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1. Why RL?

- Nature of the problems for power system control: optimal, nonlinear, stochastic, and fast.
  - RL is for optimal sequential decision making, which maximize an expected cumulative reward (certain objective).
  - Compared with optimization approaches (e.g., stochastic programing), RL can handle system nonlinearity and stochasticity more easily.
  - RL optimal control policy is trained offline through simulation and it only requires policy evaluation during real-time control, which provides great action readiness (suitable for scenarios that needs fast response).
- Optimal control problems suitable for RL: sequential optimal control with strong temporal dependency. Not good for snapshot optimization such as solving OPF.

2. What’s the problem?

- Distribution system load restoration with renewable and dispatchable DERs
  \[
  \max_{P_t, p_t^w, p_t^m, p_t^c \ (t \in T)} C = \sum_{t \in T} H^T P_t - \epsilon \sum_{t \in T} H^T [P_{t-1} - P_t]^+ - \beta 1^T P^\alpha
  \]
  - Sequential optimal control with temporal dependency and uncertainty.
  - Support the grid operator to take a sequence of fast, correct and coordinated actions for fast system recovery.
- For a proof of concept, in this paper, a single-bus distribution system is considered, from energy adequacy perspective.
3. How did it work?

- Compared the performance of an RL controller and a deterministic MPC, given imperfect forecast of future renewable generation.
  - RL controller learned from experience that the imperfect renewable forecast cannot be fully trusted; the policy learned shows a more stable performance when compared with the MPC’s performance.
  - RL controller’s performance does not deteriorate under unseen testing scenarios. (Good for real-world applications)

4. What’s next?

- Increase problem complexities:
  - System complexity: e.g., consider power flow (e.g., using OpenDSS for simulation) and other operational constraints.
  - Baseline complexity: e.g., use the state-of-the-art stochastic programming based controller as baseline.
  - Uncertainty complexity: e.g., consider uncertainty in upstream substation restoration time.
- Explore the techniques for selecting a proper training data (scenario diversity ↔ true distribution)
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Background

Many power system control problems require optimal and sometimes fast-response control to the nonlinear system with consideration of uncertainty. Oftentimes, these problems are solved by optimization-based approaches (e.g., model predictive control or stochastic programming). This study investigates an alternative controller based on reinforcement learning (RL).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RL</th>
<th>Optimization-based</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real-time computation</td>
<td>Light, involving only policy evaluation. Optimal control can be generated instantly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling nonlinearity</td>
<td>Able to learn control policies for non-linear systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling stochasticity</td>
<td>Able to use raw historical data, learn distribution implicitly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training requirement</td>
<td>Require, can be computationally intensive, offline.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study, the advantages of using RL as an alternative for solving a power system optimal control problem will be explored. A distribution system load restoration problem is presented here.
Load Restoration Problem V1 (Single Bus Case)

Objective:
During the upstream substation downtime, by leveraging renewable generations and properly controlling dispatchable generators accordingly, the control objective is to maximize the prioritized load pick-up with the consideration of the penalty for repeated load shedding and renewable curtailment.

Assumptions:
1. The network/power flow constraints are not considered.
2. Fuel for micro-turbine and the initial storage for battery are limited, and these two dispatchable resources alone are not sufficient to restore the system.
3. Only imperfect forecast for renewable generation is available.
4. The demand from each critical load ($p^i, \forall i \in \mathcal{L}$) is assumed to be time-invariant over the control horizon, and it can be partially restored.
5. The length of the restoration control horizon/upstream repair time is deterministic and known in advance (e.g., 6 hours.) and the control interval is five minutes.
Load Restoration Problem V1 (Single Bus Case)

\[ \mathbf{H} = [\eta^1, \eta^2, ..., \eta^N]^T \in \mathbb{R}^N \]
\[ \mathbf{P}_t = [p_t^1, p_t^2, ..., p_t^N]^T \in \mathbb{R}^N \]

Penalty term for shedding previously restored load.

Reward term for prioritized load restoration.

\[ \text{maximize} \quad \mathcal{C} = \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbf{H}^T \mathbf{P}_t - \epsilon \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbf{H}^T \left[ \mathbf{P}_{t-1} - \mathbf{P}_t \right]^+ - \beta \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{P}^\alpha \]  

subject to
\[ \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} p_t^g + \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{R}} \hat{p}_t^\tau - p_t^\alpha = \mathbf{1}^T \mathbf{P}_t \]
\[ 0 \leq \mathbf{P}_t \leq \mathbf{P} \]
\[ p_t^\mu \leq \bar{p}_t^\mu \leq \underline{p}^\mu \]
\[ \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} p_t^\mu \cdot \tau \leq E^\mu \]
\[ -p_t^{\theta, ch} \leq p_t^\theta \leq p_t^{\theta, dis} \]
\[ S_{t+1}^\theta = \mathcal{F}(S_t^\theta, p_t^\theta) \]
\[ S_{t+1}^\theta \leq S_t^\theta \leq S_{t+1}^\theta \]
\[ S_0^\theta = s_0 \]

Penalty term for renewable curtailment.

Notations:

PV: \( \rho \)
Wind: \( \omega \)
Storage: \( \theta \)
Micro Turbine: \( \mu \)
Curtailment: \( \alpha \)

\( \mathcal{R} = \{ \rho, \omega \} \)
\( \mathcal{G} = \{ \theta, \mu \} \)
RL Formulation and Learning

- **RL Markov decision process (MDP) formulation**

  **State Space:**
  \[ s_t = \left[ P^p_t, P^\omega_t, S^\theta_t, E^\mu_t, \frac{TP_t}{T_P}, t \right] \in \mathbb{R}^{24} \]

  - Renewable prediction (imperfect) for the next hour
  - Current system status
  - Current control step

  **Action Space:**
  \[ a_t = [p_t^\mu, p_t^\theta, p_t^\alpha] \in \mathbb{R}^3 \]

  **Reward structure:**
  \[ r_t = H^T P_t - H^T [P_{t-1} - P_t]^+ - \beta p_t^\alpha \]

- **RL Objective**

  Train an optimal control policy that maximize the control rewards:
  \[ \pi^* = \arg\max_{\pi_w \in \Pi} \mathbb{E}_{\pi}[\sum_{t \in T} \gamma^t r_t] \]

  where \( \pi_w \) is a parameterized control policy \( (a_t = \pi_w(s_t)) \), which is usually instantiated by a neural network in deep RL.

  A policy gradient algorithm uses gradient ascent for policy training:
  \[ w^{t+1} = w^t + \alpha \nabla_w J(w) = w^t + \alpha \nabla \mathbb{E}_{\pi_w}[\sum_{t \in T} \gamma^t r_t] \]
Controller Evaluation

- **Baseline controller**

Baseline: a deterministic model predictive control (MPC) based controller based on mixed integer linear programming (MILP) is used.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{maximize} & \quad C = \sum_{t \in T} H^T P_t - \epsilon \sum_{t \in T} H^T [P_{t-1} - P_t]^+ - \beta 1^T P^\alpha \\
\end{align*}
\]

- Only imperfect forecast for renewable generations are available and are updated every time step.
- Optimization problems are solved at each control interval with reduce planning horizon.

- **Experimenting framework**

[Diagram showing the framework with blocks labeled: Renewable Generation Data Pool (Training/Testing), Scenario Sampler, Predictor, Controller, Load Restoration System Simulator, and variables.]
Case Study
(Experiment Settings)

- Using an RL algorithm based on evolution strategies*

- Training was conducted on ten computing nodes of the NREL high-performance computing system.

- Policy converged in one hour, around 140 million steps of experience. (Yes, ES-RL is known to have low sample efficiency, but the wall-time training efficiency is okay.)

---


---

**Parameters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Var</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>[1.0, 1.0, 0.9, 0.85, 0.8, 0.65, 0.45, 0.4, 0.3, 0.3]</td>
<td>(p^\mu, p^\nu)</td>
<td>[0, 300]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>[33, 34, 8.5, 85, 60, 60, 58, 115, 64, 85]</td>
<td>(E^\mu)</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\mathcal{T})</td>
<td>[1, 2, ..., 72]</td>
<td>((p^{\theta,des}, p^{\theta,eh}))</td>
<td>[200, 200]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\mathcal{L})</td>
<td>[1, 2, ..., 10]</td>
<td>(s_0)</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>[0, 300]</td>
<td>((S^{\theta}, S^{\theta}))</td>
<td>[160, 800]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind</td>
<td>[0, 150]</td>
<td>(\tau)</td>
<td>1/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\epsilon)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(\beta)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Learning curve

---

Exogenous data splitting
Case Study
(Results for the single-bus system)

Single Scenario

- Load 1 (Highest priority) → Load 10 (Lowest priority)
- RL controller starts with less load restored, but gradually picks up more in a monotonic manner.
- MPC starts high, but Load 8 receives intermittent service and finally fully shed together with Load 7.

Multiple Scenarios

- In general, RLC can achieve a higher reward when compared with the objective function value of the deterministic MPC. RLC shows a relatively more stable behavior (less variance over different scenarios).

### TABLE II
**Average Objective Fn. Values over 25 Scenarios in Each Case**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controller</th>
<th>Scenarios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPC</td>
<td>15811.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLC</td>
<td>17633.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal:
Using DERs for distribution system load restoration after a substation outage.

Specific Objective:
During the upstream substation downtime, maximizing the prioritized load pick-up with the consideration of the penalty for repeated load shedding and renewable curtailment.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{maximize} & \quad P^t, P^e, P^d, P^c \quad (t \in T) \\
\text{subject to} & \quad (1) + \text{other operational penalty (e.g., voltage deviation, line limit)} \\
& \quad (2) - (9) \\
& \quad \text{+ power flow network constraints, both active and reactive power.}
\end{align*}
\]
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