

Uncertainty-Informed Renewable Energy Scheduling: A Scalable Bilevel Framework

Dongwei Zhao^{*†}, Vladimir Dvorkin^{*†}, Stefanos Delikaraoglou[†], Alberto J. Lamadrid L.[‡], and Audun Botterud[†]

^{*}MIT Energy Initiative, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA

[†]Laboratory for Information and Decision Systems (LIDS), Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA, USA

[‡] Department of Economics, Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA, USA

Abstract—Accommodating the uncertainty of variable renewable energy sources (VRES) in electricity markets requires sophisticated and scalable tools to achieve market efficiency. To account for the uncertain imbalance costs in the real-time market while remaining compatible with the existing sequential market-clearing structure, our work adopts an uncertainty-informed adjustment toward the VRES contract quantity scheduled in the day-ahead market. This mechanism requires solving a bilevel problem, which is computationally challenging for practical large-scale systems. To improve the scalability, we propose a technique based on strong duality and McCormick envelopes, which relaxes the original problem to linear programming. We conduct numerical studies on both IEEE 118-bus and 1814-bus NYISO systems. Results show that the proposed relaxation can achieve good performance in accuracy (0.7%-gap in the system cost wrt. the least-cost stochastic clearing benchmark) and scalability (solving the NYISO system in minutes). Furthermore, the benefit of the uncertainty-informed VRES-quantity adjustment is more significant under higher levels of VRES (e.g., 70%), under which the system cost can be reduced substantially compared to a myopic day-ahead offer strategy of VRES.

Symbols

$(n, m) \in \Lambda$	set	set of transmission lines
$\omega \in \Omega$	set	Set of VRES production scenarios
$i \in I$	set	set of conventional generation units
$j \in J$	set	set of VRES power quantity offers
$k \in K$	set	set of VRES power units
$n \in N$	set	set of buses
$\{ \}_n$	set	mapping of $\{ \}$ into the set of buses
δ_n^{DA}	variable	day-ahead voltage angle at bus n
δ_n^{RT}	variable	real-time voltage angle at bus n in scenario ω
L_n^{sh}	variable	shedding of load n in scenario ω
P_i^{C}	variable	day-ahead schedule of conventional unit i
P_k^{W}	variable	day-ahead schedule of VRES unit k
$P_k^{\text{W,cr}}$	variable	VRES power curtailment of unit k in scenario ω
$r_{i\omega}^{\text{U/D}}$	variable	up-/downward redispatch of unit i in scenario ω
C_i	parameter	day-ahead energy price offer of unit i
$C_i^{\text{U/D}}$	parameter	real-time up-/downward redispatch cost of unit i
$C_{i\omega}^{\text{LoLL}}$	parameter	cost of lost load
\bar{F}_{nm}	parameter	capacity of transmission line (n, m)
x_{nm}	parameter	reactance of transmission line (n, m)
L_n	parameter	demand of load located at bus n
\bar{P}_i	parameter	day-ahead quantity offer of unit i
$\bar{R}_i^{\text{U/D}}$	parameter	up-/downward reserve capacity offer of unit i
$\bar{W}_{k\omega}$	parameter	VRES power realization of unit k in scenario ω
\bar{W}_k	parameter	VRES power capacity of unit k

The information, data, or work presented herein was funded by the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy (ARPA-E), U.S. Department of Energy, under Award Number DE-AR0001277. The views and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of the United States Government or any agency thereof.

I. INTRODUCTION

The appeal for a transition to zero-carbon power systems has motivated the large-scale deployment of variable renewable energy sources (VRES). From 2010 to 2020, the globally installed solar PV capacity increased from about 40 GW to 760 GW, while the wind energy capacity grew from about 200 GW to 740 GWh [1]. In many regions, this transition takes place in restructured electricity markets, which were initially designed according to the technical and economic properties of dispatchable generators, usually fossil-fueled. As a result, the ability of the current market design to efficiently accommodate large shares of VRES is called into question.

Current short-term electricity markets are typically organized into two main settlements [2]: a day-ahead market set of contracts cleared before actual operations to establish initial generation schedules and prices, and a real-time market that runs close to actual delivery in order to compensate for any imbalances from the day-ahead schedule. In this sequential settlement process, the uncertainty information about VRES generation in the day-ahead market is usually summarized in a single-valued point forecast [3], typically the conditional expectation of the predictive probability distribution. This myopic view of forecast uncertainty leads to imperfect coordination between the day-ahead and real-time operations, since the day-ahead schedule does not account for the re-dispatch cost under generation uncertainty.

Aiming to improve scheduling efficiency accounting for system uncertainties, the works [4]–[6] proposed alternative dispatch approaches which co-optimized day-ahead and real-time operations to minimize total expected system costs. Although these models attain perfect temporal coordination between the day-ahead and real-time stages, they are not readily compatible with the existing market structure in which day-ahead and real-time markets are cleared sequentially and separately. Morales *et al.* [7] proposed an adjustment of day-ahead wind-energy quantities based on bilevel models. Such a framework can account for the imbalance costs in the real-time market while maintaining the sequential market-clearing structure. Several follow-up works applied this bilevel approach to other reserve and energy problems [8]–[10]. However, these works solved the bilevel problem by formulating a single mixed-integer linear programming (MILP) problem, which was only tested on small-scale systems, e.g., a 24-bus system [7]. The MILP problems are hard to solve for large-scale

systems, e.g., NYISO, and thus may fail to support practical market operations.

In contrast to the literature above, following the bilevel optimization model, our work aims to *efficiently compute the optimal quantity adjustment for VRES in the day-ahead market for a practical large-scale system*. We summarize the key contributions of this work as follows.

Efficient algorithm for practical large-scale systems: To solve the bilevel problem of VRES quantity adjustment, the conventional method is to reformulate a MILP problem using KKT conditions. We find that this approach cannot solve the 1814-bus NYISO system within two hours. To resolve this scalability issue, we propose a technique based on the strong duality of linear programming and McCormick-envelope relaxation. We design proper relaxation bounds for decision variables. This method is computationally efficient as it only requires solving a linear program, which can produce solutions for the NYISO system in minutes.

Performance and benefit: We conduct numerical studies on IEEE 118-bus and 1814-bus NYISO systems. The results show that the proposed relaxation technique can achieve accuracy (0.7%-gap in the system cost wrt. the least-cost stochastic dispatch benchmark) and scalability (solving the NYISO system in minutes). Besides, the benefit of the uncertainty-informed VRES-quantity adjustment is more significant under high levels of VRES (e.g., 70%), under which the system cost can be reduced by over 15% compared to the myopic strategy.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We first introduce the current market-clearing model in Section II. Then, we formulate a bilevel model for VRES quantity adjustments in Section III and present the solution method in Section IV. Finally, we test results and conclude in Sections V and VI.

II. TWO-SETTLEMENT MARKET CLEARING

This section provides optimization models for conventional day-ahead and real-time market dispatch. In terms of modeling assumptions, the network topology is included considering linear DC power flows. Energy and reserve supply functions are linear, and all generators behave as price takers. For simplicity, the sole source of uncertainty is VRES power production, and system demand is inelastic with a large value of lost load (VoLL). To maintain convexity in the market-clearing models, we assume that binary commitment decisions are internalized by the market participants (self-commitment), and we do not consider inter-temporal constraints.

A. Day-ahead market

The day-ahead market clearing problem minimizes the total generation costs f^{DA} of all the conventional units.

$$\begin{aligned} \min f^{\text{DA}}(\Phi^{\text{DA}}) &:= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} C_i P_i^{\text{C}} & (1a) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_n} P_i^{\text{C}} + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} P_k^{\text{W}} - L_n \\ & - \sum_{m: (n,m) \in \Lambda} \frac{\delta_n^{\text{DA}} - \delta_m^{\text{DA}}}{x_{nm}} = 0, \forall n \in \mathcal{N}, \quad [\lambda_n^b] & (1b) \end{aligned}$$

$$- \bar{F}_{nm} \leq \frac{\delta_n^{\text{DA}} - \delta_m^{\text{DA}}}{x_{nm}} \leq \bar{F}_{nm}, \quad \forall (n, m) \in \Lambda, \quad [\underline{\lambda}_{nm}, \bar{\lambda}_{nm}] \quad (1c)$$

$$\underline{P}_i^{\text{C}} \leq P_i^{\text{C}} \leq \bar{P}_i^{\text{C}}, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, \quad [\underline{\lambda}_i^{\text{C}}, \bar{\lambda}_i^{\text{C}}] \quad (1d)$$

$$0 \leq P_k^{\text{W}} \leq W_k, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \quad [\underline{\lambda}_k^{\text{W}}, \bar{\lambda}_k^{\text{W}}] \quad (1e)$$

$$\text{var} : \Phi^{\text{DA}} = \{P_i^{\text{C}}, \forall i; P_k^{\text{W}}, \forall k; \delta_n^{\text{DA}}, \forall n\}.$$

The decision variable set Φ^{DA} comprises the day-ahead energy quantities for each conventional and VRES unit as well as voltage angles at each bus. Constraint (1b) ensures power balance. Constraints (1c)-(1e) enforce the transmission power flow, conventional-generation schedule, and VRES schedule within the capacity limits. In constraint (1e), $\mathbf{W} = (W_k, \forall k \in \mathcal{K})$ is the VRES quantity offer, which can be empirically set at the mean value of the forecast or optimized in the later bilevel model. We denote by $\mathcal{X}^{\text{DA}}(\mathbf{W})$ the constraint set constructed by (1b)-(1e) under the VRES offer \mathbf{W} . We list the dual variables λ corresponding to each constraint and denote the optimal day-ahead schedule as $\Phi^{\text{DA}*}$.

B. Real-time market

Getting closer to real-time operation, any deviation from the day-ahead schedule Φ^{DA} has to be covered by balancing actions. For a specific realization $\omega \in \Omega$ of random production $\widetilde{W}_{k\omega}$, the system operator decides the optimal re-dispatch by minimizing the redispatch cost f_{ω}^{RT} as follows.

$$\min f_{\omega}^{\text{RT}}(\Phi_{\omega}^{\text{RT}}) := \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} C_i^{\text{U}} r_{i\omega}^{\text{U}} - C_i^{\text{D}} r_{i\omega}^{\text{D}} + \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} C^{\text{VoLL}} L_{n\omega}^{\text{sh}} \quad (2a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}_n} (r_{i\omega}^{\text{U}} - r_{i\omega}^{\text{D}}) + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n} (\widetilde{W}_{k\omega} - P_k^{\text{W}} - P_{k\omega}^{\text{W,cr}}) + L_{n\omega}^{\text{sh}}$$

$$- \sum_{m: (n,m) \in \Lambda} \frac{\delta_{n\omega}^{\text{RT}} - \delta_n^{\text{DA}} - \delta_{m\omega}^{\text{RT}} + \delta_m^{\text{DA}}}{x_{nm}} = 0, \forall n \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (2b)$$

$$0 \leq r_{i\omega}^{\text{U}} \leq \bar{P}_i - P_i^{\text{C}}, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, \quad (2c)$$

$$0 \leq r_{i\omega}^{\text{D}} \leq P_i^{\text{C}} - \underline{P}_i^{\text{C}}, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, \quad (2d)$$

$$- \bar{F}_{nm} \leq \frac{\delta_{n\omega}^{\text{RT}} - \delta_{m\omega}^{\text{RT}}}{x_{nm}} \leq \bar{F}_{nm}, \quad \forall (n, m) \in \Lambda, \quad (2e)$$

$$0 \leq P_{k\omega}^{\text{W,cr}} \leq \widetilde{W}_{k\omega}, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \quad (2f)$$

$$0 \leq L_{n\omega}^{\text{sh}'} \leq L_n, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (2g)$$

$$\text{var} : \Phi_{\omega}^{\text{RT}} = \{r_{i\omega}^{\text{U}}, r_{i\omega}^{\text{D}}, \forall i; P_k^{\text{W,cr}}, \forall k; \delta_{n\omega}^{\text{RT}}, L_{n\omega}^{\text{sh}}, \forall n\}.$$

The decision variable set $\Phi_{\omega}^{\text{RT}}$ comprises the redispatch variables as well as real-time voltage angles at each bus. Constraint (2b) ensures power re-balance. Constraints (2c)-(2g) enforce the upward and downward adjustments, transmission power flow, VRES curtailment, and shed load within the capacity limits. We denote by $\mathcal{X}^{\text{RT}}(\Phi^{\text{DA}})$ the constraint set constructed by (2b)-(2g), which is coupled with day-ahead schedule Φ^{DA} . Note that both optimization problems for the day-ahead and real-time dispatch are linear programming (LP) problems.

III. UNCERTAINTY-INFORMED QUANTITY ADJUSTMENTS

Based on the sequential day-ahead and real-time markets that have been introduced, we propose an uncertainty-informed

framework based on bilevel optimization to reveal the optimal quantity offers of VRES producers. We also introduce two benchmarks for the proposed model.

A. Bilevel optimization model

We introduce a bilevel model *BiD*. In the upper level, the system operator will decide the day-ahead bidding quantity W_k for each VRES producer k . In the lower level, the day-ahead schedule Φ^{DA} will be optimized given the bidding quantity \mathbf{W} announced from the upper problem. Constrained by the day-ahead schedule Φ^{DA} in the lower level, the system operator will also decide the real-time redispatch Φ^{RT} in addition to the day-ahead VRES bidding quantity \mathbf{W} in the upper level. The upper level aims to minimize the system cost including the day-ahead cost and real-time expected costs. We formulate such a bilevel optimization problem *BiD* as follows.

Problem *BiD*: Bilevel optimization problem for day-ahead VRES quantity offer

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\Phi^{\text{RT}} \cup \mathbf{W}} \quad & f^{\text{DA}}(\Phi^{\text{DA}*}) + \mathbb{E}_{\omega \in \Omega} [f_{\omega}^{\text{RT}}(\Phi_{\omega}^{\text{RT}})] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \Phi_{\omega}^{\text{RT}} \in \mathcal{X}_{\omega}^{\text{RT}}(\Phi^{\text{DA}}), \forall \omega \in \Omega, \\ & \Phi^{\text{DA}*} \in \arg \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \min_{\Phi^{\text{DA}}} f^{\text{DA}}(\Phi^{\text{DA}}) \\ \text{s.t. } \Phi^{\text{DA}} \in \mathcal{X}^{\text{DA}}(\mathbf{W}) \end{array} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

After obtaining the optimal VRES offer quantity \mathbf{W}^* , the system operator will first clear the day-ahead market without any information about its decisions on the real-time stage, and then sequentially clear the real-time market.

B. Benchmarks

We consider two dispatch benchmarks for *BiD*.

1) *Myopic dispatch (MyD)*: Each VRES producer k offers the bidding quantity at the expected value of the forecast, i.e., $W_k = \mathbb{E}_{\omega \in \Omega} [W'_{k\omega}]$. Then, the markets are cleared sequentially.

2) *Stochastic dispatch (StD)*: The system operator jointly schedules the day-ahead and real-time dispatches by minimizing the total expected costs in the two markets.

$$S^{\text{StD}} := \min f^{\text{DA}}(\Phi^{\text{DA}}) + \mathbb{E}_{\omega \in \Omega} [f_{\omega}^{\text{RT}}(\Phi_{\omega}^{\text{RT}})] \quad (4a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \Phi_{\omega}^{\text{RT}} \in \mathcal{X}_{\omega}^{\text{RT}}(\Phi^{\text{DA}}), \forall \omega \in \Omega, \quad (4b)$$

$$\Phi^{\text{DA}} \in \mathcal{X}^{\text{DA}}(\overline{\mathbf{W}}), \quad (4c)$$

$$\text{var: } \Phi^{\text{DA}}, \Phi^{\text{RT}}. \quad (4d)$$

We denote the optimal system cost above as S^{StD} . Note that *StD* schedules the day-ahead and real-time markets jointly while *BiD* and *MyD* follow the sequential-clearing structure of the two markets. We denote the system costs under *BiD* and *MyD* as S^{BiD} and S^{MyD} , respectively, based on sequential-clearing results. The system costs always satisfy $S^{\text{MyD}} \geq S^{\text{BiD}} \geq S^{\text{StD}}$. The reason is that the solution of *MyD* is one feasible solution to Problem-*BiD* while the optimal solution to Problem-*BiD* is also one feasible solution to Problem-*StD*. The two benchmarks serve as the upper bound and lower bound for the proposed bilevel model.

IV. SOLUTION METHOD

The bilevel problem *BiD* is non-convex and challenging to solve. The conventional method is to replace the lower-level problem using KKT conditions and transform the problem into a MILP problem [7]. This method can work well on a small-scale system (e.g., IEEE 118-bus system), but it cannot solve a large-scale system (e.g., NYISO) in reasonable time. To resolve this scalability issue, we propose a method based on the strong duality of LP and a McCormick-envelope relaxation.

A. Strong duality transformation

Based on the strong duality of LP, we establish a new optimization problem equivalent to *BiD*.

First, for the low-level LP problem, the equivalent KKT conditions include primary feasibility, dual feasibility, stationary conditions, and complementarity constraints. For LP, the strong-duality condition is equivalent to complementarity constraints [11]. We list these constraints in the following: (i) Primary feasibility: (1b)-(1e); (ii) Dual feasibility:

$$\lambda_{nm} \geq 0, \bar{\lambda}_{nm} \geq 0, \forall (n, m) \in \Lambda, \quad (5a)$$

$$\lambda_i^C \geq 0, \bar{\lambda}_i^C \geq 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, \quad (5b)$$

$$\lambda_k^W \geq 0, \bar{\lambda}_k^W \geq 0, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}. \quad (5c)$$

(iii) Stationary conditions:

$$C_i - \lambda_n^b - \lambda_i^C + \bar{\lambda}_i^C = 0, \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_n, \quad (6a)$$

$$-\lambda_n^b - \lambda_k^W + \bar{\lambda}_k^W = 0, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}_n, \quad (6b)$$

$$\sum_{m:(n,m) \in \Lambda} \frac{-\lambda_n - \lambda_{nm} + \bar{\lambda}_{nm}}{x_{nm}} = \sum_{m:(m,n) \in \Lambda} \frac{-\lambda_m - \lambda_{mn} + \bar{\lambda}_{mn}}{x_{mn}}, \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (6c)$$

(iv) Strong-duality condition:

$$f^{\text{DA}}(\Phi^{\text{DA}}) \leq g^{\text{DA}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}), \quad (7)$$

where we let

$$\begin{aligned} g^{\text{DA}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) := & \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \lambda_n^b \cdot L_n - \sum_{n,m \in \mathcal{N}} (\lambda_{nm} + \bar{\lambda}_{nm}) \cdot \bar{F}_{nm} \\ & - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \bar{\lambda}_i^C \cdot \bar{P}_i^C + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \lambda_i^C \cdot P_i^C - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} \bar{\lambda}_k^W \cdot W_k. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Then, we have an equivalent optimization problem *BiD-S* to Problem *BiD*.

Problem *BiD-S*: Equivalence with strong duality

$$\min f^{\text{DA}}(\Phi^{\text{DA}}) + \mathbb{E}_{\omega \in \Omega} [f_{\omega}^{\text{RT}}(\Phi_{\omega}^{\text{RT}})]$$

$$\text{s.t. } \Phi_{\omega}^{\text{RT}} \in \mathcal{X}_{\omega}^{\text{RT}}(\Phi^{\text{DA}}), \forall \omega \in \Omega,$$

$$\Phi^{\text{DA}} \in \mathcal{X}^{\text{DA}}(\mathbf{W}),$$

$$(5a) - (5c), (6a) - (6c), (7),$$

$$\text{var: } \Phi^{\text{RT}}, \mathbf{W}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}.$$

However, Problem *BiD-S* has the bilinear term $\bar{\lambda}_k^W \cdot W_k$ in the constraint (7). Next, we adopt the McCormick envelope to relax this bilinear item.

B. McCormick-envelope relaxation

We will first formulate the McCormick-envelope relaxation, and then introduce how we choose the bounds for the envelope.

1) *Convex relaxation*: We let $z_k = \bar{\lambda}_k^W \cdot W_k$ in (8) and change $g^{\text{DA}}(\lambda)$ into $g^{\text{DA}}(\lambda, z)$, which transforms (7) into

$$f^{\text{DA}}(\Phi^{\text{DA}}) \leq g^{\text{DA}}(\lambda, z). \quad (10)$$

If we have the bounds $\alpha_k^\lambda \leq \bar{\lambda}_k^W \leq \beta_k^\lambda$ and $\alpha_k^W \leq W_k \leq \beta_k^W$, the McCormick envelope gives the following convex relaxation for z_k [12].

$$z_k \geq \alpha_k^\lambda \cdot W_k + \alpha_k^W \cdot \bar{\lambda}_k^W - \alpha_k^\lambda \alpha_k^W, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \quad (11a)$$

$$z_k \geq \beta_k^\lambda \cdot W_k + \beta_k^W \cdot \bar{\lambda}_k^W - \beta_k^\lambda \beta_k^W, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \quad (11b)$$

$$z_k \leq \beta_k^\lambda \cdot W_k + \alpha_k^W \cdot \bar{\lambda}_k^W - \beta_k^\lambda \alpha_k^W, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}, \quad (11c)$$

$$z_k \leq \alpha_k^\lambda \cdot W_k + \beta_k^W \cdot \bar{\lambda}_k^W - \alpha_k^\lambda \beta_k^W, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{K}. \quad (11d)$$

This leads to the following relaxed LP problem *BiD-SR* for Problem *BiD-S*

Problem *BiD-McCormick*: Relaxed problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & f^{\text{DA}}(\Phi^{\text{DA}}) + \mathbb{E}_{\omega \in \Omega} [f_\omega^{\text{RT}}(\Phi_\omega^{\text{RT}})] \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \Phi_\omega^{\text{RT}} \in \mathcal{X}_\omega^{\text{RT}}(\Phi^{\text{DA}}), \quad \forall \omega \in \Omega, \\ & \Phi^{\text{DA}} \in \mathcal{X}^{\text{DA}}(\mathbf{W}), \\ & (5a) - (5c), (6a) - (6c), (10), (11a) - (11d) \\ \text{var :} \quad & \Phi^{\text{RT}}, \mathbf{W}, \lambda, z. \end{aligned}$$

2) *Bounds choice*: It is important to choose proper lower and upper bounds for W_k and $\bar{\lambda}_k^W$. Note that we always have $0 \leq W_k \leq \bar{W}_k$ and $0 \leq \bar{\lambda}_k^W$ thanks to primal and dual feasibility conditions, respectively. In the later numerical studies, for $W_k, \forall k \in \mathcal{K}$, we choose the bounds $\alpha_k^W = 0$ and

$$\beta_k^W = \gamma \cdot \mathbb{E}_\omega[\bar{W}_{k\omega}], \quad (13)$$

where we adjust the parameter γ for the upper bounds around the mean value. For $\bar{\lambda}_k^W$, we let $\alpha_k^\lambda = 0$ and $\beta_k^\lambda = \bar{\lambda}_k(\mathbf{0})$, where $\bar{\lambda}_k(\mathbf{0})$ denotes the dual solution of $\bar{\lambda}_k$ in the day-ahead schedule when all VRES producers bid zero quantity. Since VRES have zero marginal cost in the day-ahead market, the dual value $\bar{\lambda}_k(\mathbf{0})$ roughly indicates the upper bound for $\bar{\lambda}_k$.

Although the selected lower and upper bounds for W_k and $\bar{\lambda}_k^W$ are not tight, they can guarantee the system cost very close to *StD* when γ is within $[0.2, 1.2]$ as shown in the numerical studies. Besides, the relaxed problem *BiD-McCormick* is a LP problem that can be efficiently solved even on large-scale systems. Recall that after obtaining the quantity solution \mathbf{W}^* from *BiD-McCormick*, the system operator will first clear the day-ahead market given \mathbf{W}^* , and then sequentially clear the real-time market, based on which we calculate the system cost under *BiD-McCormick*.

V. NUMERICAL STUDIES

We use the IEEE 118-bus system [13] to demonstrate the accuracy of the proposed *BiD-McCormick* formulation and adopt the NYISO system [14] to show scalability. We simulate




Fig. 1: IEEE 118-bus system: (a) System cost; (b) Day-ahead aggregate VRES quantity. Both are functions of bound adjustment γ .

on a MacBook Pro (2020) with a 2.3 GHz Quad-Core Intel Core i7 processor. We use the solver Mosek to solve LP and Gurobi to solve MILP in Julia/JuMP.

A. Case of the IEEE 118-bus system

For the 118-bus system, we consider 14 spatially distributed wind farms. We randomly generate 20 forecast scenarios of wind energy following the truncated normal distribution within the wind capacity. We demonstrate that *BiD-McCormick* can achieve good accuracy and tightness. Also, the benefit of *BiD* is more significant under higher VRES integration.

1) *Good performance of BiD-McCormick*: Figures 1(a) and (b) show system costs and day-ahead VRES quantities, respectively, when we adjust the upper bound parameter γ in (13) under *BiD-McCormick*. Different curves represent *StD*, *BiD-KKT*, *BiD-McCormick*, and *MyD*, respectively. Note that *BiD-KKT* refers to solving the bilevel problem directly using KKT-condition-based MILP. To simulate a case of high VRES integration, we increase the capacity of wind farms so that the VRES penetration level reaches 70%, and double the transmission capacity to accommodate this VRES expansion.

As we increase γ in a wide range from 0.2 to 1.6, in Figure 1(a), the system cost under *BiD-McCormick* (red curve) is always very close to *StD* (blue curve) within the gap 0.7%, but lower than *MyD* (black curve) by about 8%. This shows that *BiD-McCormick* can achieve very close performance to the least-cost benchmark *StD*, which is also robust under the bound choice of γ . As shown in Figure 1(b), the day-ahead scheduled VRES quantities under *StD*, *BiD-KKT*, and *BiD-McCormick* are much more conservative than *MyD* so as to avoid the shortage redispatch cost in the real-time market.

In this small system, *BiD-KKT* and *-McCormick* can both compute solutions in about one minute.

2) *System-cost gap between MyD and StD*: Figure 2 shows the system-cost comparison between *StD*, *BiD-McCormick*, and *MyD* under different settings of $\mu R - \nu L$, where μ denotes the VRES penetration level and ν denotes the ratio of transmission-line capacity to the original one.

As shown in Figure 2, higher penetration levels of VRES and transmission capacity will reduce the system cost but increase the system-cost gap between *MyD* and *BiD-McCormick* or *StD*. The intuition is that although higher integration of VRES will reduce the scheduling of high-cost conventional generations, it also brings more uncertainty to the system.

TABLE I: NYISO: System cost (\$1000) and Computation time (second) for a varying number of uncertainty scenarios.

# of scenarios	10		20		50		100	
	cost	time	cost	time	cost	time	cost	time
<i>MyD</i>	392.9	14	393.0	13	398.7	14	396.0	14
<i>BiD-McCormick</i>	383.4	165	383.2	224	387.7	619	386.7	1034
<i>BiD-KKT</i>	—	≫ 2h	—	≫ 2h	—	≫ 2h	—	≫ 2h
<i>StD</i>	383.4	44	383.1	70	387.5	184	386.1	360




Fig. 2: IEEE 118-bus system: System costs under different VRES penetration levels and transmission-line capacity ratios.

In this case, our bilevel model reduces the system cost by over 15% compared with *MyD*. Note that the performance is affected by various system parameters and we will provide more sensitivity analysis in future work.

B. Case study of the NYISO system

We show that *BiD-McCormick* can still compute accurate solutions in minutes on the large-scale NYISO system but *BiD-KKT* cannot.

The tested NYISO system has 1814 buses, 2264 transmission lines, 1564 loads, 345 conventional generation, and 14 wind farms. The original number and capacity of wind farms are small, and only meet 4.4% of the total demand. We generate forecast scenarios of wind energy following the truncated normal distribution within the capacity. To simulate a high VRES level, we increase the capacity of wind farms so that the VRES penetration level reaches 70%, and upgrade the transmission capacity to 5 times, accordingly.

Table I presents the results of the system cost and computation time under *MyD*, *BiD-McCormick*, *BiD-KKT*, and *StD*. *BiD-McCormick* can compute solutions within minutes. The computation time increases linearly from 2.5 minutes to 20 minutes as the number of scenarios increases from 10 to 100. However, the conventional KKT method fails to give solutions within 2 hours for only 10 scenarios. The system cost under *BiD-McCormick* is almost the same as the ideal *StD*-benchmark. However, we also notice that the system cost reduction under *StD* compared with *MyD* is around 2.5%, which is relatively modest under the high VRES penetration level. In future work, including ramping constraints and unit commitment decisions may increase this gap.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this work, we propose a computationally efficient mechanism to adjust the VRES quantity in the day-ahead market,

which accounts for the uncertain real-time imbalance costs. The proposed scheme remains compatible with the existing sequential market-clearing structure. To facilitate efficient computation, we propose a linear relaxation for the bilevel problem based on strong duality and McCormick envelopes. We conduct numerical studies on both IEEE 118-bus and NYISO systems. The results show that the proposed technique achieves good performance in terms of both accuracy and scalability on large-scale systems. Furthermore, the economic benefit of the uncertainty-informed VRES-quantity adjustment is more significant under higher VRES levels. The proposed model can serve as a decision-support tool for the market operator, which can provide a benchmark enabling market efficiency improvements. In future work, we will include ramping constraints and reserve decisions, and further improve the tightness of the McCormick envelope.

REFERENCES

- [1] REN21, “Renewables 2021 global status report,” 2021.
- [2] D. S. Kirschen and G. Strbac, *Fundamentals of power system economics*. John Wiley & Sons, 2018.
- [3] “Wind and solar resource bidding, scheduling, dispatch, and settlement,” *NYISO: Technical Bulletin 154*, 2021.
- [4] J. M. Morales, A. J. Conejo, K. Liu, and J. Zhong, “Pricing electricity in pools with wind producers,” *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 1366–1376, 2012.
- [5] L. Exizidis, J. Kazempour, A. Papakonstantinou, P. Pinson, Z. De Grève, and F. Vallée, “Incentive-compatibility in a two-stage stochastic electricity market with high wind power penetration,” *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 2846–2858, July 2019.
- [6] J. Kazempour, P. Pinson, and B. F. Hobbs, “A stochastic market design with revenue adequacy and cost recovery by scenario: Benefits and costs,” *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 3531–3545, 2018.
- [7] J. M. Morales, M. Zugno, S. Pineda, and P. Pinson, “Electricity market clearing with improved scheduling of stochastic production,” *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 235, no. 3, pp. 765–774, 2014.
- [8] N. Viafora, S. Delikaraoglou, P. Pinson, G. Hug, and J. Holbl, “Dynamic reserve and transmission capacity allocation in wind-dominated power systems,” *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 2020.
- [9] S. Delikaraoglou and P. Pinson, “Optimal allocation of HVDC interconnections for exchange of energy and reserve capacity services,” *Energy Systems*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 635–675, 2019.
- [10] V. Dvorkin, S. Delikaraoglou, and J. M. Morales, “Setting reserve requirements to approximate the efficiency of the stochastic dispatch,” *IEEE Trans. on Power Systems*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 1524–1536, 2018.
- [11] S. Boyd, S. P. Boyd, and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- [12] G. P. McCormick, “Computability of global solutions to factorable nonconvex programs: Part I—convex underestimating problems,” *Mathematical programming*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 147–175, 1976.
- [13] “118 bus power flow test case,” accessed on 2022.10.31, http://labs.ece.uw.edu/pstca/pf118/pg_tca118bus.htm.
- [14] S. Greene, “NYISO network 2019,” University of Wisconsin-Madison, Tech. Rep., 2022.