

Convergence Guarantees of a Distributed Network Equivalence Algorithm for Distribution-OPF

Yunqi Luo, Rabayet Sadnan, *Student Member, IEEE*, Bala Krishnamoorthy, and Anamika Dubey, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—The massive integration of distributed energy resources changes the operational demands of the electric power distribution system, motivating optimization-based approaches. The added computational complexities of the resulting optimal power flow (OPF) problem have generally been managed by approximated or relaxed models; however, they may lead to infeasible or inaccurate solutions. Decomposition-based methods have also been used to solve the OPF problems. But the existing methods require several message passing rounds for relatively small systems, causing significant delays in decision making; related feedback-based methods also suffer from slow tracking of the optimal solutions. In this paper, we propose a provably convergent distributed algorithm to solve the nonlinear OPF problem for power distribution systems. Our method is based on a previously developed decomposition-based optimization method that employs the network equivalence method. We present a thorough mathematical analysis that includes sufficient conditions that guarantee convergence of the method. We also present simulation results using the IEEE-123 bus test system to demonstrate the algorithm’s effectiveness and provide additional insights into theoretical results.

Index Terms—Distributed optimization, optimal power flow, power distribution systems, Method of multipliers.

I. INTRODUCTION

The nature and the requirements of power systems, especially at the distribution level, are rapidly changing with the large-scale integration of controllable distributed energy resources (DERs). Optimal power flow (OPF) methods have emerged as a possible mechanism to coordinate DERs for specified grid services [1], [2]. However, the nonconvex power flow constraints in the distribution OPF (D-OPF) problem pose significant computational challenges that increase drastically with the size of the distribution systems. Existing methods manage the computational challenges using convex relaxation or linear approximation techniques that may lead to infeasible power flow solutions or high optimality gap [3]–[5]. On the other hand, decomposition approaches based on the Augmented Lagrangian Method (ALM) and its variant, the Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM), have been applied successfully to scale ACOPF problems for large feeders [6], [7]. In a series of early papers, Baldick et al. applied a linearized ALM to a regional decomposition of ACOPF [8]–[10]. Peng and Low applied ADMM to certain convex relaxations of ACOPF on radial networks [11]–[13]. Computational efficiency of ADMM has been reported in practice for nonconvex ACOPF as well [14]–[18], with convergence

guarantees studied under certain technical assumptions [17], [19]. Along with computational advantages, the distributed methods can be used to coordinate the decisions of physically distributed agents, provide added robustness to single-point failure, and reduce communication overheads [20].

Unfortunately, generic distributed optimization algorithms such as ADMM do not guarantee convergence for a general nonconvex optimization problem and may take a many message-passing rounds to converge to a local optimal solution. Specific to the D-OPF problem, the existing methods require a large number of message-passing rounds among the agents (on the order of 10^2 – 10^3) to converge for a single-step optimization, which is not preferred from both distributed computing and distributed coordination standpoints [21]–[24]. When used for distributed coordination, many communication rounds or message-passing events among distributed agents increases the time-of-convergence (ToC) and results in significant delays with decision-making. Some of these challenges are mitigated by distributed online controllers; however, they also take several time-steps to track the optimal decisions [25]–[30].

To address these challenges, we recently proposed a distributed algorithm for the optimization of radial distribution systems based on the equivalence of networks principle [20], [31]. The proposed approach solves the original non-convex OPF problem for power distribution systems using a novel decomposition technique that leverages the structure of the power flow problem. The use of problem structure in our distributed algorithm results in a significant reduction in the number of message-passing rounds needed to converge to an optimal solution by orders of magnitude ($\sim 10^2$). This results in significant advantages over generic application of distributed optimization techniques for distributed computing or distributed coordination in radial power distribution systems. However, our previous work requires solving a generic nonlinear optimization problem at each distributed node and does not provide any convergence guarantees.

The objective of this paper to develop a provably convergent distributed optimization algorithm to solve D-OPF problems in a radial power distribution system. Our decomposition approach is based on the structure of power flow problem in radial distribution systems and employs method of multipliers to solve the distributed subproblems exchanging specific power flow. Then, we present a comprehensive mathematical analysis on the convergence of the proposed approach and how it relates to the structural decomposition of the problem and problem-specific variables. Standard sufficiency conditions for optimality in nonlinear optimization [32] could be used to derive a set of conditions that guarantee convergence of

YL is with University of Science and Technology of China, RS and AD are with EECS, Washington State University, Pullman and, BK is with Mathematics and Statistics, Washington State University, Vancouver. YL and BK acknowledge funding from NSF through grant 1819229. E-mail: anamika.dubey@wsu.edu.

local systems within a single time step. While the distributed nature stemming from the decomposition approach of our algorithm leads to its strong performances, the same setting poses considerable challenges to derive theoretical convergence guarantees over the entire network and also over time. As we employ a decomposition approach that solves local subsystems to optimality followed by communication rounds to achieve global convergence, we develop a similar strategy to derive guarantees for the same. To this end, we specify an additional condition on the convergence of voltage over time (Eqn. 11) which when satisfied along with second order sufficient conditions for the local subsystem provide guarantees of its convergence over time. We then utilize the structure of the network to derive a set of conditions that guarantee convergence of a *line network* in a sequential fashion starting from the root node and propagating the convergence down the line in subsequent time steps. Our analysis results in a relationship among power flow variables (which is trivially satisfied for a well-designed power distribution system) under which the proposed distributed optimization approach shows linear convergence. Finally, we validate the efficacy of the proposed approach by solving multiple distribution-level OPF problems. We also use simulations to provide additional insights into the convergence properties.

II. MODELING AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

In this paper $(\cdot)^{(t)}$ represents the variable at time step t , $(\underline{\cdot})$ and $(\bar{\cdot})$ denote the minimum and maximum limit of any quantity, respectively, and $\tilde{j} = \sqrt{-1}$. We assume a radial single-phase power distribution network, where \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{E} denote the set of nodes and edges of the system. Here, edge $ij \in \mathcal{E}$ identifies the distribution lines connecting the ordered pair of buses (i, j) and is weighted with the series impedance of the line, represented by $r_{ij} + \tilde{j}x_{ij}$. The set of load buses and DER buses are denoted by \mathcal{N}_L and \mathcal{N}_D , respectively.

A. Network and DER Model

Let, node i be the unique parent node and node k is the children node for the controllable node j , i.e., $k : j \rightarrow k$ where, $\{jk\} \in \mathcal{E}$. We denote v_j and l_{ij} as the squared magnitude of voltage and current flow at node j and in branch $\{ij\}$, respectively. The network is modeled using the nonlinear branch flow equations [33] shown in Eqn. (1). Here, $p_{L_j} + \tilde{j}q_{L_j}$ is the load connected at node $j \in \mathcal{N}_L$, $P_{ij}, Q_{ij} \in \mathcal{R}$ are the sending-end active and reactive power flows for the edge ij , and $p_{D_j} + \tilde{j}q_{D_j}$ is the power output of the DER connected at node $j \in \mathcal{N}_D$.

$$P_{ij} - r_{ij}l_{ij} - p_{L_j} + p_{D_j} = \sum_{k:j \rightarrow k} P_{jk} \quad (1a)$$

$$Q_{ij} - x_{ij}l_{ij} - q_{L_j} + q_{D_j} = \sum_{k:j \rightarrow k} Q_{jk} \quad (1b)$$

$$v_j = v_i - 2(r_{ij}P_{ij} + x_{ij}Q_{ij}) + (r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2)l_{ij} \quad (1c)$$

$$v_i l_{ij} = P_{ij}^2 + Q_{ij}^2 \quad (1d)$$

The DERs are modeled as Photovoltaic modules (PVs) interfaced using smart inverters, capable of two-quadrant operation. At the controllable node $j \in \mathcal{N}_D$, the real power generation by

the DER, p_{D_j} is assumed to be known (measured), however, the reactive power generation, q_{D_j} , is assumed controllable and modeled as the decision variable. With the rating of the DER connected at node $j \in \mathcal{N}_D$ denoted as S_{DR_j} , the limits on q_{D_j} are given by Eqn. (2).

$$-\sqrt{S_{DR_j}^2 - p_{D_j}^2} \leq q_{D_j} \leq \sqrt{S_{DR_j}^2 - p_{D_j}^2} \quad (2)$$

B. Problem Formulation and Algorithm

We recently [31] developed a real-time distributed controller to solve OPF problems for distribution systems, and the method is a variant of nodal-level extension of previously developed distributed OPF [20]. In this section, we develop a similar approach for distributed OPF termed *ENDiCo-OPF* by decomposing the overall problem at each node that is solved using the decomposition method developed previously [20]. All controllable nodes in the system receive updated computed voltage and power flow quantities from their parent and children nodes, respectively, and in parallel calculate their optimum dispatches. Briefly, each node $j \in \mathcal{N}_D$ solves a small-scale OPF problem defined by SYSTEM (P1) in Eqn. (3). The reactive power dispatch q_{D_j} is controlled to minimize some cost/objective function \mathbf{f} . Note that the resulting nonlinear optimization problem is in five variables, $\{P_{ij}, Q_{ij}, v_j, l_{ij}, q_{D_j}\}$, with four equality and five inequality constraints. Some examples of the cost function \mathbf{f} include active power loss ($\mathbf{f} = r_{ij}l_{ij}$) and voltage deviation ($\mathbf{f} = (v_j - v_{\text{ref}})^2$), among others. The ENDiCo-OPF assumes the parent node voltage and the power flow to the children node to be constant and solves the problem (P1) locally for the reduced network. Steps of ENDiCo-OPF are presented in Algorithm 1. We work under the following standard assumption.

Assumption 1. *All the nodes in the network have an agent that can measure its local power flow quantities (node voltages and line flows) and communicate with neighboring nodes.*

$$(P1) \quad \min \mathbf{f}^{(t)} \quad (3a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad P_{ij}^{(t)} - r_{ij}l_{ij}^{(t)} - p_{L_j}^{(t)} + p_{D_j}^{(t)} = \sum_{k:j \rightarrow k} P_{jk}^{(t-1)} \quad (3b)$$

$$Q_{ij}^{(t)} - x_{ij}l_{ij}^{(t)} - q_{L_j}^{(t)} + q_{D_j}^{(t)} = \sum_{k:j \rightarrow k} Q_{jk}^{(t-1)} \quad (3c)$$

$$v_j^{(t)} = v_i^{(t-1)} - 2(r_{ij}P_{ij}^{(t)} + x_{ij}Q_{ij}^{(t)}) + (r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2)l_{ij}^{(t)} \quad (3d)$$

$$l_{ij}^{(t)} = \frac{(P_{ij}^{(t)})^2 + (Q_{ij}^{(t)})^2}{v_i^{(t-1)}} \quad (3e)$$

$$\underline{V}^2 \leq v_j^{(t)} \leq \bar{V}^2 \quad (3f)$$

$$-\sqrt{S_{DR_j}^2 - p_{D_j}^2} \leq q_{D_j}^{(t)} \leq \sqrt{S_{DR_j}^2 - p_{D_j}^2} \quad (3g)$$

$$l_{ij}^{(t)} \leq (I_{ij}^{\text{rated}})^2 \quad (3h)$$

Here, $\underline{V} = 0.95$ and $\bar{V} = 1.05$ pu are the limits on bus voltages, and I_{ij}^{rated} is the thermal limit for the branch $\{ij\}$.

While the optimization problem (P1) in eq. (4) was solved by a commercial solver previously [31], we introduce a subroutine in Algorithm 2 for Step 3 where (P1) is solved using an Augmented Lagrangian Multiplier (ALM) method.

Algorithm 1: Equivalence of Network-based Distributed Controller for OPF (ENDiCo-OPF)

Node : $\forall j \in \mathcal{N}_D$
Time Step : t
Calculate : q_{Dj}^*
Receive : $v_i^{(t-1)}$ and $P_{jk_i}^{(t-1)} + \tilde{j}Q_{jk_i}^{(t-1)}$
Transmit : $v_j^{(t)}$ and $P_{ij}^{(t)} + \tilde{j}Q_{ij}^{(t)}$

ENDiCo-OPF Steps :

- 1 Calculate $\sum P_{jk}^{(t-1)} + \tilde{j}Q_{jk}^{(t-1)}$ from all the $P_{jk_i}^{(t-1)} + \tilde{j}Q_{jk_i}^{(t-1)}$, received from child nodes $k_i \in \mathcal{N}_{jk}$
- 2 Approximate the upstream and downstream network of line (i, j) with fixed value of $v_i^{(t-1)}$ and $\sum P_{jk}^{(t-1)} + \tilde{j}Q_{jk}^{(t-1)}$
- 3 Solve optimization problem (P1) for time step (t) , i.e.,

$$q_{Dj}^* = \arg \min_{q_{Dj}} \mathbf{F}^{(t)}(q_{Dj}) \quad (4)$$

Set Reactive power output $q_{Dj}^{(t)} = q_{Dj}^*$

- 4 Calculate the node voltage $v_j^{(t)}$ at node j and complex power flow $P_{ij}^{(t)} + \tilde{j}Q_{ij}^{(t)}$ in the line (i, j)
 - 5 Sends $v_j^{(t)}$ and $P_{ij}^{(t)} + \tilde{j}Q_{ij}^{(t)}$ to child node k and parent node i , respectively
 - 6 Receives $v_i^{(t)}$ and $P_{jk_i}^{(t)} + \tilde{j}Q_{jk_i}^{(t)}$ from parent and child nodes, respectively
 - 7 Move forward to the next time step $(t + 1)$
-

This generalized algorithm is a minor modification of the classical ALM algorithm [32].

To describe the steps in the subroutine (and for presenting the main results on convergence of ENDiCo-OPF), we first write the optimization model (P1) in Eqn. (3) in standard form. We set the local variables of the bus j at time step t as

$$\mathbf{z}_j = \left[P_{ij}^{(t)} \quad Q_{ij}^{(t)} \quad v_j^{(t)} \quad l_{ij}^{(t)} \quad q_{Dj}^{(t)} \right]^T. \quad (5)$$

We also write the set of four equality constraints in Eqns. 3b–3e as $\mathcal{A}_p(\mathbf{z}_j) = 0$ for $p = 1-4$ and the five inequality constraints in Eqns. 3f–3h as $\mathcal{B}_r(\mathbf{z}_j) \leq 0$ for $r = 1-5$. Finally, setting $R_{ij} = [0 \ 0 \ 0 \ r_{ij} \ 0]^T$ we rewrite the original system as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & f(\mathbf{z}_j) = R_{ij}^T \mathbf{z}_j \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbf{z}_j) = 0 \quad p = 1, \dots, 4 \\ & \mathcal{B}_r(\mathbf{z}_j) \leq 0 \quad r = 1, \dots, 5 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{P1}')$$

For the rest of the paper, we refer to the ENDiCo-OPF in Algorithm 1 using the subroutine in Algorithm 2 as simply ENDiCo-OPF.

III. CONVERGENCE ANALYSIS

We present theoretical guarantees for the convergence of the ENDiCo-OPF algorithm under certain standard assumptions on the network topology and structural properties of the distribution system. We use the method of Lagrangian multipliers from nonlinear optimization coupled with techniques from linear algebra to derive the convergence property of ENDiCo-OPF. We (i) first study the convergence of the simplest structure of a distributed network for a single time

Algorithm 2: Subroutine for Step 3 of ENDiCo-OPF

- 1 Initialize: Given $v_i^{(t-1)}$ and $\sum_{k:j \rightarrow k} (P_{jk}^{(t-1)} + \tilde{j}Q_{jk}^{(t-1)})$ from ENDiCo of time step $(t - 1)$. Let $m = 1$, initialize positive multipliers $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^0, \boldsymbol{\mu}^0$ and penalty parameter $c^0 > 0$. Fix the time step t .
- 2 Solve the subproblem (P1') by quadratic penalty method to obtain the solution \mathbf{z}_j^m .

Update the multipliers as

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{m+1} &= \boldsymbol{\lambda}^m + c^m \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{z}_j^m) \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}^{m+1} &= \max\{0, \boldsymbol{\mu}_j^m + c^m \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{z}_j^m)\} \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{z}_j^m minimizes the augmented Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} L_{c^m}(\mathbf{z}_j, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^m, \boldsymbol{\mu}^m) &= f(\mathbf{z}_j) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^m \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{z}_j) + \frac{c^m}{2} \|\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{z}_j)\|^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{2c^m} \sum_{j=1}^5 \{(\max\{0, \boldsymbol{\mu}_j^m + c^m \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{z}_j)\})^2 - (\boldsymbol{\mu}_j^m)^2\} \end{aligned}$$

with the penalty parameter c^m .

- 3 **if** $\|q_{Dj}^{(m+1)} - q_{Dj}^{(m)}\| \geq \epsilon^{\text{sub}}$ **then**
 - Set $\mathbf{z}_j = \mathbf{z}_j^m$ and $c^{m+1} \geq c^m$;
 - Set $m = m + 1$ and go to Step 2.
 - else**
 - Stop and return \mathbf{z}_j^m .
 - end**
-

step (section III-A). As a first step toward generalizing this property to multiple time steps as well as to general networks, we present a slight modification of the ENDiCo-OPF algorithm using a new convergence parameter Δ (section III-B). We (ii) derive conditions that guarantee the convergence of the Δ -ENDiCo-OPF algorithm for a local system over time steps (section III-C). Then we (iii) generalize the problem to achieve a network-level convergence guarantee for line networks (section III-D). We introduce auxiliary variables to measure the difference of variable values between the adjacent time steps in the process of proving global convergence of ENDiCo-OPF over time for line networks.

A. Proof of Local Convergence

We first study the convergence of the ENDiCo-OPF algorithm at a local level on a *subsystem*, which refers to a system with only one communication layer that contains a middle node to receive voltages from a parent node as well as power flows from its children nodes (fig. 1). The system consists of nodes $\{i, j, k\}$ when there is a single child node, or nodes $\{i, j, k_1, \dots, k_l\}$ in general when there are l child nodes. We assume that the system conditions are changing at a slower rate than the decision variables.

We introduce auxiliary variables φ_r to convert the inequality constraints in the system (P1') to equations.

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & f(\mathbf{z}_j) = R_{ij}^T \mathbf{z}_j \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathcal{A}_p(\mathbf{z}_j) = 0 \quad p = 1, \dots, 4 \\ & \mathcal{B}_r(\mathbf{z}_j) + \varphi_r^2 = 0 \quad r = 1, \dots, 5 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{P2})$$

We apply second order sufficiency conditions [32, §3.2] that guarantee when \mathbf{z}_j^* is a strict local minimum of the objective function f in the system (P2) under standard assumptions.




Fig. 1: Two instances of single subsystem networks

Proposition 2 ([32], Proposition 3.2.1). Assume f and $\mathcal{A}_p, \mathcal{B}_r$ in the System (P2) are twice continuously differentiable for all p, r and let $\mathbf{z}_j^* \in \mathbb{R}^n, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^* \in \mathbb{R}^p$, and $\boldsymbol{\mu}^* \in \mathbb{R}^r$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\mathbf{z}_j} L(\mathbf{z}_j^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*, \boldsymbol{\mu}^*) &= 0, \quad \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} L(\mathbf{z}_j^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*, \boldsymbol{\mu}^*) = 0, \\ \nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} L(\mathbf{z}_j^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*, \boldsymbol{\mu}^*) &= 0, \quad \text{and} \\ a^T \nabla_{\mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j} L(\mathbf{z}_j^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*, \boldsymbol{\mu}^*) a &> 0 \text{ for all } a \neq 0 \text{ with} \\ [\nabla \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{z}_j^*) \quad \nabla \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{z}_j^*)]^T a &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Then \mathbf{z}_j^* is a strict local minimum of f .

We now present the theorem that specifies a basic condition under which the ENDiCo-OPF algorithm is guaranteed to converge for a single time step on single subsystem networks as shown in fig. 1. We show that this condition always holds for power systems operating under standard settings. To specify the result, we consider the augmented Lagrangian function for the System (P2) for penalty parameter $c > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} L_c(\mathbf{z}_j, \boldsymbol{\varphi}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) &= f(\mathbf{z}_j) + \boldsymbol{\lambda}^T \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{z}_j) + \frac{c}{2} \|\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{z}_j)\|^2 + \\ &\boldsymbol{\mu}^T (\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{z}_j) + \boldsymbol{\varphi}^2) + \frac{c}{2} \|\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{z}_j) + \boldsymbol{\varphi}^2\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Theorem 3. Assume f and $\mathcal{A}_p, \mathcal{B}_r$ in the System (P2) are twice continuously differentiable for all p, r and there exists a threshold penalty parameter \bar{c} in the augmented Lagrangian (eq. (6)). If

$$v_i^{(t-1)} - 4P_{ij}^{(t)} r_{ij}^{(t)} - 4Q_{ij}^{(t)} x_{ij}^{(t)} > 0, \quad (7)$$

then the ENDiCo-OPF algorithm converges for a single time-step t for all $c > \bar{c}$.

Before presenting the proof, we note that the main condition in eq. (7) holds for typical values that the variables take in power systems. At the same time, this is a sufficient condition—local convergence could happen even when eq. (7) does not hold.

Proof. We obtain this result from the application of Proposition 2. We first consider the gradient of the Lagrangian

function in eq. (6) with respect to \mathbf{z}_j . We use the equations specifying the constraints in the System (P2) to simplify the expression for the gradient, and for the sake of brevity, we suppress the subscript of \mathbf{z}_j of ∇ for the terms on the right-hand side.

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\mathbf{z}_j} L_c(\mathbf{z}_j, \boldsymbol{\varphi}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) &= \nabla f(\mathbf{z}_j) + \nabla \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{z}_j)(\boldsymbol{\lambda} + c\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{z}_j)) \\ &+ \nabla \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{z}_j)(\boldsymbol{\mu} + c(\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{z}_j) + \boldsymbol{\varphi}^2)) \\ &= \nabla f(\mathbf{z}_j) + \boldsymbol{\lambda} \nabla \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{z}_j) + \boldsymbol{\mu} \nabla \mathcal{B}(\mathbf{z}_j) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

We work under the assumption that there exist Lagrangian multipliers $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^*, \boldsymbol{\mu}^*$ and variables $\mathbf{z}_j^*, \boldsymbol{\varphi}^*$ that satisfy $\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_j} L_c(\mathbf{z}_j^*, \boldsymbol{\varphi}^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^*, \boldsymbol{\mu}^*) = 0$.

The main technical work is involved in specifying the structure of the Hessian such that Proposition 2 will hold. To this end, we first note that the last sufficient condition specified in Proposition 2 can be shown to hold by equivalently showing that the Hessian $\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j}^2 L_c$ is positive definite. We assume the time step t is fixed, use the expression for \mathbf{z}_j in eq. (5), suppress the superscripts (t) of variables, let v_i represent $v_i^{(t-1)}$, and let $d_j = \lambda_4^*$ to get the Hessian as

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j}^2 L_c(\mathbf{z}_j, \boldsymbol{\varphi}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = d_j \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} + cM \quad (9)$$

where $M =$

$$\begin{bmatrix} 4r_{ij}^2 + 4P_{ij}^2 + 1 & 4r_{ij}x_{ij} + 4P_{ij}Q_{ij} \\ 4r_{ij}x_{ij} + 4P_{ij}Q_{ij} & 4x_{ij}^2 + 4Q_{ij}^2 + 1 \\ 2r_{ij} & 2x_{ij} \\ -r_{ij} - 2r_{ij}(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) - 2P_{ij}v_i & -x_{ij} - 2x_{ij}(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) - 2Q_{ij}v_i \\ 0 & 1 \\ 2r_{ij} & -r_{ij} - 2r_{ij}(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) - 2P_{ij}v_i & 0 \\ 2x_{ij} & -x_{ij} - 2x_{ij}(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) - 2Q_{ij}v_i & 1 \\ 1 & -(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) & 0 \\ -(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) & r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2 + (r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2)^2 + v_i^2 & -x \\ 0 & -x_{ij} & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

We simplify the expression in eq. (9) to obtain the following expression for the Hessian, which we investigate in detail.

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j}^2 L_c(\mathbf{z}_j, \boldsymbol{\varphi}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = cM' \quad (10)$$

where $M' =$

$$\begin{bmatrix} 4r_{ij}^2 + 4P_{ij}^2 + 1 + (2d_j/c) & 4r_{ij}x_{ij} + 4P_{ij}Q_{ij} \\ 4r_{ij}x_{ij} + 4P_{ij}Q_{ij} & 4x_{ij}^2 + 4Q_{ij}^2 + 1 + (2d_j/c) \\ 2r_{ij} & 2x_{ij} \\ -r_{ij} - 2r_{ij}(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) - 2P_{ij}v_i & -x_{ij} - 2x_{ij}(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) - 2Q_{ij}v_i \\ 0 & 1 \\ 2r_{ij} & -r_{ij} - 2r_{ij}(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) - 2P_{ij}v_i & 0 \\ 2x_{ij} & -x_{ij} - 2x_{ij}(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) - 2Q_{ij}v_i & 1 \\ 1 & -(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) & 0 \\ -(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) & r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2 + (r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2)^2 + v_i^2 & -x \\ 0 & -x_{ij} & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Given that $c > 0$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} > \mathbf{0}$, we can show that the Hessian in eq. (10) is positive definite if M' is so. And we can show that the 5×5 matrix M' is positive definite by checking that all its five upper left subdeterminants are positive [34, Chapter 6.5].

1) 1×1 upper-left subdeterminant: We get that

$$4r_{ij}^2 + 4P_{ij}^2 + 1 + (2d_j/c) > 0$$

since $d_j = \lambda_4^* > 0$ and $c > 0$, and from the observation that $r_{ij}^2, P_{ij}^2 \geq 0$.

2) 2×2 upper-left subdeterminant:

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{vmatrix} 4r_{ij}^2 + 4P_{ij}^2 + 1 + (2d_j/c) & 4r_{ij}x_{ij} + 4P_{ij}Q_{ij} \\ 4r_{ij}x_{ij} + 4P_{ij}Q_{ij} & 4x_{ij}^2 + 4Q_{ij}^2 + 1 + (2d_j/c) \end{vmatrix} \\ &= 16(r_{ij}^2Q_{ij}^2 + P_{ij}^2x_{ij}^2) + 4(r_{ij}^2 + P_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2 + Q_{ij}^2) + \\ & (1/c)(8x_{ij}^2d_j + 8r_{ij}^2d_j + 8P_{ij}^2d_j + 8Q_{ij}^2d_j + 4d_j + (4d_j^2/c)) \\ & - 32r_{ij}Q_{ij}P_{ij}x_{ij} \\ & \geq 4(r_{ij}^2 + P_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2 + Q_{ij}^2) + \\ & (1/c)(8x_{ij}^2d_j + 8r_{ij}^2d_j + 8P_{ij}^2d_j + 8Q_{ij}^2d_j + 4d_j + (4d_j^2/c)) \\ & > 0 \end{aligned}$$

since $(4r_{ij}Q_{ij} - 4P_{ij}x_{ij})^2 \geq 0$, $d_j = \lambda_4^* > 0$, and $c > 0$.

3) 3×3 upper-left subdeterminant: Expanding along the third row, for instance, gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{vmatrix} 4r_{ij}^2 + 4P_{ij}^2 + 1 + 2d_j/c & 4r_{ij}x_{ij} + 4P_{ij}Q_{ij} & 2r_{ij} \\ 4r_{ij}x_{ij} + 4P_{ij}Q_{ij} & 4x_{ij}^2 + 4Q_{ij}^2 + 1 + 2d_j/c & 2x_{ij} \\ 2r_{ij} & 2x_{ij} & 1 \end{vmatrix} \\ &= [16(Q_{ij}^2r_{ij}^2 + P_{ij}^2Q_{ij}^2) + 4(r_{ij}^2 + P_{ij}^2 + Q_{ij}^2) + \\ & (1/c)(8r_{ij}^2d_j + 8P_{ij}^2d_j + 8Q_{ij}^2d_j + 4d_j + (4d_j^2/c)) + 1] \\ & - (16P_{ij}Q_{ij}r_{ij}x_{ij} + 16P_{ij}^2Q_{ij}^2) + \\ & (16P_{ij}Q_{ij}r_{ij}x_{ij} - 16Q_{ij}^2r_{ij}^2 - 4r_{ij}^2 - (1/c)8r_{ij}^2d_j) \\ &= 4(P_{ij}^2 + Q_{ij}^2) + (1/c)(8P_{ij}^2d_j + 8Q_{ij}^2d_j + 4d_j + (4d_j^2/c)) \\ & + 1 \\ & > 0 \end{aligned}$$

following the same observations as before.

4) 4×4 upper-left subdeterminant: Expanding along the fourth row gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{vmatrix} 4r_{ij}^2 + 4P_{ij}^2 + 1 + (2d_j/c) & 4r_{ij}x_{ij} + 4P_{ij}Q_{ij} & 2r_{ij} & 2x_{ij} \\ 4r_{ij}x_{ij} + 4P_{ij}Q_{ij} & 4x_{ij}^2 + 4Q_{ij}^2 + 1 + (2d_j/c) & 2x_{ij} & 1 \\ -r_{ij} - 2r_{ij}(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) - 2P_{ij}v_i & -x_{ij} - 2x_{ij}(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) - 2Q_{ij}v_i & 2r_{ij} & -r_{ij} - 2r_{ij}(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) - 2P_{ij}v_i \\ & & 2x_{ij} & -x_{ij} - 2x_{ij}(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) - 2Q_{ij}v_i \\ & & 1 & -(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) \\ & & -(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) & r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2 + (r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2)^2 + v_i^2 \end{vmatrix} \\ &= [r_{ij} + 2r_{ij}(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) + 2P_{ij}v_i] [4x_{ij}P_{ij}Q_{ij} - 4r_{ij}Q_{ij}^2 \\ & - 2P_{ij}v_i - r - (1/c)(2d_jr_{ij} + 4d_jP_{ij}v_i)] \\ & + [-x_{ij} - 2x_{ij}(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) - 2Q_{ij}v_i] [4P_{ij}^2x_{ij} - 4r_{ij}P_{ij}Q_{ij} \\ & + 2Q_{ij}v_i + x + (1/c)(2d_jx_{ij} + 4d_jQ_{ij}v_i)] \\ & + [r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2] [-16P_{ij}Q_{ij}r_{ij}v_i + 4r_{ij}^2Q_{ij}^2 + 4x_{ij}^2P_{ij}^2 - 4r_{ij}^2P_{ij}^2 \\ & - 4x_{ij}^2Q_{ij}^2 + 4x_{ij}Q_{ij}v_i + 4P_{ij}v_i r_{ij} + r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2] \\ & - (1/c) [8d_jx_{ij}^2P_{ij}^2 + 8d_jr_{ij}^2P_{ij}^2 + 8d_jx_{ij}^2Q_{ij}^2 - 8d_jx_{ij}Q_{ij}v_i + \\ & 8d_jQ_{ij}^2r_{ij}^2 - 8d_jP_{ij}r_{ij}v_i + (1/c)(4d_j^2x_{ij}^2 + 4d_j^2r_{ij}^2)] \\ & + [r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2 + (r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2)^2 + v_i^2] [4P_{ij}^2 + 4Q_{ij}^2 + 1 + \\ & (1/c)(8d_jQ_{ij}^2 + 8d_jP_{ij}^2 + 4d_j + (4d_j^2/c))] \\ &= 8x_{ij}P_{ij}Q_{ij}v_i + 4P_{ij}^2r_{ij}^2 + 4Q_{ij}^2x_{ij}^2 + \\ & v_i(v_i - 4P_{ij}r_{ij} - 4x_{ij}Q_{ij}) + (1/c)[8d_jP_{ij}^2r_{ij}^2 + 8d_jQ_{ij}^2r_{ij}^2 + \\ & 8d_jP_{ij}^2x_{ij}^2 + 8d_jQ_{ij}^2x_{ij}^2 + 2d_jv_i^2 + 2d_jv_i(v_i - 4P_{ij}r_{ij} - 4x_{ij}Q_{ij}) \\ & + 2d_jr_{ij}^2 + 2d_jx_{ij}^2 + (1/c)(4d_j^2r_{ij}^2 + 4d_j^2x_{ij}^2 + 4d_j^2v_i^2)] \\ & > 0 \end{aligned}$$

following the assumption of the theorem in eq. (7) which guarantees that $v_i - 4P_{ij}r_{ij} - 4x_{ij}Q_{ij} > 0$.

5) 5×5 upper-left subdeterminant: Expanding along the fifth row gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{vmatrix} 4r_{ij}^2 + 4P_{ij}^2 + 1 + (2d_j/c) & 4r_{ij}x_{ij} + 4P_{ij}Q_{ij} & 2r_{ij} & 2x_{ij} & -r_{ij} - 2r_{ij}(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) - 2P_{ij}v_i \\ 4r_{ij}x_{ij} + 4P_{ij}Q_{ij} & 4x_{ij}^2 + 4Q_{ij}^2 + 1 + (2d_j/c) & 2x_{ij} & 1 & -x_{ij} - 2x_{ij}(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) - 2Q_{ij}v_i \\ 2r_{ij} & 2x_{ij} & 1 & -(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -r_{ij} - 2r_{ij}(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) - 2P_{ij}v_i & -x_{ij} - 2x_{ij}(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) - 2Q_{ij}v_i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2r_{ij} & -r_{ij} - 2r_{ij}(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) - 2P_{ij}v_i & 0 \\ & & 2x_{ij} & -x_{ij} - 2x_{ij}(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) - 2Q_{ij}v_i & 1 \\ & & 1 & -(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) & 0 \\ & & -(r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2) & r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2 + (r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2)^2 + v_i^2 & -x \\ & & 0 & -x_{ij} & 1 \end{vmatrix} \\ &= -4r_{ij}x_{ij}P_{ij}Q_{ij} - 4r_{ij}^2P_{ij}^2 + 4r_{ij}P_{ij}v_i + 2Q_{ij}x_{ij}v_i - v_i^2 + \\ & (1/c)(-2d_jr_{ij}^2 - 2d_jv_i^2 + 4d_jQ_{ij}x_{ij}v_i) - 4r_{ij}x_{ij}P_{ij}Q_{ij} \\ & - 4Q_{ij}^2x_{ij}^2 + 2Q_{ij}v_ix_{ij} + (1/c)[-8d_jP_{ij}^2x_{ij}^2 - 8d_jQ_{ij}^2x_{ij}^2 \\ & + 4d_jQ_{ij}x_{ij}v_i - 2d_jx_{ij}^2 - (1/c)4d_j^2x_{ij}^2] + 8x_{ij}r_{ij}P_{ij}Q_{ij} \\ & + 4P_{ij}^2r_{ij}^2 + 4Q_{ij}^2x_{ij}^2 - 4P_{ij}r_{ij}v_i - 4Q_{ij}x_{ij}v_i + v_i^2 \\ & + (1/c)[8d_jP_{ij}^2r_{ij}^2 + 8d_jQ_{ij}^2r_{ij}^2 + 8d_jP_{ij}^2x_{ij}^2 + 8d_jQ_{ij}^2x_{ij}^2 \\ & - 8d_jP_{ij}r_{ij}v_i - 8d_jQ_{ij}x_{ij}v_i + 4d_jv_i^2 + 2d_jr_{ij}^2 \\ & + 2d_jx_{ij}^2 + (1/c)(4d_j^2r_{ij}^2 + 4d_j^2x_{ij}^2 + 4d_j^2v_i^2)] \\ &= (1/c)[8d_jP_{ij}^2r_{ij}^2 + 8d_jQ_{ij}^2r_{ij}^2 + 2d_jv_i(v_i - 4P_{ij}r_{ij}) + \\ & (1/c)(4d_j^2r_{ij}^2 + 4d_j^2v_i^2)] \\ & > 0 \end{aligned}$$

as the assumption in eq. (7) gives that $v_i - 4P_{ij}r_{ij} > 0$.

Hence we get that \mathbf{z}_j^* satisfying the setting of Proposition 2 is a strict local minimum of f . Thus we get the convergence of ENDiCo-OPF algorithm for a single time step when f is convex. \square

B. Modification of Algorithm: Δ -ENDiCo-OPF

Developing similar convergence guarantees for local systems over time and further extending the same to global networks present non-trivial challenges. Motivated by the convergence behavior in practice of the original ENDiCo algorithm [31], we present a modification of the algorithm where a convergence parameter $\Delta^{(t)} \geq 1$ is adaptively chosen in each time step t . We then derive conditions generalizing ones in Theorem 3 that guarantee convergence of a local system over time when $\Delta^{(t)} = 1$.

Motivated by the definition of bi-Lipschitz functions in real analysis [35, Def 28.7], we define the following condition for the convergence of voltage v_j over time as captured by the parameter $\Delta^{(t)} \geq 1$:

$$\frac{1}{\Delta^{(t)}}v_j^{(t-1)} \leq v_j^{(t)} \leq \Delta^{(t)}v_j^{(t-1)}. \quad (11)$$

Note that $\Delta^{(t)} = 1$ in the above condition implies $v_j^{(t)} = v_j^{(t-1)}$, which certifies convergence of v_j over time.

The only modification we make to the ENDiCo-OPF algorithm is the use of the scaling parameter $\Delta^{(t)}$ that is suitably initialized by the user ($\Delta^{(0)} > 1$) and the addition of Step 8 presented in Algorithm 3. Subsequently, the final step advancing the algorithm to the next time step is now numbered as Step 9.

$$\begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
2P_{jk}^{(t)} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
2Q_{jk}^{(t)} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\
-v_k^{(t)} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -1 & 0 & 2r_{ij} & 2P_{ij}^{(t+1)} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -1 & -2x_{ij} & 2Q_{ij}^{(t+1)} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & r_{ij} & x_{ij} & r_{ij}^2 + x_{ij}^2 & -v_j^{(t+1)} & -1/\Delta^{(t)} & -\Delta^{(t)} \\
0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}$$

We then considered the positive definiteness of the Hessian $\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j} L$ to derive conditions under which all its upper left sub-determinants are positive. We used symbolic computation in Maple [36] to simplify expressions for the higher order sub-determinants. These expressions turn out to be too tedious to present here in full, so we present them online [37]. Examining expressions of the sub-determinants led to the conditions in eq. (13), which when satisfied guarantee positive definiteness of the Hessian. Our approach was similar to the one we used in the proof of Theorem 3 where we paired or grouped positive terms in the determinant expressions with negative ones so that their sum is guaranteed to be positive (when the condition in eq. (7) is satisfied).

While $\Delta^{(t)}$ appears in the last two columns of the gradient $\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_j} L$, it does not appear in the Hessian $\nabla_{\mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_j} L$ and hence does not appear in eq. (13). But these conditions holding along with the Δ -convergence condition (11) with $\Delta^{(t)} = 1$ guarantee the convergence over time of the local subsystem. \square

D. Global Convergence for Line Systems

As the next generalization, we consider a *line* network with $n \geq 4$ nodes. To keep notation simple, we label the nodes $\{1, \dots, n\}$ where 1 is the source node and n is the final leaf node (note that n is also the number of nodes in the line). Not surprisingly, this system presents even more challenges to derive conditions that guarantee global convergence over time. Guided by the convergence behavior of the original ENDiCo algorithm in practice, we derive conditions under a suitable assumption that when satisfied in a time sequential manner guarantee global convergence of the line system in a sequential manner, i.e., starting with the first local subsystem $\{1, 2, 3\}$, moving to the next local subsystem $\{2, 3, 4\}$, and so on until the last local subsystem $\{n-2, n-1, n\}$.

Assumption 5. *Given two adjacent and overlapping local subsystems $\{i, i+1, i+2\}$ and $\{i+1, i+2, i+3\}$ from the line network $\{1, \dots, n\}$ where the first subsystem is convergent at time step t_i , the convergence of the controllable node $i+1$ is preserved in the next time step $t_{i+1} \geq t_i + 1$ for the second subsystem.*

We get the guarantee of global convergence of a line system under Assumption 5 by repeatedly applying Theorem 4 in sequence going from the source node to the final leaf node.

Theorem 6. *The global convergence of a line system $\{1, \dots, n\}$ is guaranteed under Assumption 5 if the following conditions hold at each local subsystem $\{i, i+1, i+2\}$ in a sequential manner with time steps $t_{i+1} \geq t_i + 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-2$.*

$$(1/\Delta^{t_i}) v_{i+1}^{(t_i-1)} \leq v_{i+1}^{(t_i)} \leq \Delta^{t_i} v_{i+1}^{(t_i-1)} \quad (15)$$

holds for $\Delta^{t_i} = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, n-2$.

$$\begin{aligned}
& x_{i,i+1} - r_{i,i+1} \geq 0 \\
& v_i^{(t_i-1)} v_{i+1}^{(t_i-1)} - 4P_{i,i+1}^{(t_i+1)} r_{i,i+1} v_{i+1}^{(t_i-1)} - \\
& \quad 4P_{i+1,i+2}^{(t_i)} r_{i+1,i+2} v_i^{(t_i-1)} \geq 0 \\
& v_i^{(t_i-1)} v_{i+1}^{(t_i-1)} - 4P_{i,i+1}^{(t_i)} r_{i,i+1} v_{i+1}^{(t_i-1)} - \\
& \quad 4P_{i+1,i+2}^{(t_i)} r_{i+1,i+2} v_i^{(t_i-1)} \geq 0 \\
& v_i^{(t_i-1)} - 4P_{i,i+1}^{(t_i+1)} r_{i,i+1} - 4P_{i,i+1}^{(t_i)} r_{i,i+1} \geq 0 \\
& v_i^{(t_i-1)} - 4P_{i,i+1}^{(t_i+1)} r_{i,i+1} - 2P_{i,i+1}^{(t_i)} r_{i,i+1} - \\
& \quad 2P_{i,i+1}^{(t_i)} x_{i,i+1} \geq 0 \\
& v_i^{(t_i-1)} - 4P_{i,i+1}^{(t_i)} r_{i,i+1} - 4P_{i,i+1}^{(t_i)} x_{i,i+1} \geq 0 \quad (16) \\
& v_i^{(t_i-1)} - P_{i,i+1}^{(t_i+1)} r_{i,i+1} - P_{i+1,i+2}^{(t_i)} r_{i+1,i+2} \geq 0 \\
& v_i^{(t_i-1)} v_{i+1}^{(t_i-1)} - 4P_{i+1,i+2}^{(t_i)} r_{i+1,i+2} v_i^{(t_i-1)} \\
& \quad - 2P_{i,i+1}^{(t_i)} r_{i,i+1} v_{i+1}^{(t_i-1)} - 2P_{i,i+1}^{(t_i)} x_{i,i+1} v_{i+1}^{(t_i-1)} \geq 0 \\
& (v_{i+1}^{(t_i-1)})^3 - 4P_{i,i+1}^{(t_i+1)} r_{i,i+1} v_i^{(t_i-1)} v_{i+1}^{(t_i-1)} \\
& \quad - 2P_{i+1,i+2}^{(t_i)} r_{i+1,i+2} v_i^{(t_i-1)} - 4P_{i,i+1}^{(t_i+1)} r_{i,i+1} \geq 0 \\
& v_i^{(t_i-1)} - 8P_{i,i+1}^{(t_i)} r_{i,i+1} \geq 0 \\
& v_i^{(t_i-1)} - 8Q_{i,i+1}^{(t_i)} x_{i,i+1} \geq 0 \\
& v_i^{(t_i-1)} - 8P_{i+1,i+2}^{(t_i)} r_{i+1,i+2} \geq 0
\end{aligned}$$

We note that most conditions in eq. (16) hold for typical values of the variables except the first one. But we observe global convergence in practice in the sequential manner even when $x_{i,i+1} \geq r_{i,i+1}$ may not hold.

Proof. Note that conditions in eq. (16) are the same as those in eq. (13) from Theorem 4 applied for the local subsystem $\{i, i+1, i+2\}$ in place of $\{i, j, k\}$. Since conditions in eqs. (15) and (16) hold for $i = 1$, the first local subsystem $\{1, 2, 3\}$ is convergent at time step t_1 following Theorem 4. By Assumption 5, the convergence of node 2 is preserved in the next time step, and hence it can be treated as the fixed source node for the next local subsystem $\{2, 3, 4\}$. The convergence of this subsystem is then guaranteed at time $t_2 \geq t_1 + 1$ by conditions in eqs. (15) and (16) holding for $i = 2$. The overall result follows by the sequential application of Theorem 4. \square

IV. NUMERICAL STUDY

In this section, we demonstrate the convergence properties of the ENDiCo-OPF algorithm with the help of numerical

simulations. We also validate the optimality of our algorithm by comparing its results with those of a centralized solution. These simulations not only justify the convergence analysis of the method but also showcase the efficacy of the proposed real-time distributed controller to attain optimal power flow solutions. After attaining the optimal dispatch, the controller shares the computed boundary variables with its neighbors instead of implementing and measuring the variables.





Fig. 2: IEEE-123 Bus Test System

A. Simulated System and Results

As a test system, we simulated a balanced IEEE-123 bus system with a maximum of 85 DERs (PVs) connected to the network (Fig. 2), where the DER/PV penetration can vary from 10% to 100%. As a cost function, we have simulated both (i) active power loss minimization ($f = r_{ij}l_{ij}$), and (ii) voltage deviation (ΔV) minimization ($f = (v_j - v_{\text{ref}})^2$) optimization problems.

1) *Residual and Objective Value Convergence:* We have simulated the test system with 10%, 50%, and 100% DER/PV penetration cases for both active power loss minimization and ΔV minimization. The system converged after 42 iterations for all six cases (Fig. 3). For the loss minimization objective, the maximum border residual goes below the tolerance value of 10^{-3} after the 42nd iteration. The objective values for the loss minimization OPF is 26.5 kW, 19.6 kW, and 11.8 kW, for 10, 50, and 100% DER penetration, respectively. Similarly, for ΔV minimization, we can see that the maximum residual goes below the tolerance after the 42nd iteration as well. Thus the convergence is related to the network size, but not to the number of controllable variables.



(a) Loss Minimization


(b) ΔV Minimization

Fig. 3: Max Residual and Objective Value Convergence

2) *Validation of the Optimal Solution:* Besides a faster convergence, we also present the efficacy of the distributed OPF controller in terms of the optimality gaps and feasibility. To this end, we have compared (a) the objective values, and (b) the nodal voltages with the centralized solution (see Fig. 4). It can be observed in Table I that the value of the objective functions from centralized and distributed solutions matches for all the cases. For example, for the 100% DER penetration case, the line loss is 11.80 kW for proposed ENDiCo-OPF method, and the central solution is 11.78 kW. Similar comparisons can be found for other DER/PV penetration cases with different OPF objectives. This validates the solution quality of ENDiCo-OPF. Further, we can see in Fig. 4 that upon implementing ENDiCo-OPF, the difference in nodal voltages in the system and those from a centralized solution is in the order of 10^{-4} ; this is true for both OPF objectives. This validates the feasibility of ENDiCo-OPF.

TABLE I: Objective Value Comparison

OPF Problem	Method	10% PV	50% PV	100% PV
Loss Min (kW)	Central	26.4	19.6	11.78
	ENDiCo-OPF	26.5	19.6	11.80
ΔV Min (pu)	Central	0.5300	0.5038	0.4640
	ENDiCo-OPF	0.5306	0.5042	0.4642




(a) Loss Minimization

(b) ΔV Minimization

Fig. 4: Validation: Nodal Voltage Comparison

B. Numerical Experiments of Convergence

In this section, we provide further simulated results on the convergence of the proposed ENDiCo-OPF method. Here we showcase the boundary variable convergence with respect to iterations, as well as their properties. We also compare the numerical convergence results with the theoretical analysis presented in Section III.



(a) Loss Minimization

(b) ΔV Minimization

Fig. 5: Convergence: From Root to Leaf nodes




Fig. 6: Boundary Variable Convergence with respect to iterations for Loss (top row) and ΔV (bottom row) minimizations.

1) *Convergence at the Boundary*: The convergence of the boundary variables (shared boundary voltage) for the simulated cases has been shown in Fig. 5 and Fig.6; Fig. 5 shows the boundary variables for 100% PV cases for 3 different locations that helps to visualize the convergence of the shared variable w.r.t. the distance from the root node (substation node). Specifically, from Fig. 6, we can see that after the initial values, the shared variables (shared nodal voltages) suddenly changes abruptly till 22nd iterations. This location, i.e., iteration number, where this sudden changes happen depends on the distance of that shared node from the root node (substation node). For example, ‘Bus 3’ is 2 node distant from the substation, and thus this abrupt changes happen at the 2nd iteration (Fig. 5); similarly, ‘Bus 62’ is 11 node distant from the substation, and that changes happen at the 11th iteration as well. Along with these characteristics, the overall convergence properties of the shared variables are consistent with both objectives and for all the PV penetration cases as well (Fig. 6). It corroborates with the statement that the convergence properties is not dependent on the OPF objective or the DER penetration percentage, but rather dependent on the system network. Instead of using a flat start with 1.02 pu for the controller, a measured voltage initialization would reduce the iteration number; however, we would like to mention that, this method is robust enough to initialize with any reasonable flat start values.

2) *Discussion on Convergence*: In section III, we guaranteed the convergence of the proposed method under some sufficient conditions. Specifically, we showed (i) convergence of the local sub-problem for a given time step (Theorem

3), (ii) convergence of the local sub-problem over time-steps (Theorem 4), and (iii) convergence over time for a line network with multiple nodes (Theorem 6). At the same time, our numerical experiments demonstrated similar convergence behavior for more general (than line) networks.

The condition for the convergence of the local sub-problem in a single time-step is expressed in equation (7). Generally for a stable electric power supply in a power distribution system, v_i and P_{ij} , Q_{ij} are in the order of 1 pu., and the corresponding line parameters, i.e., r_{ij} , x_{ij} , are both in the order of 10^{-2} or less. This guarantees that condition (7) is always satisfied for a practical power distribution system. In our simulated cases, line parameters are also in the order of $\leq 10^{-2}$, thus satisfying the condition for Theorem 3. Further, this also satisfies most of the sufficient conditions for Theorem 4 and 6, except the first conditions, i.e., $x_{ij} - r_{ij} \geq 0$ of both of the theorems. We note that these are sufficient conditions, and that we can observe overall convergence for the cases where $x_{ij} - r_{ij} < 0$ as well. For the simulation cases, while other sufficient conditions hold true, we observed $x_{ij} - r_{ij} < 0$ for some of the lines, but still the controller converged. In addition, Fig. 5 showcases the same result as Theorem 6. The node that is closer to the root node/substation node, i.e., the node with a strong voltage source, converges earlier than the node that is more distant from the root node. For instance, ‘Bus 3’, which is two nodes away from the substation, converges earlier than the ‘Bus 62’ that is 11 nodes distant from the substation. Bus 3 converges around the 22nd iteration, whereas Bus 62 converges around 30th iteration for both loss and ΔV minimization optimization problems.

V. CONCLUSION

The optimal coordination of growing DER penetrations requires computationally efficient models for distribution-level optimization. In this paper, we have developed a provably convergent, nonlinear distributed optimal power flow algorithm using network equivalence methods. Then we present sufficient conditions to guarantee the convergence of the proposed method. While our most general sufficient conditions for global convergence over time are presented for line networks, our numerical simulations demonstrate similar convergence behavior for more general, e.g., radial, networks. Developing similar sufficient conditions for global convergence of radial networks, or other general network topologies, will be of high interest.

Our approach leverages the structure of the power flow problems in radial distribution systems and is used to solve multiple D-OPFs with a relatively fast solution time. The numerical simulation on the IEEE 123 bus test system corroborates the theoretical analysis. The proposed distributed method has also been validated by comparing the results with a centralized formulation.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. A. Momoh, R. Adapa, and M. El-Hawary, "A review of selected optimal power flow literature to 1993. i. nonlinear and quadratic programming approaches," *IEEE transactions on power systems*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 96–104, 1999.
- [2] A. Castillo and R. P. O'Neill, "Survey of approaches to solving the ACOPE," *US Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, Tech. Rep.*, 2013.
- [3] L. Gan and S. H. Low, "Convex relaxations and linear approximation for optimal power flow in multiphase radial networks," in *2014 Power Systems Computation Conference*, pp. 1–9, IEEE, 2014.
- [4] R. R. Jha and A. Dubey, "Network-level optimization for unbalanced power distribution system: Approximation and relaxation," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 4126–4139, 2021.
- [5] R. R. Jha and A. Dubey, "Exact distribution optimal power flow (d-opf) model using convex iteration technique," in *2019 IEEE Power Energy Society General Meeting (PESGM)*, pp. 1–5, 2019.
- [6] D. K. Molzahn, F. Dörfler, H. Sandberg, S. H. Low, S. Chakrabarti, R. Baldick, and J. Lavaci, "A survey of distributed optimization and control algorithms for electric power systems," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 8, no. 6, pp. 2941–2962, 2017.
- [7] S. Boyd, N. Parikh, E. Chu, B. Peleato, J. Eckstein, et al., "Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers," *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 1–122, 2011.
- [8] B. H. Kim and R. Baldick, "Coarse-Grained Distributed Optimal Power Flow," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 932–939, 1997.
- [9] R. Baldick, B. H. Kim, C. Chase, and Y. Luo, "A Fast Distributed Implementation of Optimal Power Flow," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 858–864, 1999.
- [10] B. H. Kim and R. Baldick, "A Comparison of Distributed Optimal Power Flow Algorithms," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 599–604, 2000.
- [11] Q. Peng and S. H. Low, "Distributed Algorithm for Optimal Power Flow on a Radial Network," in *53rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, pp. 167–172, 2014.
- [12] Q. Peng and S. H. Low, "Distributed Algorithm for Optimal Power Flow on an Unbalanced Radial Network," in *2015 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pp. 6915–6920, 2015.
- [13] Q. Peng and S. H. Low, "Distributed Optimal Power Flow Algorithm for Radial Networks, I: Balanced Single Phase Case," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 111–121, 2018.
- [14] K.-H. Chung, B. H. Kim, and K.-B. Song, "Implementing Distributed Optimal Power Flow Using the Alternating Direction Method," *KIEE international transactions on power engineering*, pp. 412–415, 2005.
- [15] K.-H. Chung, B. H. Kim, and D. Hur, "Multi-area generation scheduling algorithm with regionally distributed Optimal Power Flow using alternating direction method," *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, vol. 33, no. 9, pp. 1527–1535, 2011.
- [16] A. X. Sun, D. T. Phan, and S. Ghosh, "Fully Decentralized AC Optimal Power Flow Algorithms," in *2013 IEEE Power & Energy Society General Meeting*, pp. 1–5, 2013.
- [17] T. Erseghe, "Distributed Optimal Power Flow Using ADMM," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 2370–2380, 2014.
- [18] S. Mhanna, G. Verbič, and A. C. Chapman, "Adaptive ADMM for Distributed AC Optimal Power Flow," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 2025–2035, 2019.
- [19] K. Sun and X. A. Sun, "A Two-Level ADMM Algorithm for AC OPF With Global Convergence Guarantees," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 5271–5281, 2021.
- [20] R. Sadnan and A. Dubey, "Distributed optimization using reduced network equivalents for radial power distribution systems," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 2021.
- [21] T. Erseghe, "Distributed optimal power flow using admm," *IEEE transactions on power systems*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 2370–2380, 2014.
- [22] E. Dall'Anese, H. Zhu, and G. B. Giannakis, "Distributed optimal power flow for smart microgrids," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 1464–1475, 2013.
- [23] B. Millar and D. Jiang, "Smart grid optimization through asynchronous, distributed primal dual iterations," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 2324–2331, 2016.
- [24] S. Magnússon, P. C. Weeraddana, and C. Fischione, "A distributed approach for the optimal power-flow problem based on admm and sequential convex approximations," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 238–253, 2015.
- [25] S. Bolognani, R. Carli, G. Cavraro, and S. Zampieri, "Distributed reactive power feedback control for voltage regulation and loss minimization," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 966–981, 2014.
- [26] G. Cavraro and R. Carli, "Local and distributed voltage control algorithms in distribution networks," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 1420–1430, 2017.
- [27] A. Bernstein and E. Dall'Anese, "Real-time feedback-based optimization of distribution grids: A unified approach," *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 1197–1209, 2019.
- [28] N. Bastianello, A. Ajalloeian, and E. Dall'Anese, "Distributed and inexact proximal gradient method for online convex optimization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.00870*, 2020.
- [29] G. Qu and N. Li, "Optimal distributed feedback voltage control under limited reactive power," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 35, no. 1, pp. 315–331, 2019.
- [30] X. Hu, Z.-W. Liu, G. Wen, X. Yu, and C. Li, "Branch-wise parallel successive algorithm for online voltage regulation in distribution networks," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 6678–6689, 2019.
- [31] R. Sadnan and A. Dubey, "Real-time distributed control of smart inverters for network-level optimization," in *2020 IEEE International Conference on Communications, Control, and Computing Technologies for Smart Grids (SmartGridComm)*, pp. 1–6, IEEE, 2020.
- [32] D. P. Bertsekas, *Nonlinear Programming*. Athena Scientific, 2nd ed., 1999.
- [33] M. Baran and F. F. Wu, "Optimal sizing of capacitors placed on a radial distribution system," *IEEE Transactions on power Delivery*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 735–743, 1989.
- [34] G. Strang, *Linear Algebra and its Applications*. Wellesley-Cambridge Press, 5th ed., 2016.
- [35] J. J. Yeh, *Lectures On Real Analysis*. World Scientific Publishing Company, 2000.
- [36] Maplesoft, a division of Waterloo Maple Inc., "Maple," 2021. <https://www.maplesoft.com/>.
- [37] https://github.com/YunqiLuo/Convergence_ENDiCO.