

# Quantifying the Aggregate Flexibility of EV Charging Stations for Dependable Congestion Management Products: A Dutch Case Study<sup>\*</sup>

Nanda Kishor Panda<sup>a,\*\*</sup>, Simon H. Tindemans<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Department of Electrical Sustainable Energy, Delft University of Technology, Mekelweg 4, Delft, 2628 CD, The Netherlands

## ARTICLE INFO

**Keywords:**  
Electric Vehicle  
Congestion  
Flexibility  
Market Product  
Smart charging

## ABSTRACT

Electric vehicles (EVs) play a crucial role in the transition towards sustainable modes of transportation and thus are critical to the energy transition. As their number grows, managing the aggregate power of EV charging is crucial to maintain grid stability and mitigate congestion. This study analyses more than 500 thousand real charging transactions in the Netherlands to explore the challenge and opportunity for the energy system presented by EV growth and smart charging flexibility. Specifically, it analyses the collective ability to provide congestion management services according to the specifications of those services in the Netherlands. In this study, a data-driven model of charging behaviour is created to explore the implications of delivering dependable congestion management services at various aggregation levels and types of service. The probability of offering specific grid services by different categories of charging stations (CS) is analysed. These probabilities can help EV aggregators, such as charging point operators, make informed decisions about offering congestion mitigation products per relevant regulations and distribution system operators to assess their potential. The ability to offer different flexibility products, namely re-dispatch and capacity limitation, for congestion management, is assessed using various dispatch strategies. Next, machine learning models are used to predict the probability of CSs being able to deliver these products, accounting for uncertainties. Results indicate that residential charging locations have significant potential to provide both products during evening peak hours. While shared EVs offer better certainty regarding arrival and departure times, their small fleet size currently restricts their ability to meet the minimum order size of flexible products. The findings demonstrate that the timing of EV arrivals, departures, and connections plays a crucial role in determining the feasibility of product offerings, and dependable services can generally be delivered using a sufficiently large number of CSs.

## Abbreviations

**ACM** Authority for Consumers & Markets  
**BAU** Business as-usual  
**CP** Charging Point  
**CS** Charging Station  
**CSP** Congestion Service Provider  
**CPO** Charging Point Operator  
**DSO** Distribution System Operator  
**EV** Electric Vehicle  
**EVSE** Electric Vehicle Supply Unit  
**OCPI** Open Charge Point Interface  
**SOC** State of Charge  
**SOE** State of Energy  
**TOU** Time of Use

## 1. Introduction

Electric Vehicles (EVs) offer a promising and sustainable alternative to traditional Internal Combustion Engine (ICE) vehicles. This has prompted many countries to encourage the adoption of EVs through subsidies and the development of networks of charging infrastructure to support this transition. Without timely measures, the existing electricity grid in many locations cannot cope with heavy charging demand during peak hours, causing voltage fluctuations and overloading transformers and cables [1]. Typically, problems caused by increased EV charging demand can be eliminated by leveraging smart charging of EVs based on grid conditions, in other words, through leveraging their charging flexibility. Moreover, given that EVs are idle for 95% of the day, their inherent storage flexibility makes them an attractive option for grid balancing or other ancillary services [2]. The services offered by the EVs can range from simple demand response to more complex frequency regulation services.

The ability to offer grid services by the EVs is a well-researched field demonstrated by numerous researchers. One of the earliest studies from 2005 demonstrates how bi-directional charging (also known as V2G) of EVs can be used to balance the utility grid by charging and discharging based on grid conditions [3]. Apart from reducing the burden on the grid by charging smartly, EVs can even complement the integration of Renewable Energy Sources (RESs) by

<sup>\*</sup> The research was supported by the ROBUST project, which received funding from the MOOI subsidy programme by the Netherlands Ministry of Economic Affairs and Climate Policy and the Ministry of the Interior and Kingdom Relations, executed by the Netherlands Enterprise Agency.

<sup>\*\*</sup>Corresponding author

 n.k.panda@tudelft.nl (N.K. Panda); s.h.tindemans@tudelft.nl

(S.H. Tindemans)

ORCID(s): 0000-0002-9647-4424 (N.K. Panda); 0000-0001-8369-7568

(S.H. Tindemans)

storing the excess energy generated during low demand periods [4]. Therefore, the flexibility of EVs can significantly aid the transition to renewable energy sources rather than being an obstacle by functioning only as passive energy consumers.

Recent studies have shown how EVs can potentially offer solutions to grid problems based on implicit strategies [5]. Individual EV users can directly participate in the retail electricity market by offering services like demand response for financial incentives, optimised charging based on renewable energy generation or providing storage flexibility through bi-directional charging of EVs. There exist numerous studies in the literature quantifying the potential flexibility of EVs that can be accessed through strategic pricing and operating strategies [6, 7]. The authors of [8] show how certain incentives to EV users can be used to alleviate localised grid issues in an Low Voltage (LV) distribution network. Results show that benefits to the Distribution System Operator (DSO) and EV users vary based on charging strategy and incentive structure. In a different study, Time of Use (TOU) rates were effective in peak shaving using smart charging of EVs [9]. However, using TOU tariffs requires extensive consumer education and can be unfair to people who do not have access to TOU pricing schemes [10]. These studies focus on the control and operation of individual EVs, which limits the capacity and ability to participate in energy markets (day-ahead, re-dispatch or balancing market). Aggregation comes out as a powerful tool in using a group of EVs to participate in energy markets with the help of aggregators. For example, aggregate EVs can be used effectively for regulated ancillary services to provide secondary frequency response [11].

The previously mentioned studies highlight the numerous possibilities of using EV flexibility, the success of which is contingent upon the availability and design of incentives, geographic and contextual factors, regulatory environment, and the extent of EV adoption and charging infrastructure development. Particularly, the absence of an adequate regulatory framework results in economic and institutional barriers, which prevent proper valuation of EV flexibility services at the distribution level. This leads to increasing uncertainty surrounding the value of these services. A range of European demonstrator projects related to the adoption of EV flexibility is analyzed along with its associated barriers by the authors in [12], which highlights the lack of regulatory frameworks concerning the use of flexibility as a mainstream product. Several researchers have demonstrated the technical feasibility of offering flexibility by smart charging of EVs, but literature that quantifies the practical applicability of using EV flexibility is less abundant.

Grid congestion is influenced by EVs, but also an issue on its own that network operators must overcome at both the local and distribution levels [13]. Although reinforcing the grid to increase capacity is the simplest solution to this issue, it may not be the most desirable option from an investment perspective [14], or it may be impractical due to planning or resource constraints. This has led network operators to seek alternatives that can potentially delay investments, such

as new tariff structures [15], direct control schemes [16], and other market-based approaches [17, 18, 19]. This paper focuses on the market-based approach to congestion management within the context of the Netherlands' regulations. Market-based mechanisms are considered more effective at solving congestion problems on a larger scale, as they are less sensitive to individual flexible assets and have minimal impact on individual users [20].

In this paper, we demonstrate how aggregated flexibility of EVs can be leveraged to create dependable market-based products for congestion management services to DSOs, demonstrating this with a comprehensive case study of the Netherlands' EV charging landscape and congestion management practices. Real-life data from EV charging sessions in the Netherlands is used to model charging behaviour, its impact on the grid under various scenarios, and the potential ability of the EV fleet to provide grid services and congestion products. The analysed dataset includes charging stations in a variety of public and commercial spaces, and sessions from both shared and privately owned vehicles. The charging sessions are categorised into groups based on their typical charging behaviour (e.g. residential, shared and commercial use), which is a key factor for both grid impacts and flexibility of charging patterns. The statistical model of charging behaviour is used to explore the implications of delivering dependable congestion management services at various aggregation levels and types of service. The probability of meeting the requirements in specific grid services by a particular EV category is analysed using historical charging session data. These probabilities will help EV aggregators, such as charging point operators, make informed decisions about offering congestion mitigation products per relevant regulations and distribution system operators to assess their potential. Further, it is also shown how machine learning models can be effectively leveraged to predict the potential of offering flexibility products for congestion management services by Charging Stations (CSs).

## 2. EV flexibility in the Netherlands

### 2.1. EV adoption and charging infrastructure

Recently, the Netherlands has witnessed significant developments in the adoption of electric EVs as well as the associated expansion of charging infrastructure. The government aims to reduce carbon emissions by over 95% by 2050, with a significant portion of these emissions attributed to vehicular traffic. In light of this goal, policymakers have planned to ban the sale of ICE powered passenger vehicles by 2030 and plan to decarbonize the entire mobility sector by 2050 through the use of green electricity, green hydrogen, Power-to-X solutions, and bio-fuels [21]. Until July 2022, EVs amounted to 31.75% of the total sales of passenger cars in the Netherlands. Currently, over 450,000 passenger EVs are registered in the Netherlands. Of these, more than 13.1% belong to shared EV fleets, which play a crucial role in providing congestion management services, as will be emphasized later [22].

The rapid adoption of electric vehicles (EVs) in the Netherlands has gone hand in hand with the development of an extensive network of charging infrastructure. This surge in EV adoption, in turn, is putting stress on the existing electricity grid. With more than 270,000 public and semi-public CSs available, the ratio of chargers to registered EVs is a promising 0.6. The National Charging Infrastructure Agenda, part of the National Program for Charging Infrastructure, mandates smart charging requirements for all EV chargers installed in the Netherlands to ensure the future-proof deployment of electric mobility. The smart charging requirements guarantee that by 2025, all chargers (private, semi-private and public) will be equipped with internet connectivity, can receive control signals, communicate securely through standardized protocols such as Open Charge Point Interface (OCPI), and can have the capability to discharge for bi-directional charging [23, 24].

## 2.2. Congestion management regulations

The functioning of a whole network (HV, MV or LV) can be compromised due to a single bottleneck, usually in the form of capacity limitations of cables, transformers or other equipment responsible for power transportation in the network. Alternatively, voltage violations at specific nodes in the network can also pose significant challenges. These bottlenecks, also attributed as congestion, can impact the whole network below it. Congestion in networks can occur due to electrification of heating, cooling, and the mobility sector along with the growing penetration of distributed renewable energy sources [25]. In the Netherlands, electrification of demand and the rapid growth of distributed renewable generation have led to pervasive congestion in transmission and distribution grids, resulting in regular curtailment of generation and the delay of new connection requests. Measures to prevent and mitigate congestion in the Dutch power grid are being explored through alternative flexibility solutions to avoid the high costs and resource constraints of extensive network expansions in the short term. To encourage the use of flexibility as one of the mainstream solutions to avoid grid reinforcement, the Netherlands' energy regulatory body, the Authority for Consumers & Markets (ACM), has recently introduced new regulations that clarify the concept of congestion, assign specific responsibilities to stakeholders participating in congestion management services, and defines the characteristics of market products that can help alleviate congestion [26].

Under the congestion management regulations, in the event of structural congestion, grid operators must inform all parties in the affected area about the nature, duration and magnitude of the expected congestion. Moreover, all available market-based resources must be used for congestion management before using non-market-based solutions (e.g. forced curtailment). The regulations introduce a new role in the Dutch grid code known as Congestion Service Providers (CSPs), responsible for offering flexibility to the grid operators. CSPs can place bids on behalf of connected

parties with power-generating units, energy storage, or demand installations of 1 MW capacity or more. They can also participate in the re-dispatch process via counter-trading and act as aggregators of small-scale flexibility by submitting bids for a group of affiliates with power-generating units, energy storage, or demand installations under 1 MW capacity.

One of the key additions to these new regulations is that anyone with telemetry or a smart meter may offer flexibility services (through a CSP), but those with a connection of over 60 MW are required to do so. Exemptions from regulations may be made for national security, hospitals, and other similar entities. In congested areas, smaller consumers with a connection capacity of greater than 1 MW and less than 60 MW may be required by the DSOs to participate in congestion services.

Market-based congestion management in the Netherlands is based on two types of products with various sub-types:

- *Re-dispatch*: Adjustments relative to the scheduled consumption after the closure of the day-ahead market. This is achieved through matching intra-day bids and offers inside and outside the congested region, mediated by the GOPACS<sup>1</sup> platform. To participate in the re-dispatch product, a CSP must offer a minimum of 100 kW for one imbalance settlement period. Two variations exist:
  - Mandatory participation (*biedplichtcontract*). Large customers must offer re-dispatch products, often for an agreed price.
  - Voluntary participation, enabled by trading on the intra-day market with the addition of a location tag that enables matching trades across congestion boundaries.
- *Capacity limitation*: Standard connection agreements in the Netherlands have a fixed capacity. Various options have been (and are being) created to offer more flexible connection contracts.
  - Fixed capacity limitation contracts. For a fee, customers agree to reduce their contracted capacity at specified times.
  - On-demand capacity limitation contracts. As mentioned above, the capacity reduction only applies when the network operator sends a notification through the GOPACS platform. The notification is sent in the morning of the previous day, so that it can be accounted for in day-ahead trading.
  - Non-firm connection agreement. Connections are offered at a reduced cost but come with limitations on usable capacity. The option with day-ahead notification as above is being rolled out and alternatives with restrictions are regular

<sup>1</sup><https://www.gopacs.eu>

times or a maximum restriction budget are under discussion.<sup>2</sup>

In the following, we will consider the two mean categories of re-dispatch and capacity limitation products for our analysis.

### 3. Classification of charging sessions

#### 3.1. EV charging topology

For the rest of the paper, the following definitions and arrangements hold as is the general practice in the Netherlands. The charging topology used in this paper consists of three entities:

- *Charging point (CP)*: It refers to the physical connector in the form of socket or a cable connection that an EV can make use of to charge. In OCPI, this is referred to as an Electric Vehicle Supply Unit (EVSE), which is responsible for the power supply to a single EV in a single session.
- *Charging station (CS)*: This refers to a charging pole which can contain one or more Charging Points (CPs). The typical arrangement for charging points in public or commercial settings (used in this study) is a CS with two CPs.
- *Charging session*: data related to the charging of an EV at one of the CPs of a CS.

#### 3.2. Dataset

The analysis presented in this paper is based on over 550,000 EV charging transactions that occurred between June 2020 and March 2023. All the charging events are associated with CSs operated by a single Charging Point Operator (CPO) distributed in and around Utrecht, The Netherlands. The data is extracted using the OCPI protocol, an open-source, scalable protocol that enables a seamless connection between a CPOs and any e-mobility service provider [28]. The OCPI protocol is also mandated in all CSs by 2025 in the list of smart charging requirements outlined by the Dutch National Agenda for Charging Infrastructure [24]. Data related to individual charging transactions were extracted from the Charge Detail Record (CDR) module, part of the OCPI v2.1 protocol, which describes the charging session and its associated costs. The time-series power profile for all charge points was extracted first and then linked with each charging session based on the starting and ending times of connections. The maximum charging power ability of EVs in each charging session was obtained by finding the maximum power of its associated charging profile.

<sup>2</sup>Although formally not a market-based congestion management product, the non-firm connection agreement is included in this listing because, on operational time scales, it works the same way as the capacity limitation contracts [27]

#### 3.3. Statistical insights

There has been a growth in the EV charging infrastructure along with the daily charging sessions, as seen in Fig:1; however, this growth has been uneven due to various factors such as societal, political, and economic reasons. For example, sharp variations in daily charging events could be seen on days near the introduction/ withdrawal of certain coronavirus-related restrictions. The large-scale effect of the pandemic on the EV industry has been analysed in detail in [29]. Periodic events such as public holidays also impact the EV's usage pattern, which in turn affects the daily charging transactions as shown in Fig:1.


Daily EV charging events were strongly correlated with the increase in CSs. Daily available CSs refer to those available on a given day, whether or not they were utilized by any EVs. Daily active CSs refer to CS that have been utilized at least once during the day for EV charging. By definition, the number of daily active CSs is always less than or equal to the number of daily available CSs for a given day.

As seen in Fig:1, there has been strong growth in daily charging events over the past years. When the number of charging sessions is normalized by the number of either daily active or available CSs, we observe a similar distribution of charging events per available/active CS across all three years of data. Among those, the ratio of charging events to that of daily available CSs shows fewer fluctuations. For this reason, the stochastic model introduced in later sections samples charging sessions by drawing sets of sessions associated with available CSs on a random day.

#### 3.4. Charging locations and accessibility

Although EVs charging schedules are highly stochastic, their properties depend on the time of the day, location of charging and category of EV users. This is most easily explored through aggregate charging profiles. Based on visual analysis, we chose to categorise all the available CSs into three categories and labelled *shared*, *commercial* or *residential* based on their characteristics as shown in Fig:2. Shared CSs are predominantly used by shared EVs (more than 50% sessions), whereas residential and commercial CSs are categorised based on their location, as locations influence the charging patterns of the EVs charged there.

In the dataset being analyzed, all the charging sessions are from CSs operated by a single CPO. These CSs are located at different places, some of which have accessibility restrictions. Using the accessibility tags along with the type of location, we segregate the charging stations into either residential or commercial. For instance, on-street chargers that are publicly accessible are considered residential. The CSs that are open to the public can be used by anyone who owns an EV. On the other hand, the charging stations located at private locations have limited accessibility due to their physical location, such as being inside a gated property. This means that only individuals with access to the private location, such as residents or employees, can use the CSs located there. The categorisation of charging sessions based on location and accessibility is depicted in Table:1.




**Figure 1:** Evolution of charging events over time. The top figure shows the trends in daily charging transactions while the middle plot shows the evolution of daily available and active CSs. The bottom plot shows the ratio of daily charging events with that of daily active and available CSs. Data spans from May 2020 till February 2023. Measures related to the coronavirus pandemic are shown in  $---$ , where annotations 1, 2, 3, and 4 reflect major events, such as the start of the start of partial lockdown, begin of night curfews, the closure of catering/ social places and the start of the second lockdown respectively in the Netherlands. Background shading differentiates various years. Also, public holidays that might affect charging patterns are shown using  $----$ .

**Table 1**  
Distribution of charging sessions based on charging location and accessibility.

% of sessions	Public	Private
On street	78.6	1.8
Unknown	1.8	8.7
Other	0	2.0
Parking lot	3.3	1.7
Parking garage	1.7	0.2
Underground garage	0	0.1
	Residential	Commercial


The distinct charging behaviour in these three categories is evidenced by the statistical distributions shown in Fig:3. Shared EVs transactions have a similar distribution of arrival times with transactions from residential CSs during weekdays, except for fewer new arrivals in the morning hours. However, transactions in commercial locations experience a morning peak in activity when people arrive at work and connect their vehicles to charging stations. The evening peak for residential CSs is attributed to vehicle connections made after returning from work. Shared CSs, on the other hand, are primarily occupied during evening hours as the shared



**Figure 2:** Method of categorisation for CSs based on location, accessibility and type of usage.

EVs are used in the morning and gradually returned during the evening hours.

Based on the distribution of connection times, it can be inferred that EVs are connected for significantly longer periods in shared CSs compared to EVs in residential and commercial CSs. This trend may be due to lower reservation rates for shared EVs during weekends compared to weekdays. Analysis of the distribution of charging volume



**Figure 3:** Distribution of arrival time, parking duration and charging energy demand for the charging sessions in each category of CSs.

requirements also shows that EVs using shared CS exhibit greater homogeneity in terms of charging volume compared to other CS categories.

There are also differences in arrival times and connection duration between weekdays and weekends for all three categories of CS. During the weekend, the arrival time peak for EVs in shared CS is shifted back a few hours, possibly due to different usage patterns during weekdays and weekends, as well as varying charging infrastructure availability. We also observe a group of very late arrivals after midnight, which likely consists of EVs used for longer leisure or sightseeing trips. For commercial CSs, there is a reduction in the morning peak on weekends attributed to the closure of work locations. Most weekend arrivals at commercial charging poles are at locations that can also be used by the public, such as shopping complex or tourist attractions. For residential users, the morning and evening peaks are flatter. We see considerable peaks in connection duration for shared transactions during weeks. This is mainly due to low reservation rates of shared EVs during the start of the week. For residential charging sessions, the connection duration shows less variability, also due to the prevalence of occupancy fees (parking for an extended duration) in most of the on-street charging locations.

The differences among the three categories of CSs can also be seen in their aggregated daily unoptimised charging profiles as shown in Fig:4, separated by day of the week (weekday or weekend). Unoptimised charging refers to the charging strategy where each EV is charged with the maximum possible power as soon as it is connected to the charger until it is fully charged. The data underlines the difference

in charging behaviour for the three identified categories and between weekdays and weekends.

Fig:4 also shows the weighted average 15-minute probability ( $\mathbb{P}_t(c)$ ) of an EV being connected to one of the CPs within a specific CS category ( $c$ ). To calculate this probability, we first determine the probability of an EV being connected per quarter hour for each individual CP:

$$\mathbb{P}_t(CP) = \frac{\sum_{d \in D_{CP}} a_{d,t}}{|D_{CP}|}, \quad \forall CP, \forall t \in \{1, \dots, 24 \times 4\}. \quad (1)$$

Here,  $D_{CS}$  refers to the collection of continuous days during which a CP is operational (available). The binary variable  $a_{d,t}$  indicates whether a connection between an EV and a CP exists at a specific 15-minute interval  $t$  on a given day  $d$ . Subsequently, we compute the weighted average of these probabilities across all CP within the same category, as explained in (2). The weights ( $w_{cs}$ ) correspond to the ratio of the operational time (measured in days) of each CP to the total time span (also in days) of the dataset.

$$\mathbb{P}_t(c) = \frac{\sum_{CP \in c} w_{CP} \mathbb{P}_t(CP)}{\sum_{CP \in c} w_{CP}}, \quad \forall t \in \{1, \dots, 24 \times 4\}. \quad (2)$$


## 4. Models and Methods

For each of the CS categories, a statistical model is constructed using historical charging transactions. This model is subsequently utilized to generate random input samples for various dispatch strategies, thereby enabling an evaluation of their effectiveness in delivering a specific flexibility product. First we explain how sampling is done for analysing historical charging transactions.

### 4.1. Random sampling of charging events

Initially, our analysis aims to assess the probability of offering various market products (re-dispatch and capacity limitation) through the CSs of various pre-determined categories using the set of historical charging transaction data. For this, we perform Monte Carlo analysis using deterministic dispatch models with different objectives for each market product. These models are applied to randomly selected charging events, sampled from historical data using the process explained in Algorithm 1. Sampling is performed per discrete quantities of CS per category, ensuring that the quantity of daily available CSs used for sampling does not surpass the lowest daily available CSs for that category in the data.

We include all available CS in our analysis because the capacity to provide flexibility products is closely tied to the frequency of daily charging sessions. As the daily charging transactions are unevenly spread across years, there is a notable correlation with the daily count of available charging stations. By taking into account the minimum number of charging stations available daily within a specific category, we can effectively eliminate the bias of any disproportionate surge in daily charging transactions in the sampling process.



**Figure 4:** Quantile distribution of unoptimised aggregate load profiles (normalised by the number of available charging points), segregated by CS category and weekday/weekend. The empirical probability of an EV being connected to one of the CS is also plotted using a secondary axis. Charging profiles are computed based on the arrival time, energy transfer and maximum charging power associated with the charging sessions for each category.

Nomenclature			
<i>Sets</i>			
$\mathcal{N}$	Set of all EV transactions in the chosen sample.	$\bar{p}_n$	The maximum charging/ discharging power of $n^{\text{th}}$ EV $\forall n \in \mathcal{N}$ .
$\mathcal{T}$	Set of all time-steps considered in the optimisation problem.	$\underline{p}_n$	The minimum charging/ discharging power of $n^{\text{th}}$ EV $\forall n \in \mathcal{N}$ .
$\mathcal{T}_f$	Set of all time-steps considered in the flexibility request window.	$P_t^{\text{base}}$	The aggregate charging power demand of all the EVs assuming dumb charging at time-step $t$ .
<i>Parameters</i>		$t_n^a$	Arrival time of $n^{\text{th}}$ EV
$\Delta t$	Duration of one time-step.	$t_n^d$	Departure time of $n^{\text{th}}$ EV
$\epsilon$	A small number used as a multiplier for balancing the numerical sensitivity of the objective function.	<i>Variables</i>	
$\bar{e}_n$	The maximum State of Energy (SOE) of $n^{\text{th}}$ EV $\forall n \in \mathcal{N}$ .	$\sigma$	The maximum deviation from the aggregate dumb charging profile
		$p_{n,t}$	The charging/ discharging power of $n^{\text{th}}$ EV at time-step $t$ ; $\forall t \in \mathcal{T}$ and $n \in \mathcal{N}$ .

This approach helps us mitigate the potential impact of skewed transaction data on our analysis.

The Monte Carlo samples generated are then utilized to estimate the likelihood of offering a particular type of flexibility product. In accordance with the congestion management products outlined in Section 2.2, our focus is on two types of flexibility products: re-dispatch and capacity limitations.

## 4.2. Dispatch Strategies

In this paper, we use four dispatch strategies for each of the CS categories, including unoptimized charging of EVs, to compare their effectiveness in delivering different market products. Each of these strategies is based on the set of following assumptions.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Pseudocode for Monte Carlo analysis.

---

**Input:**

- $D$ : Set of unique dates available in the charging transaction data
- $C$ : Set of CS categories (shared, residential & commercial)
- $Q$ : Set of quantities of CS, for which simulation is run
- $n_{sample}$ : number of sampled days
- $D_{CS}(d, c)$ : Set of daily available CSs on  $d \in D$  for category  $c \in C$

**Output:** Monte Carlo iteration results for the desired model.

```

1 for  $c \in C$  do
2   for  $q \in Q$  do
3     initialize:  $n = 0$ 
4     while  $n < n_{sample}$  do
5        $d_s :=$  random sampled date from  $D$ 
6       if  $n \geq |D_{CS}(d_s, c)|$  then
7         continue with while loop
8       else
9         Solve the desired model, analyse
          and store the results
10       $n += 1$ 

```

---

- All EVs are charged fully by the end of their session. The volume of energy charged by each vehicle is taken from the historical data, which can be less than or equal to the actual capacity of the EV's battery.
- For the bi-directional charging of EVs, the State of Charge (SOC) of the batteries can never be less than their initial SOC. This assumption reflects the fact that the total battery capacity is not contained in the session information, but it also ensures that an EV owner never finds their vehicle with a lower SOC than they initially had.
- EVs are not allowed to charge more than their corresponding historical charge volume, which potentially limits the actual flex capability of EVs and results in a conservative estimation of flexibility.
- The time resolution of available data is in seconds. However, it was re-sampled to a time resolution of 15 minutes, which is also the time step used for all the analyses. The arrival and departure times are rounded to the nearest 15 minutes. Transactions that became infeasible after rounding due to having a connection time lower than the minimum time required for charging were dropped (fewer than 0.1% of transactions)

- The maximum duration for which an EV can be connected to a charger is restricted to 36 hours (144 time steps).

#### 4.2.1. Unoptimised charging

Unoptimised charging (also known as or *dumb* charging) is conventionally used in the absence of other control strategies (smart charging). The EVs are charged using maximum power ( $\bar{p}_n$ ) until their original charging demand ( $\bar{e}_n$ ). In order to generate the dumb profile using discrete time steps, the *minimum time to charge* is rounded down to nearest integer time step. Next, the EV is charged with a reduced power for the last time step, which can be calculated from the remaining power that needs to be charged.

#### 4.2.2. Optimal re-dispatch

The optimal re-dispatch strategy is based on the assumption of having perfect knowledge of the arrival and departure times of all EVs, with the aim of maximizing the deviation between the optimized aggregated power profiles and the Business as-usual (BAU) scenario. In this paper, we consider the BAU aggregate profile as the unoptimised case, which is generated using unoptimized charging as detailed in Section 4.2.1. The deviation is maximised for all time-steps within the flexibility request time-window ( $\mathcal{T}_f$ ) as shown in Fig:5. The objective is to maximize  $\sigma$  which represents the shift from the BAU aggregate profile inside  $\mathcal{T}_f$ .

The optimal re-dispatch power ( $\sigma$ ) is calculated by solving a simple Linear Programming (LP) defined by the set of equations (3)-(10). An additional term  $\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \vartheta_{n,t}$  is added to the objective function in order to minimize frequent switching *On* and *Off* of the EVs, especially in case of bi-directional charging. Maximising  $\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \vartheta_{n,t}$  forces the optimiser to penalise switching events (transition from charging to discharging or vice-versa) for all the EVs considered in the optimisation instance. A small multiplier  $\epsilon$  is also used in the objective function to maintain equal numerical sensitivity of both:  $\sigma$  and  $\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \vartheta_{n,t}$ . Equations (4)-(6) shows the relationship between power and energy and makes sure that all EVs are fully charged by the time they depart from the charging station. The charging and discharging power is limited through the constraints (7)-(8). The optimal re-dispatch policy is enforced by constraint (9) and the objective function (3).

$$\max_{\sigma, \vartheta} \sigma + \epsilon \left( \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \vartheta_{n,t} \right) \quad (3)$$

subject to:


$$e_{n,t} = 0, \quad t \leq t_n^a \quad n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (4)$$

$$e_{n,t} = e_{n,t-1} + p_{n,t-1} \Delta t, \quad t_n^a < t < t_n^d \quad n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (5)$$

$$e_{n,t} = \bar{e}_n, \quad t \geq t_n^d \quad n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (6)$$

$$p_{n,t} = 0, \quad t < t_n^a \wedge t \geq t_n^d \quad n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (7)$$

$$\underline{p}_n \leq p_{n,t} \leq \bar{p}_n \quad t_n^a \leq t < t_n^d \quad n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (8)$$



**Figure 5:** Aggregated power profiles for different dispatch strategies as explained in Section 4.2 for a randomly selected day with 250 residential type CSs sampled from all available CSs on that day used pre-dominantly by non-shared residential EVs users.

$$P_t^{base} \geq \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} p_{n,t} + \sigma, \quad t \in \mathcal{T}_f \quad (9)$$

$$\sigma \geq 0 \quad (10)$$

#### 4.2.3. Optimal capacity limitation

Optimal capacity limitation strategies dispatches EVs in such a way that minimises the maximum aggregate power during a given flexibility request window. Like the optimal re-dispatch policy, this also assumes perfect knowledge of all EV's arrival and departure time. A LP based optimisation can be used to minimise the value of  $\sigma$  as given in (11). The optimisation formulation for capacity limitation is similar to that of re-dispatch except for the sense of optimisation and the constraint for  $\sigma$  as shown in (12). As  $\sigma$  is taken to be positive real, the effect of uni or bidirectional charging on capacity limitations will be the same.

The optimal peak capacity required during the flexibility request window can be leveraged for non-firm capacity contracts by the CPOs. For a single case, the calculated capacity limitation is shown in Fig:5.

$$\min_{\sigma, \theta} \quad \sigma - \epsilon \left( \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \vartheta_{n,t} \right) \quad (11)$$

subject to:

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} p_{n,t} - \sigma \leq 0, t \in \mathcal{T}_f \quad (12)$$

Constraints (4) – (8), (10)

#### 4.2.4. Greedy avoidance dispatch

The presented greedy algorithm assumes that the departure time of EVs is only known upon their arrival. This dispatch approach does not take into account the interdependencies between individual EVs' arrival and departure times, unlike optimal re-dispatch and capacity limitation dispatch policies. Similar to other dispatch policies, the greedy dispatch can be realised by minimising the charging power of each EV within the flexibility request window  $\mathcal{T}_f$  using the objective (13) along with the following linear constraints.  $\Phi_n$  is the optimal capacity limitation per vehicle. The greedy capacity limitation of the aggregate fleet is given

by  $\max \left( \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} p_{n,t}^* \right), t \in \mathcal{T}_f$ , where  $p_{n,t}^*$  is the optimised individual power profile. Similarly, the greedy re-dispatch can be calculated with respect to the base profile (unoptimised) as  $\min \left( P_t^{base} - \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} p_{n,t}^* \right), t \in \mathcal{T}_f$ .

$$\min_{\Phi, \theta} \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \Phi_n - \epsilon \left( \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \vartheta_{n,t} \right) \quad (13)$$

subject to:

$$p_{n,t} - \Phi_n \leq 0, \quad t \in \mathcal{T}_f \quad (14)$$

$$\Phi_n \geq 0, \quad n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (15)$$


Constraints (4) – (8)

There exists a certain degree of uncertainty with EV's arrival and departure time; however, in practice CPOs can estimate the departure times of EVs by analyzing their users' past data. This method is particularly effective for shared EVs, which typically have a predictable booking schedule.

Figure 5 shows the aggregated power profile for different dispatch strategies presented above for both mono- and bi-directional charging. Although bi-directional charging performs much better in the case of a re-dispatch strategy, but does not have any influence on the greedy and capacity limitation dispatch policy.

### 4.3. Forecasting of flexibility

The models outlined in Section 4.2 rely on having perfect foresight to determine optimal values for delivering various market products. However, real-world scenarios are characterized by inherent uncertainty regarding the departure and arrival times of each EV. For example, a study focused on EV users in the Netherlands revealed that the chosen route by drivers can impact the SOC of each vehicle upon arrival at the charging location and the availability of different types of chargers, such as fast or slow, can influence the EV user's route selection [30]. As a result, a single charging session can be influenced by numerous uncertainties, which in turn can ultimately affect the EV fleet's flexibility. This



**Figure 6:** Workflow showing extraction of features from pre-processed EV transactions data.

uncertainty can impact the overall aggregated charging profile, subsequently affecting the feasibility of delivering re-dispatch flexibility products. Similarly, uncertainties about the availability of EVs at charging locations can influence the charging stations' capacity to offer capacity limitation products.

To address this inherent uncertainty to a certain extent and understand its impact on the probability of providing the two congestion products, we take the following approach:

- For re-dispatch, we initially forecast the base profile (unoptimised), which is subsequently utilized to forecast the re-dispatch power for the aggregate fleet. This is achieved by applying a greedy avoidance dispatch method to individual vehicles.
- Similarly, we directly forecast the power for capacity limitation within the aggregate fleet. In this case, each individual EV's dispatch is determined using the greedy avoidance algorithm.

This methodology enables us to account for and analyze uncertainty while evaluating the feasibility of offering the aforementioned congestion products.

As shown in Fig:6, the pre-processed charging transactions are grouped per their start date and sampled based on Algorithm 1. Each sample is used to create additional

features, which together form a single input to the machine learning models.

The features incorporated in our approach are derived from key factors that have the potential to influence the usage patterns of EVs. These features are selected in collaboration with industry partners participating in the ROBUST project, which encompass entities such as CPO, DSO, and energy companies. Four date-related features, namely the day of the week, season, month and holidays, are used. Days of the week and seasons are transformed into circular coordinates using trigonometric transformations, whereas the holiday feature is taken as a boolean feature. These features, along with the 7-day moving average, are known by CPO. In addition number of weather-related features are chosen due to their influence on the usage and driving pattern of EVs [31]. For example, a less sunny and windy day will attract more users to use their cars rather than their bicycles. How seasonal variations can affect EV usage among different categories like private and shared EVs is explained in detail in [32]. The daily mean temperature, daily sunshine duration, daily mean wind speed and precipitation duration are taken as weather-related features.

For predicting re-dispatch power within the flexibility request window, it is crucial to estimate the BAU power profile first, as it influences how much the EV fleet can deviate. Two machine learning models ( $\mathcal{M}_1^{rd}$  and  $\mathcal{M}_2^{rd}$ ) together are used to predict the re-dispatch product. The input data is preprocessed and split into three segments, with the first two comprising 40% each, designated for training the models, while the final 20% is reserved for testing both models.

First a Support Vector Regressor (SVR) ( $\mathcal{M}_1^{rd}$ ) is trained using the set of features  $F_1 - F_2$  ( $X$ ) to predict  $\hat{P}_{dumb}$  (c.f. Fig:5), which is the minimum of the unoptimised aggregate charging profile within the flexibility request window. Next, the trained model is used to create the new target labels:  $\hat{L}_1 - L_2$ , which is a conservative estimate of re-dispatch power from the aggregate unoptimised BAU profile, where individual EVs are dispatch in accordance with the greedy avoidance dispatch algorithm. Next, the same set of features, but with the new label, is used to train  $\mathcal{M}_2^{rd}$ , which predicts the re-dispatch power ( $\hat{P}_{re-dispatch}$ ). As shown in Fig:7, the training and testing process for the re-dispatch product can be described using (16)-(17).

$$\hat{L}_1 = \mathcal{M}_1^{rd}(X, L_1) \quad (16)$$

$$\widehat{\hat{L}_1 - L_2} = \mathcal{M}_2^{rd}(X, \hat{L}_1 - L_2) \quad (17)$$

For predicting of capacity-limitation product, a third SVR ( $\mathcal{M}^{cl}$ ) is trained with the same set of features as above, but with the target label  $L_2$  which is the maximum of the aggregated greedy dispatch power profile ( $\bar{P}_{greedy}$ ) as shown in Fig:5.




Figure 7: Train and test workflows for the proposed machine learning models.

## 5. Results

In this section, we delve into the detailed analysis of the ability of EV fleets to provide two distinct flexibility products: capacity limitations and re-dispatch. We achieved this through the utilization of the previously developed models and methodologies. Our approach involved investigating different categories of CSs and their potential to offer these flexibility products under varying levels of aggregation. This analysis was carried out first using historical data and later using predictive models.

Firstly, we employed Monte Carlo simulations to estimate the probabilities of offering flexibility products for different categories of CS under varying levels of aggregation. This involved two specific flexibility request windows: 8:00-11:00 and 18:00-21:00. Randomly generated inputs according to Algorithm 1 were utilized to simulate different scenarios.

Subsequently, we trained machine learning models to directly predict the probability of these flexibility products. The performance of these predictive models was then compared with the results obtained from the Monte Carlo analysis. The evaluation was conducted within the context of two distinct flexibility windows: the morning peak hours and the evening peak hours. These windows were of three hours each.

### 5.1. Perfect Foresight


To initiate our analysis, we applied the dispatch strategies (*unoptimized*, *optimal*, and *greedy avoidance*) as explained in Section 4.2. We employed Monte Carlo analysis to assess the impact of these strategies on different categories of CS and various levels of aggregation.

For each category of CS (shared, commercial, and residential), a total of 2000 samples were generated per discrete quantity of CS, making use of the mentioned dispatch strategies. To account for the potential variability, we repeated this process for both the morning and evening peak hours. These time frames were specifically chosen due to their association with congestion in distribution networks.

Incorporating a robust statistical approach, the Monte Carlo analysis results encompass error bars that effectively capture the sampling error. This was achieved by employing bootstrapping on 10,000 samples and plotting their standard error. These error bars provide a comprehensive visualization of the uncertainty associated with our analysis and findings.

#### 5.1.1. Re-dispatch flexibility product

The initial results presented are for the re-dispatch market product, which refers to the maximum amount of power reduction that can be offered by the aggregate EV fleets as compared to the BAU case. In this case, unoptimized charging was used as the base scenario as described by the unoptimised strategy presented in Section 4.2. The optimal dispatch strategy was utilized to ensure optimal re-dispatch flexibility within the flexibility request window, assuming the arrival and departure times of all EVs are known beforehand. However, it is challenging to have knowledge of these in reality, which is why the greedy avoidance dispatch algorithm is also simulated and compared with the optimal re-dispatch case. The greedy re-dispatch estimates the conservative shift from BAU by calculating the minimum difference between the unoptimised aggregate power profile and that of the greedy dispatch aggregate power profile within the flexibility request window. Both models were analyzed




**Figure 8:** Probabilities of offering re-dispatch flexibility product for different variations in dispatch strategies, quantities of CSs and categories of CSs. The greedy dispatch for uni and bidirectional is shown using  $\bullet$  and  $\bullet$  markers respectively.  $\bullet$  and  $\bullet$  represent the uni and bidirectional results for optimal re-dispatch respectively.

for varying quantities of CSs and for uni and bidirectional charging. The results of greedy and optimal re-dispatch for each Monte Carlo sample are used to construct their empirical distribution functions, which were later employed to calculate the probabilities of providing a minimum threshold (in # kW) of re-dispatch flexibility, as depicted in Fig:8.

Upon analysis of the results presented in Figure 8, two distinct trends can be observed within each category with respect to different re-dispatch threshold powers and quantities of CS. Generally, an increase in the quantity of CS for each category leads to a higher probability of re-dispatching

a given threshold power. Conversely, for a fixed quantity of CS, the likelihood of re-dispatching decreases with an increase in the threshold of power. A comparison of different dispatch strategies reveals that bidirectional optimal re-dispatch has the highest probability of offering a given re-dispatch threshold, followed by bidirectional greedy re-dispatch and unidirectional optimal re-dispatch. This trend is consistent across all three categories of CS. However, the steepest increase in the ability to re-dispatch a given threshold of power is observed for bidirectional optimal re-dispatch, followed by bidirectional greedy re-dispatch and




**Figure 9:** The maximum capacity per CS for various flexibility request windows, illustrated for quantiles of 0.5, 0.95, and 0.99 while considering random quantities of CS across different categories (shared, residential, and commercial). The greedy dispatch for uni and bidirectional is shown using  $\bullet$  and  $\bullet$  markers respectively.  $\bullet$  and  $\bullet$  represent the uni and bidirectional results for optimal re-dispatch respectively.  $\bullet$  represents the case of unoptimised or dumb charging.

unidirectional optimal re-dispatch, with an increase in quantities of CS. It should be noted that bidirectional smart charging greatly increases the probability of reaching a desired threshold power or reduces the quantities of CS required to re-dispatch a certain threshold power level compared with other strategies.

The probabilities of offering a certain threshold of re-dispatch during the two flexibility request windows vary for each category. As depicted in Fig:8b, the shared and residential CSs are more likely to offer re-dispatch products during

the evening window than during the morning window (see Fig:8a). This observation is consistent with the arrival time distributions of EVs shown in Fig:3. During the morning flexibility request window, these categories perform poorly due to the lower probability of an EV being connected and charging to one of their CSs. In contrast, commercial CSs have the most EVs arriving during the morning hours and thus perform better during this window.

In order to offer a reliable re-dispatch product in accordance with the updated ACM regulations, the CSP is



**Figure 10:** Effects of varying the duration of flexibility request window on the delivery of different flexibility products. The flexibility window starts from 18:00 hours during the evening peak. Results are plotted for different categories of CSs using an optimal dispatch scheme with bidirectional charging. —, —, —, —, — represents flexibility request windows of length 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 hours, respectively, starting from 18:00 hours.

**Table 2**

Minimum required CS for offering at least 100 kW re-dispatch between 18:00-21:00 hours with 100% probability

Dispatch strategies	Categories of CSs		
	Shared	Commercial	Residential
Optimal re-dispatch (bidirectional)	75	-	50
Greedy re-dispatch (bidirectional)	-	-	100
Optimal re-dispatch (unidirectional)	-	-	150


required to supply a minimum of 100 kW for re-dispatch across various types of Charging Stations (CSs). In the analysed case study, CPO can assume the role of the CSP. Therefore, it becomes imperative for the CPO to ensure that the re-dispatch product meets or exceeds the threshold of 100 kW. Table 2 shows the minimum quantities of CS required needed to offer 100 kW re-dispatch with 100% certainty based on perfect foresight. Residential charging locations, which have high usage during evening hours and a larger fleet of vehicles, can certainly offer 100 kW re-dispatch with all types of dispatch strategies. In contrast, the commercial category of CS, with a low probability of EV connection during evening hours, cannot offer any re-dispatch flexibility during the evening flexibility request window.

### 5.1.2. Capacity-limitation flexibility product


In general, the newer three-phase EV chargers can provide up to 22 kW of charging power. When looking at the aggregate level, the total available connected capacity for a single CPO becomes, in the aggregate, very high. In practice, only a few CSs are active at a given time, making the aggregate connected capacity much lower than the available connection capacity. This is further reduced with smart charging. To leverage this flexibility of connection capacities, the capacity-limitation product, as outlined by the Netherlands' congestion management regulations, can be lucrative for network operators as well as CPOs. Initial analysis shows that the average load per CS without smart charging during the flexibility request windows is already lower than 6 kW for all quantiles in all the categories of CSs. As seen in Fig:9 the reduction in the case of smart charging from unoptimised charging is considerable for both morning and evening flexibility request windows.

Fig:9 shows the average capacity per CS for different dispatch strategies compared to the unoptimised case. Almost for all the categories, there is a decrease in capacity per CS from dumb charging to other smart charging cases. However, the largest and most consistent drop can be seen for the residential charging locations due to the availability of a large fleet and high connection probability during evening hours. As the commercial charging locations are seldom used during the evening hours, their average capacity per CS is already low for unoptimised charging compared with other categories. This changes when we look at the morning


### Aggregate flexibility of EV fleets for congestion management




(a) Unidirectional charging for flexibility request window between 08:00-11:00 hours.



(b) Bidirectional charging for flexibility request window between 08:00-11:00 hours.



(c) Unidirectional charging for flexibility request window between 18:00-21:00 hours.



(d) Bidirectional charging for flexibility request window between 18:00-21:00 hours.

**Figure 11:** Model performances for prediction of BAU power profile, greedy re-dispatch and greedy capacity-limitation for both uni and bidirectional charging. Test data is plotted using  $\bullet$ , whereas the training data is plotted using  $\circ$ . The performance scores ( $R^2$ , MSE and MAE) are displayed per category for the test data.

flexibility request window as shown in Fig:9a. Currently, the DSOs can rely on the average capacity per CS, depicted by the red line. This capacity estimation does not involve any control over EV fleets. The decrease in capacity is due to the inherent variation in the arrivals and departures of the EVs.

Bidirectional charging has the ability to restrict the capacity per CS below 1 kW for all cases and quantiles with

more than 50 CSs. As the shift from unoptimised charging to unidirectional smart charging is more than that of bidirectional from unidirectional capacity limitation, bidirectional charging may not be very lucrative for this particular product, provided its cost and effect on EV's battery health is more than that of unidirectional charging.

### 5.1.3. Duration of flexibility request window

The span of the flexibility request window affects the magnitude of flexibility that could be leveraged for a given system. To demonstrate this request, windows with different durations are simulated each for re-dispatch and capacity limitation congestion products. As illustrated in Fig:10a and Fig:10b, the ability to offer a specific product decreases with the increase in the length of the request window. This is due to the increase in the number of hours the combined EV population has to shift with the increase in window length. The increase in window length will also cause a stronger re-bounce effect on the aggregate charging profile once the request window ends. The peak after the flexibility request window may be managed by limiting the maximum power of EVs by a fixed percentage unless they need to charge with full power for 100% recharge.

### 5.2. Forecasting of flexibility products

The previous analysis assumed perfect information and could realistically only provide an approximate estimate of the EV fleet's flexibility, especially when new data and scenarios comes into play. In order to include uncertainty while estimating the probabilities of meeting the requirements for predicted flexibility products, their performance is compared with the deterministic case. The workflow for training and testing used for the models are explained in Section 4.3

First, a model was trained to forecast the BAU case, which is in this case the unoptimised dispatch of all EVs. Next, this model was used to predict the conservative greedy re-dispatch. The greedy capacity-limitation product is predicted by a separate model directly. Three models were trained and tested to predict BAU, greedy re-dispatch, and greedy capacity limitations for the three categories of charging stations, using two fixed flexibility request windows - one in the morning and one in the evening. The models were built using SVRs with a Gaussian kernel. All the trained models perform satisfactorily as shown by their performance metrics for the test dataset in Fig:11 alongside the normalized actual and predicted values for different entities. These normalized values have been processed using the min-max scaler.

The model's performance is compared with that of the perfect foresight scenario in Fig:12 and Fig:13 for the re-dispatch and capacity limitation products, respectively. To construct the probability distribution for the machine learning models, we employ the same input dataset as in the deterministic setup to predict the desired quantities. After prediction, the standard error is calculated through bootstrap re-sampling with 10000 iterations, following a similar approach to the previous analysis. Subsequently, both the predicted and perfect foresight outcomes are presented within the same figure for comparison. Results show that the predicted probabilities for the re-dispatch of 100 kW are lower than that of the perfect foresight case for all categories and cases.

## 6. Conclusion

This study addresses the congestion-related challenges faced in the power system due to aggregate uncontrolled charging of EVs. Potential market-based solutions leveraging the flexibility of EVs using smart charging applications are analysed in detail. The ability to dependably offer two types of congestion management products (capacity limitation and re-dispatch) using various aggregations of EVs is quantified using a model based on historical charging transactions and product specifications in line with the Netherlands' congestion management regulations. Moreover, machine learning models were used to directly predict the flexibility offerings to include uncertainties associated with individual charging sessions.

It is seen that the ability to offer flexibility products varies based on the level of aggregation, dispatch strategies and location of the CSs. Based on the characteristics of charging sessions, three main categories of CS were identified and used for the analysis. Among the discussed strategies, optimal dispatch performs the best, followed by greedy dispatch, which requires no information on future arrival times of EVs. However, when looking at aggregate performance, they are remarkably similar. We also examined all models for the case of bi- and mono-directional charging. As a general trend, bi-directional charging outperforms mono-directional charging in performance. However, the difference is observed the most in the case of re-dispatch products.


Looking at capacity limitations, the first finding is that there is already substantial 'natural' diversity with unoptimised charging so that the peak power for aggregate CSs is significantly reduced from the 22 kW peak power of a single CS. Significant further reductions can be achieved using smart charging. As a result, network operators should take the baseline diversity and the additional gains from smart charging into account in their capacity planning.

Regarding re-dispatch products, the main restriction is the minimum re-dispatch unit of 100 kW. In our study, only the residential CSs could dependably reach this threshold for the evening window. This is both due to their number (in the data set) and due to the higher availability of these vehicles during evening hours. Machine learning models were shown to have good performance in forecasting market offerings for congestion management services, highlighting their value for both aggregators and network operators.

In conclusion, the study presented a comprehensive analysis of the aggregate flexibility potential of CSs for offering dependable congestion management products, focusing on a Dutch case study. By analyzing over 500 thousand real EV charging sessions, the research provided valuable insights into the challenges and opportunities posed by the growth of EVs and the implementation of smart charging flexibility within the Netherlands' energy landscape.

Considerations for future research include the effectiveness of re-dispatch products relative to different base profiles, such as cost-minimized or emission-minimized charging. Moreover, the time of network congestion can vary


## Aggregate flexibility of EV fleets for congestion management



(a) Flexibility request window between 08:00-11:00 hours.

(b) Flexibility request window between 18:00-21:00 hours.

**Figure 12:** Comparison of forecasting models and deterministic models to estimate the abilities of EV fleets to offer re-dispatch product during different flexibility request windows. The plotted results corresponds to greedy dispatch, where  $\text{---}\bullet\text{---}$  is used for bidirectional charging and the  $\blacktriangle$  marker is used for forecasted values.



(a) Flexibility request window between 08:00-11:00 hours.

(b) Flexibility request window between 18:00-21:00 hours.

**Figure 13:** Comparison of forecasting models and deterministic models to estimate the abilities of EV fleets to offer capacity-limitation product during different flexibility request windows. The greedy dispatch results are shown using  $\text{---}\bullet\text{---}$ , where  $\text{---}\bullet\text{---}$  show results of optimal re-dispatch.  $\text{---}\bullet\text{---}$  represents the case of unoptimised or dumb charging. Dashed lines are used for bidirectional charging, and the  $\blacktriangle$  marker is used for forecasted values.

based on other factors such as weather, seasons or socio-economic conditions. Hence it is also important to analyse the implications of different flexibility request windows on the potential of delivering congestion products.

## 7. Acknowledgement

The authors acknowledge the use of computational resources of the DelftBlue supercomputer, provided by Delft High Performance Computing Centre [33].

## References

- [1] A. Gadea, M. Marinelli, and A. Zecchino, "A Market Framework for Enabling Electric Vehicles Flexibility Procurement at the Distribution Level Considering Grid Constraints," in *2018 Power Systems Computation Conference (PSCC)*, pp. 1–7, IEEE, 6 2018.
- [2] IRENA, "Innovation outlook: Smart charging for electric vehicles," tech. rep., International Renewable Energy Agency, 2019.
- [3] W. Kempton and J. Tomić, "Vehicle-to-grid power implementation: From stabilizing the grid to supporting large-scale renewable energy," *Journal of Power Sources*, vol. 144, pp. 280–294, 6 2005.
- [4] G. Alkaws, Y. Baashar, D. Abbas U, A. A. Alkahtani, and S. K. Tiong, "Review of Renewable Energy-Based Charging Infrastructure for Electric Vehicles," *Applied Sciences*, vol. 11, p. 3847, 4 2021.
- [5] N. Sadeghianpourhamami, N. Refa, M. Strobbe, and C. Develder, "Quantitative analysis of electric vehicle flexibility: A data-driven approach," *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, vol. 95, pp. 451–462, 2 2018.
- [6] M. Zade, Z. You, B. Kumaran Nalini, P. Tzscheuschler, and U. Wagner, "Quantifying the Flexibility of Electric Vehicles in Germany and California—A Case Study," *Energies*, vol. 13, p. 5617, 10 2020.
- [7] A. Sørensen, K. Lindberg, I. Sartori, and I. Andresen, "Analysis of residential ev energy flexibility potential based on real-world charging reports and smart meter data," *Energy and Buildings*, vol. 241, p. 110923, 2021.
- [8] J. Soares, J. Almeida, L. Gomes, B. Canizes, Z. Vale, and E. Neto, "Electric vehicles local flexibility strategies for congestion relief on distribution networks," *Energy Reports*, vol. 8, pp. 62–69, 6 2022.
- [9] C. Birk Jones, W. Vining, M. Lave, T. Haines, C. Neuman, J. Bennett, and D. R. Scofield, "Impact of Electric Vehicle customer response to Time-of-Use rates on distribution power grids," *Energy Reports*, vol. 8, pp. 8225–8235, 11 2022.
- [10] Ofgem and PWC, "Energy consumers' experiences and perceptions of smart 'Time of Use' tariffs," Tech. Rep. September, Ofgem and PWC, London, 2020.
- [11] J. M. Clairand, "Participation of electric vehicle aggregators in ancillary services considering users' preferences," *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, vol. 12, pp. 1–17, 12 2020.
- [12] F. Gonzalez Venegas, M. Petit, and Y. Perez, "Active integration of electric vehicles into distribution grids: Barriers and frameworks for flexibility services," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 145, p. 111060, 7 2021.
- [13] M. A. Fotouhi Ghazvini, G. Lipari, M. Pau, F. Ponci, A. Monti, J. Soares, R. Castro, and Z. Vale, "Congestion management in active distribution networks through demand response implementation," *Sustainable Energy, Grids and Networks*, vol. 17, p. 100185, 3 2019.
- [14] Z. Liu, Q. Wu, S. S. Oren, S. Huang, R. Li, and L. Cheng, "Distribution Locational Marginal Pricing for Optimal Electric Vehicle Charging Through Chance Constrained Mixed-Integer Programming," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 9, pp. 644–654, 3 2018.
- [15] R. J. Hennig, D. Ribó-Pérez, L. J. de Vries, and S. H. Tindemans, "What is a good distribution network tariff?—Developing indicators for performance assessment," *Applied Energy*, vol. 318, p. 119186, 7 2022.
- [16] A. N. M. M. Haque, M. Nijhuis, G. Ye, P. H. Nguyen, F. W. Bliet, and J. G. Sloopweg, "Integrating Direct and Indirect Load Control for Congestion Management in LV Networks," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 10, pp. 741–751, 1 2019.
- [17] E. Valsomatzis, T. B. Pedersen, and A. Abelló, "Day-ahead Trading of Aggregated Energy Flexibility," in *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Future Energy Systems*, (New York, NY, USA), pp. 134–138, ACM, 6 2018.
- [18] W. Liu, Q. Wu, F. Wen, and J. Ostergaard, "Day-Ahead Congestion Management in Distribution Systems Through Household Demand Response and Distribution Congestion Prices," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 5, pp. 2739–2747, 11 2014.
- [19] R. Hennig, S. H. Tindemans, and L. De Vries, "Market Failures in Local Flexibility Market Proposals for Distribution Network Congestion Management," *International Conference on the European Energy Market, EEM*, vol. 2022-Septe, 2022.
- [20] S. Huang, Q. Wu, S. S. Oren, R. Li, and Z. Liu, "Distribution Locational Marginal Pricing Through Quadratic Programming for Congestion Management in Distribution Networks," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 2170–2178, 2015.
- [21] Ministerie van Economische Zaken en Klimaat, "Klimaatakkoord," *Klimaatverandering 1 Rijksoverheid.nl*, 2019.
- [22] Netherlands Enterprise Agency, "Electric Vehicles Statistics in the Netherlands," Tech. Rep. July, Netherlands Enterprise Agency, 2022.
- [23] Dutch National Charging Infrastructure Agenda Brochure, "Smart charging for all 2022-2025," tech. rep., National Charging Infrastructure Agenda, 2022.
- [24] NAL WG Smart Charging core team, "Smart charging requirements (SCR)," tech. rep., Nationale Agenda Laadinfrastructuur, 2 2021.
- [25] Peter Palensky (TU Delft), Jose Rueda Torres (TU Delft), Pedro Vergara Aleksandar Boričić (TU Delft), Aihui Fu (TU Delft), and Paul Voskuilen (AMS Institute), "Solutions for congestion in medium-voltage grids: the Buiksloterham-Zuid/Overhoeks Amsterdam case," tech. rep., Delft University of Technology, Amsterdam Institute for Advanced Metropolitan Solutions, Delft, 8 2021.
- [26] A. f. C. The Netherlands and M. (ACM), "Decree of the Netherlands Authority for Consumers and Markets of 24 May 2022 reference ACM/UIT/577139 amending the conditions as referred to in Article 31 of the Electricity Act 1998 regarding rules regarding transport scarcity and congestion management," 2022.
- [27] A. f. C. The Netherlands and M. (ACM), "Code decision non-firm ATO (Case number: ACM/22/180165)," 2024.
- [28] "Open charge point interface (ocpi) 2.1.1." <https://github.com/ocpi/ocpi>, 2021.
- [29] W. Wen, S. Yang, P. Zhou, and S. Gao, "Impacts of COVID-19 on the electric vehicle industry: Evidence from China," *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, vol. 144, p. 111024, 7 2021.
- [30] P. Ashkrof, G. Homem de Almeida Correia, and B. van Arem, "Analysis of the effect of charging needs on battery electric vehicle drivers' route choice behaviour: A case study in the Netherlands," *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, vol. 78, p. 102206, 1 2020.
- [31] A. Donkers, D. Yang, and M. Viktorović, "Influence of driving style, infrastructure, weather and traffic on electric vehicle performance," *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, vol. 88, p. 102569, 11 2020.
- [32] X. Hao, H. Wang, Z. Lin, and M. Ouyang, "Seasonal effects on electric vehicle energy consumption and driving range: A case study on personal, taxi, and ridesharing vehicles," *Journal of Cleaner Production*, vol. 249, p. 119403, 3 2020.
- [33] Delft High Performance Computing Centre (DHPC), *DelftBlue Supercomputer (Phase 1)*, 2022. <https://www.tudelft.nl/dhpc/ark:/44463/DelftBluePhase1>.