-1$.

Suppose (23) holds for $t+1$. Then from the proof of Theorem 1, h_t is a convex combination of $-\pi_t^+$, $-\pi_t^-$, h_{t+1} , $\nu^0(y_t) \in [-\pi_t^+, -\pi_t^-]$. Hence, (23) holds at t .

For $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{off},2}$, $\max_{k \geq t+1} \{\pi_k^+\} = \pi_{\text{off}}^+$, $\min_{k \geq t+1} \{\pi_k^-\} = \pi_{\text{off}}^-$. Hence, by Case 6 in the proof of Proposition 4, $\tau_t = (T-t-1)\bar{v}$ and $\delta_t = 0$.

For $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{on}}$, with $\mathcal{T}_{\text{off},2} \neq \emptyset$, $\max_{k \geq t+1} \{\pi_k^+\} = \pi_{\text{on}}^+$, $\min_{k \geq t+1} \{\pi_k^-\} = \pi_{\text{off}}^-$. Hence, by Case 4 in the proof of Proposition 4, $\tau_t = (T-t-1)\bar{v}$ and δ_t satisfies $h_{t+1}(\delta_t) = -\pi_{\text{on}}^-$.

For $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{on}}$, with $\mathcal{T}_{\text{off},2} = \emptyset$, $\max_{k \geq t+1} \{\pi_k^+\} = \pi_{\text{on}}^+$, $\min_{k \geq t+1} \{\pi_k^-\} = \pi_{\text{on}}^-$. Hence, by Case 6 in the proof of Proposition 4, $\tau_t = (T-t-1)\bar{v}$ and $\delta_t = 0$.

For $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{off},1}$, $\max_{k \geq t+1} \{\pi_k^+\} = \pi_{\text{on}}^+$, $\min_{k \geq t+1} \{\pi_k^-\} = \pi_{\text{off}}^-$. Hence, by Case 2 in the proof of Proposition 4, $\tau_t = (T-t-1)\bar{v}$ and τ_t satisfies $h_{t+1}(\tau_t) = \pi_{\text{off}}^+$. \square

D. Proof of Proposition 1

Proof. For $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{off},2} \cup \mathcal{T}_{\text{on}}$, $\tau_t = (T-t-1)\bar{v}$ satisfies the recursive relation. Hence, it's only necessary to show the recursive relation for $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{off},1}$.

For $y_t \geq \tau_t + \bar{v}$, $v^- = v^+ = \bar{v}$. By monotonicity $v^0 = 0$.

$$h_t(y_t) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y_t} \mathbb{E}[V_t(x_t)] = h_{t+1}(y_t - \bar{v}).$$

As $y_t \downarrow \tau_t + \bar{v}$, $h_t(y_t) \rightarrow h_{t+1}(\tau_t) = -\pi_{\text{off}}^+$. Since, $h_t(y_t)$ is continuous, $h_t(\tau_t + \bar{v}) = -\pi_{\text{off}}^+$. Hence, $\tau_{t-1} = \tau_t + \bar{v}$.

For $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{off},1} \cup \mathcal{T}_{\text{off},2}$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{on}} \wedge \mathcal{T}_{\text{off},2} = \emptyset$, $\delta_t = 0$. Hence, it's only necessary to prove for $t \in \mathcal{T}_{\text{on}} \wedge \mathcal{T}_{\text{off},2} \neq \emptyset$.

For $y_t \leq \delta_t$, $v^+ = v^- = 0$. Then, $v^0 = 0$.

$$h_t(y_t) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y_t} \mathbb{E}[V_t(x_t)] = h_{t+1}(y_t).$$

As $y_t \uparrow \delta_t$, $h_t(y_t) \rightarrow h_{t+1}(\delta_t) = -\pi_{\text{on}}^-$. Since $h_t(y_t)$ is continuous, $h_t(\delta_t) = -\pi_{\text{on}}^-$. Hence, $\delta_{t-1} = \delta_t$. \square