
Bayesian Optimisation Against Climate Change: Applications and Benchmarks

Sigrid Passano Hellan

s.p.hellan@ed.ac.uk

Christopher G. Lucas

c.lucas@ed.ac.uk

Nigel H. Goddard

nigel.goddard@ed.ac.uk

*School of Informatics
University of Edinburgh*

Abstract

Bayesian optimisation is a powerful method for optimising black-box functions, popular in settings where the true function is expensive to evaluate and no gradient information is available. Bayesian optimisation can improve responses to many optimisation problems within climate change for which simulator models are unavailable or expensive to sample from. While there have been several feasibility demonstrations of Bayesian optimisation in climate-related applications, there has been no unifying review of applications and benchmarks. We provide such a review here, to encourage the use of Bayesian optimisation in important and well-suited application domains. We identify four main application domains: material discovery, wind farm layout, optimal renewable control and environmental monitoring. For each domain we identify a public benchmark or data set that is easy to use and evaluate systems against, while being representative of real-world problems. Due to the lack of a suitable benchmark for environmental monitoring, we propose LAQN-BO, based on air pollution data. Our contributions are: a) identifying a representative range of benchmarks, providing example code where necessary; b) introducing a new benchmark, LAQN-BO; and c) promoting a wider use of climate change applications among Bayesian optimisation practitioners.

1 Introduction

The use of machine learning (ML) to tackle climate change is gaining traction, including ML-wide surveys of relevant applications (Rolnick et al., 2022; Donti & Kolter, 2021). To facilitate technical innovation and its adoption into practice, it is important to complement these reviews with concise summaries of problems that specific ML frameworks are well-matched to, along with example data sets. Here, we provide a summary, paired with data sets, for Bayesian optimisation. This is important for three reasons: a) it reduces start-up costs and overhead, as the time-consuming task of identifying suitable data sets does not have to be repeated; b) it helps researchers focus on problems that are timely and/or important, and have a structure that is suitable for the framework(s) they are using; and c) it makes it easier to compare methods, as numerical results can be compared directly. The benchmarks should be similar to real-world applications, because that provides more realistic expectations of performance. It also shows which versions of Bayesian optimisation are most likely to perform well, for instance in terms of choice of acquisition function and underlying model. More realistic benchmarks also let us identify challenges which still need to be solved, for instance in terms of generating useful priors from related data.

Bayesian optimisation (BO), is a machine-learning approach to black-box optimisation (Shahriari et al., 2015). It is particularly suited to problems that:




Figure 1: Application of Bayesian optimisation to optimising the power generation of a solar panel by adjusting the panel angle.

- a. Have a complex unknown structure which can only be efficiently modelled through a surrogate model, e.g. the conductivity of solar panel materials.
- b. Are expensive or slow to evaluate, requiring sample efficiency from trying out fewer bad or uninformative choices, e.g. when discovering new materials that must be synthesised in order to be evaluated.
- c. Require identifying extrema, either for optimisation, e.g. maximising power generation, or for intervention, e.g. emission monitoring.

An additional benefit of Bayesian optimisation is that it explicitly models its uncertainty, which can be used to determine when to stop optimising (Makarova et al., 2022), or to trade off exploration and exploitation (De Ath et al., 2021).

Bayesian optimisation consists of fitting a surrogate model, typically a Gaussian process (Williams & Rasmussen, 2006), to observed data, and using the surrogate model to choose what input value to evaluate next. Then the surrogate model is adjusted, another input value evaluated, and so on. To choose the next input value an acquisition function is used, which balances exploration and exploitation. As an illustrative example, visualised in Fig. 1, Bayesian optimisation can be used to find the angle of a solar panel that maximises power output: (1) model the output as a function of angle based on all available data and/or domain knowledge; (2) select a promising angle to try next, e.g., an angle that is a good candidate for maximising power output or that is maximally informative about the best angle; and (3) try this angle before updating the model and returning to Step 1.

We present a summary of Bayesian optimisation as applied to climate change problems. We identify the main application domains, emphasise how they impact climate change responses, and identify beginner-friendly benchmarks for each. We found a benchmark to be lacking for environmental monitoring, and therefore provide one, the LAQN-BO benchmark, based on air pollution data (Imperial College London, 1993). The four use cases are: *material discovery* — accelerating the development of e.g. new solar panels; *wind farm layouts* — choosing where to place individual turbines; *optimal renewable control* — choosing operating parameters of solar panels or wind turbines; and *environmental monitoring* — choosing where to place sensors. Bliet (2022) is a related survey of Bayesian optimisation and other surrogate-based optimisation methods. Where Bliet takes a higher-level approach, focusing on classifying previous work by methodology, we instead group work by applications in order to identify data sets and applications for new projects. When selecting benchmarks, we have emphasised ease of adoption. So we have only considered ones that are publicly available, and well documented.

This paper is predominantly concerned with Bayesian optimisation. However, Bayesian optimisation is closely related to other methods, like Bayesian experimental design (Rainforth et al., 2023), and we have included some examples of applications of these methods as well, e.g. Tran & Ulissi (2018); Kleingesse & Gutmann (2020). Bayesian optimisation can be used within Bayesian experimental design (Valentin et al., 2023), and can also be seen as a special case of Bayesian experimental design (Rainforth et al., 2023), especially when using information-theoretic acquisition functions. Both are powerful methods, with useful applications in the response to climate change and similar challenges, such as the choice of priors and scaling to large numbers of samples. Our focus on Bayesian optimisation does not reflect a preference of one method over the other, but rather that more work has been done applying Bayesian optimisation against climate

change than for Bayesian experimental design. Because the methods are so closely related, and because our focus is on the applications and benchmarks, not on the details of the methods used for solving them, we have opted to include some examples of related methods as well.

Bayesian optimisation is not a complete solution, but an important tool when combined with domain knowledge, and can help improve responses to climate change. Performance in real applications is the ultimate test of any ML method, including Bayesian optimisation. Simulated problems often fail to anticipate crucial challenges, e.g. in terms of finding suitable inductive biases (Hellan et al., 2022). Currently, Bayesian optimisation is often evaluated on synthetic functions or hyperparameter optimisation (HPO) benchmarks, either exclusively (AV et al., 2022; Papenmeier et al., 2022; Hvarfner et al., 2022; Thebelt et al., 2022) or mostly (Oliveira et al., 2022; Folch et al., 2022; Song et al., 2022). But HPO is just one kind of problem. There are other less used benchmarks, like robotics (Song et al., 2022; Nguyen et al., 2022) and chemistry simulations (Folch et al., 2022; Tu et al., 2022). Ramesh et al. (2022) test their method on optimising the control of an airborne wind energy system, but has not made their setup available as a benchmark. To increase the impact of Bayesian optimisation, and its prevalence, we should adopt a broader set of benchmarks. That would not only demonstrate which methods work well in practice, but open up new research problems to solve. Using benchmarks from climate change has the advantage of doing so in a dynamic field, increasing the chance of adoption, and with real impact. Adopting climate change motivated benchmarks, and using them to compare methods, will make Bayesian optimisation more relevant outside academia. We now proceed to the main applications domains and their respective benchmarks, starting with material discovery.

2 Material discovery

Material discovery means developing materials with superior combinations of properties (Frazier & Wang, 2016), e.g. more efficient solar cells. Bayesian optimisation and related methods have been suggested for optimising a wide range of materials, from concrete (Severson et al., 2021) and Direct Air Capture of CO₂ (Ortiz-Montalvo et al., 2021) to solar panel glass (Haghanifar et al., 2021), electrifying the transport and chemical industry sectors (Annevelink et al., 2022), and for electrocatalysts for CO₂ reduction and H₂ production (Tran & Ulissi, 2018; Zhong et al., 2020; Frey et al., 2022). The benefits are in reducing greenhouse gas emissions or increasing their capture; making renewable energy generation or storage more efficient; or making more sectors able to use renewable energy. If evaluating the material requires synthesising and testing it, there are huge potential gains in time and cost by only doing so on promising candidates identified by Bayesian optimisation.

Liang et al. (2021) provide three material discovery data sets (Sun et al., 2021; Bash et al., 2021; Mekki-Berrada et al., 2021) related to solar panels, with 3-5 features each and between 94 and 178 unique evaluated data points. Using Fig. 1 to illustrate the Bayesian optimisation process, the steps become: (1) model the material performance as a function of ingredient proportions used; (2) select a new combination of ingredient proportions to try; and (3) produce and evaluate the material. The data sets enable us to replace (3) with looking up the evaluations in a table.

- **Benchmark:** <https://github.com/PV-Lab/Benchmarking> (Liang et al., 2021)
- **Features:** Material properties: 3-5 dimensions
- **Data type:** CSV files
- **Sampling:** Manufacture material. In benchmark replaced by table look-up
- **Objective:** Material performance: conductivity, absorbance spectrum score or stability
- **Impact:** Better solar panels, which gives more renewable generation and lower climate gas emissions

3 Wind farm layout

Wind turbines are typically grouped together in wind farms, with several turbines in relatively close proximity, to reduce installation costs and environmental impacts. Before construction, the locations of individual wind turbines must be planned. Wind turbines work by extracting kinetic energy from the air, so the wind is weaker and more turbulent after flowing past a turbine. This leads to less power generation (Park &

Law, 2015) and greater dynamic loads and fatigue on the downwind turbines (Dong et al., 2022). This is illustrated in Fig. 2, where the two turbines need to be placed within the green area. Determining the optimal wind turbine layout is a difficult but important optimisation problem, as more renewable electricity can be generated without requiring more turbines to be installed. The efficiency of Bayesian optimisation is important for this problem, as the type of simulations used can take 15 seconds to run on one CPU even for five wind turbines (Bliek et al., 2021). Bayesian optimisation can be applied to the problem by replacing the steps in Fig. 1 with (1) modelling the collective power output as a function of the wind turbine placements; (2) selecting a new combination of locations to evaluate; and (3) running the power output simulation.




Figure 2: Planning of wind turbines within limits shown in green. The wind is shown by the blue arrows: wider arrows indicate stronger wind and more undulating arrows indicate more turbulence. In the layout on the left one turbine is directly downwind of the other, resulting in weaker and more turbulent wind. To the right, both turbines get unhindered wind.

Bliek et al.’s (2021) set of benchmarking problems and baselines include a wind farm layout problem, *wind-wake*, based on FLORIS (NREL, 2020) simulations. The benchmark assumes a fixed number of wind turbines; this is relaxed in Chugh & Ymeraj (2022), where the two objectives of cost and power generation are jointly optimised, using simulations based on Pedersen et al. (2019). In related pieces of work, Mern et al. (2021) build wind maps for later layout planning, and Tillmann et al. (2020) plan the layout of bifacial solar panel arrays. We use the benchmark in Bliek et al. (2021) as it has been prepared for further use.

- **Benchmark:** <https://github.com/AlgtUDeft/ExpensiveOptimBenchmark> (Bliek et al., 2021)
- **Features:** Spatial locations: 10 dimensions. 2 for each of 5 turbines
- **Data type:** Simulation
- **Sampling:** Simulate layout
- **Objective:** Energy production
- **Impact:** More renewable generation, which reduces climate gas emissions

4 Optimal renewable control

Having planned the layout of a new renewable power generation plant, the next question is how best to operate it. For wind turbines the yaw and pitch angles need to be set (Doekemeijer et al., 2019; Park & Law, 2015; Park, 2020; Yang et al., 2022), as well as the induction factor (Park, 2020) and electric load resistance (Park & Law, 2015). For solar panels the voltage level applied (Abdelrahman et al., 2016; Lyden et al., 2018) and the angle of the panel (Abel et al., 2018) can be adjusted. By adjusting these the amount of energy generated can be maximised, which in turn reduces the amount of fossil fuel consumed for a given

amount of electricity demand. A review of different control methodologies for wind turbines is given in Dong et al. (2022). For wind farms, the optimisation should occur jointly, as the available wind energy for a downstream turbine is impacted by the operating conditions of the upstream turbine (Park & Law, 2015). Bayesian optimisation is suitable for this problem as it allows the response of the non-linear problem to be learnt through data collection. Extensive work on wind turbine control has also been done using Bayesian Ascent, a version of Bayesian optimisation which limits the changes in inputs between iterations (Park & Law, 2016a;b; Park et al., 2016; 2017; 2018). Relatedly, Moustakis et al. (2019) use Bayesian optimisation to tune the parameters of traditional control methods, and Fiducioso et al. (2019) consider the problem of controlling a HVAC system. In Mulders et al. (2020), Bayesian optimisation is used to reduce blade fatigue. Andersson & Imsland (2020) use a method related to Bayesian optimisation for wind turbine control.




Figure 3: Adjusting solar panels to optimise power generation as the sun moves across the sky.

Abel et al. (2018) contribute a benchmark for solar panel optimisation¹. The goal is to maximise the energy yield by adjusting the angles of the solar panel, as illustrated in Fig. 3. They evaluate contextual bandits and reinforcement learning methods, but the problem is also suitable for Bayesian optimisation. We provide a basic example of this at https://github.com/sighellan/solar_panels_rl². Fig. 1 shows how Bayesian optimisation is applied to the problem. We model power output as a function of panel angles; decide on a new angle to try; and run the simulation to evaluate the new angle. The challenge is not to locate the sun; its location can be calculated and is given as input to the methods. Instead, the idea is to adapt to other changes like cloud cover, shading from nearby buildings and changes in the amount of reflected sunlight, for instance after snowfall. However, many solar panels are not designed to track the sun, and instead keep a fixed angle. Wind turbines have more control settings, interact in less predictable ways, and have seen more applications of Bayesian optimisation (see previous paragraph). We chose the benchmark by Abel et al. (2018) because it is well-documented and publicly available. But real-world benefits are more likely to come from applications to wind turbines than to solar panels.

- **Benchmark:** https://github.com/david-abel/solar_panels_rl (Abel et al., 2018)
- **Features:** Panel direction: 2 dimensions
- **Data type:** Simulation
- **Sampling:** Simulate collected sunlight
- **Objective:** Collected energy
- **Impact:** More renewable generation, which reduces climate gas emissions

5 Environmental monitoring

An important problem within environmental monitoring is that of choosing where to place the monitoring sensors. This is difficult as the planning has to be done without knowing the usefulness of each site, as that depends on future data. Bayesian optimisation and related methods are useful tools in this setting, as they build probabilistic models of the environmental characteristic of interest — e.g. air pollution — which they use to make efficient choices. If we are mainly interested in identifying the worst-hit locations, e.g. for targeting interventions or evaluating compliance with legal limits, Bayesian optimisation lets us

¹To make it work, we used v0.784 of the `simple_rl` Python package (Abel, 2019).

²We built the example using BoTorch (Balandat et al., 2020). In addition to integrating our basic Bayesian optimisation implementation into the framework, we also provide a requirements file and port the code to Python 3.

do that efficiently. To build accurate environmental maps for an entire area we can instead use Bayesian experimental design, for instance if we want to know the water quality throughout a lake.

Monitoring is important for tracking the impacts of climate change, including oceans (Sanchez-Pi et al., 2020), for locating gas leakages (Asenov et al., 2019; Gao & Bai, 2022; Kleinegesse & Gutmann, 2020), and the related task of air pollution monitoring (Ainslie et al., 2009; Morere et al., 2017; Marchant & Ramos, 2012; Singh et al., 2010; Hellan et al., 2020; 2022; Leu & Ho, 2020). Samaniego et al. (2021) provide a benchmark for path-planning based on water quality monitoring, also used by Folch et al. (2022), but the benchmark uses synthetic data.

The LAQN-BO benchmark

We present a new benchmark for the climate change Bayesian optimisation community, using air pollution data from the London Air Quality Network (LAQN) (Imperial College London, 1993). Air pollution monitoring is related to climate change in that the sources and hence required interventions are often interlinked, e.g. car exhaust. Also, environmental changes are often sped up by climate change, making their monitoring more important. The optimisation problems in the LAQN-BO benchmark are similar to those in Hellan et al. (2022). But while that focuses on Bayesian optimisation methodology, we focus on the problems themselves. We provide simple scripts and step-by-step instructions for generating the problems and put them in the context of other climate-related Bayesian optimisation problems and benchmarks.

The optimisation objective is the NO_2 concentration, i.e. to find the location of maximum pollution from the set of available locations. This is useful as higher pollution concentrations mean greater impacts on human health. Again using Fig. 1 as a basis, we replace the steps with: (1) model the NO_2 concentration as a function of spatial location; (2) determine a new location to evaluate; and (3) measure the pollution in the new location. We use the provided benchmark to replace (3) with looking up the historical measurement. We construct a training set from the 2015 data, and a test set from the 2016 data. Each problem corresponds to data from a single day, so multiple days give multiple problems. As in Hellan et al. (2022), we filter out days when less than 40 stations collected measurements, and only use the ‘Roadside’ sensors, resulting in 214 training problems and 365 test problems. We log-transformed the data, and standardised it using the mean and standard deviation from the training set. Example problems are shown in Fig. 4.

The LAQN-BO benchmark has several advantages. Firstly, it uses real data. Secondly, we present a *set* of related problems, so that methods can be trained on the training set, and evaluated on the test set. Finally, the provided scripts can be easily adapted to generate new Bayesian optimisation problems using other pollutants or other years of the extensive available LAQN data. None of the other benchmarks combine all of these advantages. A disadvantage is that data is not available everywhere, only at locations with existing sensors, limiting the available search space. This corresponds to having to choose from a sparse set of locations. For instance, if we are mounting sensors to lampposts, we can only choose between the locations with lampposts.

- **Benchmark:** <https://github.com/sighellan/LAQN-BO>
- **Features:** Spatial coordinates: 2 dimensions
- **Data type:** Python class
- **Sampling:** Place pollution sensor. In benchmark replaced by table look-up
- **Objective:** NO_2 concentration
- **Impact:** Better monitoring of air pollution, enabling targeted interventions

6 Benchmark comparison

The four benchmarks identified in our survey have different characteristics, as is summarised in Table 1. They represent different key challenges for Bayesian optimisation deployments, and provide breadth for evaluating different types of Bayesian optimisation methods. The key challenge of the materials benchmark is its small size, meaning there is little opportunity to fine-tune the methods. For LAQN-BO it is that of constructing priors from the training data, as the problems have as little as 40 evaluations each, requiring very sample-efficient learning. The wind farm layout benchmark also requires efficient use of data. But




Figure 4: Example LAQN-BO problems from the training set (2015, top) and test set (2016, bottom). Not all sensors are available on every day. The overall pollution level varies, compare the top left and right plots. The locations of maxima also varies, compare the right top and bottom plots. Most of the sensors are clustered together in central London.

in contrast to LAQN-BO, it does not provide training data for learning priors. The key challenge for the renewable control benchmark is dealing with large numbers of samples, as the panel direction is optimised regularly over many days. It is therefore a good candidate for testing Bayesian optimisation built on scalable Gaussian processes (Liu et al., 2020). It also requires keeping track of context, e.g. time, as the sun moves across the sky. An additional contrast to the other benchmarks is that the performance throughout the optimisation matters, as it directly impacts the amount of electricity generated.

Table 1: Comparison of benchmarks.

Benchmark	Type	Key challenge	Dimensionality	# problems
Materials (Liang et al., 2021)	Real	Small size	3/5	3
Wind farm layout (Bliek et al., 2021)	Simulation	Sample efficiency	10	1
Renewable control (Abel et al., 2018)	Simulation	Scaling, context	2	10
Environmental monitoring (LAQN-BO)	Real	Priors	2	214+365

The materials benchmark is the easiest to start using, as the data is provided in CSV files, followed by that for environmental monitoring, LAQN-BO, which provides a simple Python interface to the data. The benchmarks for wind farm layout and renewable control require more setup, as methods need to be interfaced with the simulators. Their advantage is that they are easier to extend, and can be evaluated for more input values. LAQN-BO can be easily extended to more problems using the LAQN data (Imperial College London, 1993), but extensions to other base data sets would require more work. The materials benchmark is the hardest to extend, as it relies on results from synthesising and evaluating materials.

7 Conclusion and other applications

Bayesian optimisation and related methods have many more climate-related applications: learning energy consumptions of individual household appliances (Jia et al., 2019); optimising charging protocols for electric vehicle batteries (Attia et al., 2020); scheduling smart appliances to smooth out demand curves (Tabakhi et al., 2020); determining vibration suppression parameters for floating wind turbines (Zhang et al., 2022); producing policies to reduce the impact of livestock diseases made more prevalent by global warming (Spooner et al., 2020); and tuning parameters for HVAC system and building models to reduce cooling and heating energy demands (Zhan et al., 2022; Chakrabarty et al., 2021a;b). Bayesian optimisation also has applications in improving climate models, by targeting informative training data (Watson-Parris, 2021). And it has been used for parameter tuning of a global land surface model (Druel et al., 2017), a landslide model (Pradhan et al., 2021) and forecasting models for electricity generation and demand (Trivedi & Khadem, 2021).

To encourage more Bayesian optimisation practitioners to work on climate change applications, an important next step is to establish more benchmarks, standard data sets or simulators, as we do with the LAQN-BO benchmark. More challenging benchmarks should also be established, e.g. for constrained or multi-objective optimisation, to encompass the full complexity of real problems. For example: outside a simulation, some of the ground might be unsuitable for building wind turbines; and when building renewable energy generators there are multiple competing objectives (Wu et al., 2018; Flecker et al., 2022). Additionally, there might be constraints for controlling the generators, due to increased energy costs and fatigue when changing settings. The energy cost of changing the panel angles is included in the renewable control benchmark (Abel et al., 2018), so Bayesian Ascent (Park & Law, 2016a) should be tested, as it limits the difference in input — panel angles — between iterations. As a further extension, the layout and control of wind farms can be optimised jointly (Chen et al., 2022).

In the future, all these benchmarks should be brought together and their interfaces aligned, to create a standardised, climate-themed benchmark suite. By identifying four benchmarks representing the main application domains, introducing a new benchmark, and highlighting the potential for Bayesian optimisation, we take an important step in facilitating future research.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Linus Ericsson and Michael Gutmann at the University of Edinburgh for helpful suggestions for improving the paper.

This work was supported by the EPSRC Centre for Doctoral Training in Data Science, funded by the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (grant EP/L016427/1) and the University of Edinburgh.

References

- Hany Abdelrahman, Felix Berkenkamp, Jan Poland, and Andreas Krause. Bayesian optimization for maximum power point tracking in photovoltaic power plants. In *2016 European Control Conference (ECC)*, pp. 2078–2083. IEEE, 2016.
- David Abel. `simple_rl`: Reproducible reinforcement learning in python. 2019.
- David Abel, Edward C Williams, Stephen Brawner, Emily Reif, and Michael L Littman. Bandit-based solar panel control. In *Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2018.
- B. Ainslie, C. Reuten, D. G. Steyn, Nhu D. Le, and James V. Zidek. Application of an entropy-based Bayesian optimization technique to the redesign of an existing monitoring network for single air pollutants. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 90(8):2715–2729, June 2009. ISSN 0301-4797. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2009.02.016. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0301479709000711>.
- Leif Erik Andersson and Lars Imsland. Real-time optimization of wind farms using modifier adaptation and machine learning. *Wind Energy Science*, 5(3):885–896, 2020.

-
- Emil Annevelink, Rachel Kurchin, Eric Muckley, Lance Kavalsky, Vinay I Hegde, Valentin Sulzer, Shang Zhu, Jiankun Pu, David Farina, Matthew Johnson, et al. Automat: Automated materials discovery for electrochemical systems. *MRS Bulletin*, pp. 1–9, 2022.
- Martin Asenov, Marius Rutkauskas, Derryck Reid, Kartic Subr, and Subramanian Ramamoorthy. Active Localization of Gas Leaks Using Fluid Simulation. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 4(2):1776–1783, April 2019. ISSN 2377-3766. doi: 10.1109/LRA.2019.2895820.
- Peter M Attia, Aditya Grover, Norman Jin, Kristen A Severson, Todor M Markov, Yang-Hung Liao, Michael H Chen, Bryan Cheong, Nicholas Perkins, Zi Yang, et al. Closed-loop optimization of fast-charging protocols for batteries with machine learning. *Nature*, 578(7795):397–402, 2020.
- Arun Kumar AV, Santu Rana, Alistair Shilton, and Svetha Venkatesh. Human-ai collaborative Bayesian optimisation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:16233–16245, 2022.
- Maximilian Balandat, Brian Karrer, Daniel R. Jiang, Samuel Daulton, Benjamin Letham, Andrew Gordon Wilson, and Eytan Bakshy. BoTorch: A Framework for Efficient Monte-Carlo Bayesian Optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33*, 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.06403>.
- Daniil Bash, Yongqiang Cai, Vijila Chellappan, Swee Liang Wong, Xu Yang, Pawan Kumar, Jin Da Tan, Anas Abutaha, Jayce JW Cheng, Yee-Fun Lim, et al. Multi-fidelity high-throughput optimization of electrical conductivity in P3HT-CNT composites. *Advanced Functional Materials*, pp. 2102606, 2021.
- Laurens Bliet. A survey on sustainable surrogate-based optimisation. *Sustainability*, 14(7):3867, 2022.
- Laurens Bliet, Arthur Guijt, Rickard Karlsson, Sicco Verwer, and Mathijs de Weerd. Expobench: Benchmarking surrogate-based optimisation algorithms on expensive black-box functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.04618*, 2021.
- Ankush Chakrabarty, Claus Danielson, Scott A Bortoff, and Christopher R Laughman. Accelerating self-optimization control of refrigerant cycles with Bayesian optimization and adaptive moment estimation. *Applied Thermal Engineering*, 197:117335, 2021a.
- Ankush Chakrabarty, Emilio Maddalena, Hongtao Qiao, and Christopher Laughman. Scalable Bayesian optimization for model calibration: Case study on coupled building and HVAC dynamics. *Energy and Buildings*, 253:111460, 2021b.
- Kaixuan Chen, Jin Lin, Yiwei Qiu, Feng Liu, and Yonghua Song. Joint optimization of wind farm layout considering optimal control. *Renewable Energy*, 182:787–796, 2022.
- Tinkle Chugh and Endi Ymeraj. Wind farm layout optimisation using set based multi-objective Bayesian optimisation. In *Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference Companion (GECCO '22 Companion)*, pp. 695–698. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 07 2022. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3520304.3528951>.
- George De Ath, Richard M Everson, Alma AM Rahat, and Jonathan E Fieldsend. Greed is good: Exploration and exploitation trade-offs in Bayesian optimisation. *ACM Transactions on Evolutionary Learning and Optimization*, 1(1):1–22, 2021.
- Bart M Doekemeijer, Daan C Van Der Hoek, and Jan-Willem van Wingerden. Model-based closed-loop wind farm control for power maximization using Bayesian optimization: a large eddy simulation study. In *2019 IEEE Conference on Control Technology and Applications (CCTA)*, pp. 284–289. IEEE, 2019.
- Hongyang Dong, Jingjie Xie, and Xiaowei Zhao. Wind farm control technologies: From classical control to reinforcement learning. *Progress in Energy*, 2022.
- Priya L Donti and J Zico Kolter. Machine learning for sustainable energy systems. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, 46:719–747, 2021.

-
- Arsène Druel, Philippe Peylin, Gerhard Krinner, Philippe Ciais, Nicolas Viovy, Anna Peregon, Vladislav Bastrikov, Natalya Kosykh, and Nina Mironycheva-Tokareva. Towards a more detailed representation of high-latitude vegetation in the global land surface model ORCHIDEE (ORC-HL-VEGv1. 0). *Geoscientific Model Development*, 10(12):4693–4722, 2017.
- Marcello Fiducioso, Sebastian Curi, Benedikt Schumacher, Markus Gwerder, and Andreas Krause. Safe contextual Bayesian optimization for sustainable room temperature PID control tuning. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-19*, pp. 5850–5856. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 7 2019. doi: 10.24963/ijcai.2019/811. URL <https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2019/811>.
- Alexander S Flecker, Qinru Shi, Rafael M Almeida, Héctor Angarita, Jonathan M Gomes-Selman, Roosevelt García-Villacorta, Suresh A Sethi, Steven A Thomas, N LeRoy Poff, Bruce R Forsberg, et al. Reducing adverse impacts of amazon hydropower expansion. *Science*, 375(6582):753–760, 2022.
- Jose Pablo Folch, Shiqiang Zhang, Robert Lee, Behrang Shafei, David Walz, Calvin Tsay, Mark van der Wilk, and Ruth Misener. SnAKe: Bayesian optimization with pathwise exploration. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:35226–35239, 2022.
- Peter I Frazier and Jialei Wang. Bayesian optimization for materials design. In *Information science for materials discovery and design*, pp. 45–75. Springer, 2016.
- Daniel Frey, K.C. Neyerlin, and Miguel A. Modestino. Bayesian optimization of electrochemical devices for electrons-to-molecules conversions: The case of pulsed CO₂ electroreduction. *ChemRxiv*, 2022. doi: 10.26434/chemrxiv-2022-n09hc.
- Tianyu Gao and Xiaoli Bai. Bayesian optimization-based three-dimensional, time-varying environment monitoring using an UAV. *Journal of Intelligent & Robotic Systems*, 105(4):1–21, 2022.
- Sajad Haghanifar, Bolong Cheng, Michael McCourt, and Paul Leu. Using Bayesian optimization to improve solar panel performance by developing antireflective, superomniphobic glass. 2021. URL <https://www.climatechange.ai/papers/icml2021/84>.
- Sigrid Passano Hellan, Christopher G. Lucas, and Nigel H. Goddard. Optimising Placement of Pollution Sensors in Windy Environments, December 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2012.10770>. Presented at the NeurIPS 2020 Workshop on AI for Earth Sciences.
- Sigrid Passano Hellan, Christopher G. Lucas, and Nigel H. Goddard. Bayesian optimisation for active monitoring of air pollution. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 36(11):11908–11916, Jun. 2022. doi: 10.1609/aaai.v36i11.21448. URL <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/21448>.
- Carl Hvarfner, Frank Hutter, and Luigi Nardi. Joint entropy search for maximally-informed Bayesian optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- Environmental Research Group Imperial College London. London Air Quality Network. <https://www.londonair.org.uk/LondonAir/Default.aspx>, 1993. Accessed: 2021-08-31.
- Yiling Jia, Nipun Batra, Hongning Wang, and Kamin Whitehouse. Active collaborative sensing for energy breakdown. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, pp. 1943–1952, 2019.
- Steven Kleinegesse and Michael U Gutmann. Bayesian experimental design for implicit models by mutual information neural estimation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 5316–5326. PMLR, 2020.
- Fang-Yie Leu and Jia-Sheng Ho. Air pollution source identification by using neural network with Bayesian optimization. In *Innovative Mobile and Internet Services in Ubiquitous Computing: Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Innovative Mobile and Internet Services in Ubiquitous Computing (IMIS-2019)*, pp. 514–524. Springer, 2020.

-
- Qiaohao Liang, Aldair E Gongora, Zekun Ren, Armi Tiihonen, Zhe Liu, Shijing Sun, James R Deneault, Daniil Bash, Flore Mekki-Berrada, Saif A Khan, et al. Benchmarking the performance of Bayesian optimization across multiple experimental materials science domains. *npj Computational Materials*, 7(1):1–10, 2021.
- Haitao Liu, Yew-Soon Ong, Xiaobo Shen, and Jianfei Cai. When Gaussian process meets big data: A review of scalable GPs. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 31(11):4405–4423, 2020.
- S Lyden, W Olding, and Z Darbari. Bayesian optimization for maximum power point tracking in photovoltaic systems. In *2018 IEEE Power & Energy Society General Meeting (PESGM)*, pp. 1–5. IEEE, 2018.
- Anastasia Makarova, Huibin Shen, Valerio Perrone, Aaron Klein, Jean Baptiste Faddoul, Andreas Krause, Matthias Seeger, and Cedric Archambeau. Automatic termination for hyperparameter optimization. In *International Conference on Automated Machine Learning*, pp. 7–1. PMLR, 2022.
- R. Marchant and F. Ramos. Bayesian optimisation for Intelligent Environmental Monitoring. In *2012 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems*, pp. 2242–2249. IEEE, October 2012. doi: 10.1109/IROS.2012.6385653.
- Flore Mekki-Berrada, Zekun Ren, Tan Huang, Wai Kuan Wong, Fang Zheng, Jiaxun Xie, Isaac Parker Siyu Tian, Senthilnath Jayavelu, Zackaria Mahfoud, Daniil Bash, et al. Two-step machine learning enables optimized nanoparticle synthesis. *npj Computational Materials*, 7(1):1–10, 2021.
- John Mern, Anil Yildiz, Zachary Sunberg, Tapan Mukerji, and Mykel J Kochenderfer. Bayesian optimized Monte Carlo planning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 35, pp. 11880–11887, 2021. URL <https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/17411>.
- Philippe Morere, Roman Marchant, and Fabio Ramos. Sequential Bayesian optimization as a POMDP for environment monitoring with UAVs. In *2017 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pp. 6381–6388. IEEE, May 2017. doi: 10.1109/ICRA.2017.7989754.
- Nikolaos Moustakis, Sebastiaan Paul Mulders, Jens Kober, and Jan-Willem van Wingerden. A practical Bayesian optimization approach for the optimal estimation of the rotor effective wind speed. In *2019 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pp. 4179–4185. IEEE, 2019.
- SP Mulders, AK Pamososuryo, and JW Van Wingerden. Efficient tuning of individual pitch control: a Bayesian optimization machine learning approach. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, volume 1618, pp. 022039. IOP Publishing, 2020.
- Quan Nguyen, Kaiwen Wu, Jacob Gardner, and Roman Garnett. Local Bayesian optimization via maximizing probability of descent. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 35:13190–13202, 2022.
- NREL. FLORIS. version 2.1.1, 2020. URL <https://github.com/NREL/floris>.
- Rafael Oliveira, Louis Tiao, and Fabio T Ramos. Batch Bayesian optimisation via density-ratio estimation with guarantees. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:29816–29829, 2022.
- Diana L Ortiz-Montalvo, Aaron Gilad Kusne, Austin McDannald, Daniel Siderius, Kamal Choudhary, and Taner Yildirim. Machine learning for climate change: Guiding discovery of sorbent materials for direct air capture of CO₂. In *ICML 2021 Workshop on Tackling Climate Change with Machine Learning*, 2021. URL <https://www.climatechange.ai/papers/icml2021/84>.
- Leonard Papenmeier, Luigi Nardi, and Matthias Poloczek. Increasing the scope as you learn: Adaptive Bayesian optimization in nested subspaces. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- Jinkyoo Park. Contextual Bayesian optimization with trust region (CBOTR) and its application to cooperative wind farm control in region 2. *Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments*, 38:100679, 2020.

-
- Jinkyoo Park and Kincho H Law. A Bayesian optimization approach for wind farm power maximization. In *Smart Sensor Phenomena, Technology, Networks, and Systems Integration 2015*, volume 9436, pp. 46–57. SPIE, 2015.
- Jinkyoo Park and Kincho H Law. Bayesian ascent: A data-driven optimization scheme for real-time control with application to wind farm power maximization. *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology*, 24(5):1655–1668, 2016a.
- Jinkyoo Park and Kincho H Law. A data-driven, cooperative wind farm control to maximize the total power production. *Applied Energy*, 165:151–165, 2016b.
- Jinkyoo Park, Soon-Duck Kwon, and Kincho H Law. A data-driven approach for cooperative wind farm control. In *2016 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pp. 525–530. IEEE, 2016.
- Jinkyoo Park, Soon-Duck Kwon, and Kincho Law. A data-driven, cooperative approach for wind farm control: a wind tunnel experimentation. *Energies*, 10(7):852, 2017.
- Jinkyoo Park, Max Ferguson, and Kincho H Law. Data driven analytics (machine learning) for system characterization, diagnostics and control optimization. In *Workshop of the European Group for Intelligent Computing in Engineering*, pp. 16–36. Springer, 2018.
- Mads M Pedersen, Paul van der Laan, Mikkel Friis-Møller, Jennifer Rinker, and Pierre-Elouan Réthoré. Dtuwindenergy/pywake: Pywake. *Zenodo [code]*, 10, 2019.
- Biswajeet Pradhan, Maher Ibrahim Sameen, Husam AH Al-Najjar, Daichao Sheng, Abdullah M Alamri, and Hyuck-Jin Park. A meta-learning approach of optimisation for spatial prediction of landslides. *Remote Sensing*, 13(22):4521, 2021.
- Tom Rainforth, Adam Foster, Desi R Ivanova, and Freddie Bickford Smith. Modern Bayesian experimental design. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.14545*, 2023.
- Shyam Sundhar Ramesh, Pier Giuseppe Sessa, Andreas Krause, and Ilija Bogunovic. Movement penalized Bayesian optimization with application to wind energy systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.08087*, 2022.
- David Rolnick, Priya L Donti, Lynn H Kaack, Kelly Kochanski, Alexandre Lacoste, Kris Sankaran, Andrew Slavin Ross, Nikola Milojevic-Dupont, Natasha Jaques, Anna Waldman-Brown, et al. Tackling climate change with machine learning. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 55(2):1–96, 2022.
- Federico Peralta Samaniego, Daniel Gutiérrez Reina, Sergio L Toral Marín, Mario Arzamendia, and Derlis O Gregor. A Bayesian optimization approach for water resources monitoring through an autonomous surface vehicle: The Ypacarai lake case study. *IEEE Access*, 9:9163–9179, 2021.
- Nayat Sanchez-Pi, Luis Marti, André Abreu, Olivier Bernard, Colomban de Vargas, Damien Eveillard, Alejandro Maass, Pablo A Marquet, Jacques Sainte-Marie, Julien Salomon, et al. Artificial intelligence, machine learning and modeling for understanding the oceans and climate change. In *NeurIPS 2020 Workshop-Tackling Climate Change with Machine Learning*, 2020.
- Kristen A Severson, Olivia P Pfeiffer, Jie Chen, Kai Gong, Jeremy Gregory, Richard Goodwin, and Elsa A Olivetti. Amortized inference of Gaussian process hyperparameters for improved concrete strength trajectory prediction. *Tackling Climate Change with Machine Learning: workshop at NeurIPS 2021*, 2021.
- Bobak Shahriari, Kevin Swersky, Ziyu Wang, Ryan P. Adams, and Nando de Freitas. Taking the Human Out of the Loop: A Review of Bayesian Optimization. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 104(1):148–175, 2015. ISSN 1558-2256. doi: 10.1109/JPROC.2015.2494218.
- A. Singh, F. Ramos, H. D. Whyte, and W. J. Kaiser. Modeling and decision making in spatio-temporal processes for environmental surveillance. In *2010 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation*, pp. 5490–5497, May 2010. doi: 10.1109/ROBOT.2010.5509934.

-
- Lei Song, Ke Xue, Xiaobin Huang, and Chao Qian. Monte carlo tree search based variable selection for high dimensional Bayesian optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.01628*, 2022.
- Thomas Spooner, Anne E Jones, John Fearnley, Rahul Savani, Joanne Turner, and Matthew Baylis. Bayesian optimisation of restriction zones for bluetongue control. *Scientific reports*, 10(1):1–18, 2020.
- Shijing Sun, Armi Tiihonen, Felipe Oviedo, Zhe Liu, Janak Thapa, Yicheng Zhao, Noor Titan P Hartono, Anuj Goyal, Thomas Heumueller, Clio Batali, et al. A data fusion approach to optimize compositional stability of halide perovskites. *Matter*, 4(4):1305–1322, 2021.
- Atena M Tabakhi, William Yeoh, and Ferdinando Fioretto. The smart appliance scheduling problem: A Bayesian optimization approach. In *International Conference on Principles and Practice of Multi-Agent Systems*, pp. 100–115. Springer, 2020.
- Alexander Thebelt, Calvin Tsay, Robert Lee, Nathan Sudermann-Merx, David Walz, Behrang Shafei, and Ruth Misener. Tree ensemble kernels for Bayesian optimization with known constraints over mixed-feature spaces. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:37401–37415, 2022.
- Peter Tillmann, Klaus Jäger, and Christiane Becker. Minimising the levelised cost of electricity for bifacial solar panel arrays using Bayesian optimisation. *Sustainable Energy & Fuels*, 4(1):254–264, 2020.
- Kevin Tran and Zachary W Ulissi. Active learning across intermetallics to guide discovery of electrocatalysts for CO₂ reduction and H₂ evolution. *Nature Catalysis*, 1(9):696–703, 2018.
- Rohit Trivedi and Shafi Khadem. Peak demand management and schedule optimisation for energy storage through the machine learning approaches. In *IEEE EUROCON 2021-19th International Conference on Smart Technologies*, pp. 157–163. IEEE, 2021.
- Ben Tu, Axel Gandy, Nikolas Kantas, and Behrang Shafei. Joint entropy search for multi-objective Bayesian optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.02905*, 2022.
- Simon Valentin, Steven Kleinegesse, Neil R. Bramley, Peggy Serières, Michael U. Gutmann, and Christopher G. Lucas. Designing optimal behavioral experiments using machine learning, 2023.
- Duncan Watson-Parris. Machine learning for weather and climate are worlds apart. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 379(2194):20200098, 2021.
- Christopher KI Williams and Carl Edward Rasmussen. *Gaussian processes for machine learning*, volume 2. MIT press Cambridge, MA, 2006.
- Xiaojian Wu, Jonathan Gomes-Selman, Qinru Shi, Yexiang Xue, Roosevelt Garcia-Villacorta, Elizabeth Anderson, Suresh Sethi, Scott Steinschneider, Alexander Flecker, and Carla Gomes. Efficiently approximating the pareto frontier: hydropower dam placement in the amazon basin. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 32, 2018.
- Shanghai Yang, Xiaowei Deng, Zilong Ti, Bowen Yan, and Qingshan Yang. Cooperative yaw control of wind farm using a double-layer machine learning framework. *Renewable Energy*, 193:519–537, 2022.
- Sicheng Zhan, Gordon Wichern, Christopher Laughman, Adrian Chong, and Ankush Chakrabarty. Calibrating building simulation models using multi-source datasets and meta-learned Bayesian optimization. *Energy and Buildings*, pp. 112278, 2022.
- Xiantao Zhang, Da Lu, Hongyang Dong, Xiaowei Zhao, Feargal Brennan, and Yibo Liang. Vibration suppression of multi-component floating structures via passive TMDs and Bayesian ascent. *Ocean Engineering*, 259:112088, 2022.
- Miao Zhong, Kevin Tran, Yimeng Min, Chuanhao Wang, Ziyun Wang, Cao-Thang Dinh, Phil De Luna, Zongqian Yu, Armin Sedighian Rasouli, Peter Brodersen, et al. Accelerated discovery of CO₂ electrocatalysts using active machine learning. *Nature*, 581(7807):178–183, 2020.