Distributionally Robust Aggregation of Electric Vehicle Flexibility

Karan Mukhi, Chengrui Qu, Pengcheng You and Alessandro Abate

Abstract-We address the problem of characterising the aggregate flexibility in populations of electric vehicles (EVs) with uncertain charging requirements. Building on previous results that provide exact characterisations of the aggregate flexibility in populations with known charging requirements, in this paper we extend the aggregation methods so that charging requirements are uncertain, but sampled from a given distribution. In particular, we construct distributionally robust aggregate flexibility sets, sets of aggregate charging profiles over which we can provide probabilistic guarantees that actual realised populations will be able to track. By leveraging measure concentration results that establish powerful finite sample guarantees, we are able to give tight bounds on these robust flexibility sets, even in low sample regimes that are well suited for aggregating small populations of EVs. We detail explicit methods of calculating these sets and provide numerical results that validate the theory developed here.

I. INTRODUCTION

Increasing penetrations of intermittent renewable generation are requiring power system operators to procure ever larger amounts of flexibility in order to mitigate their variability. Furthermore, as demand in the distribution networks grows, system operators are beginning to rely on these flexible loads to alleviate congestion in their networks, in particular by implementing local flexibility markets. Concurrently, EV uptake is rising and will make up a substantial portion of system demand by the end of the decade. As they are typically plugged in for more time than they require to charge, there is a set of charging profiles that an EV may take, whilst satisfying the charging requirements of its owner. Under certain charging models, this *flexibility set* can be represented as a convex polytope [1]. By controlling their charging profiles, EVs present a large potential source of flexibility to the system. However, owing to complexity and reliability constraints it is not viable for individual loads to participate in the flexibility markets, and so hierarchical control architectures have been proposed [2]. From this, aggregators, entities that collate flexibility from individual devices and bid it into the markets, have emerged. In order to participate in these markets, aggregators must represent the aggregate flexibility in the populations of devices they control. A growing trend in the literature has been to characterise the aggregate flexibility by computing the Minkowski sum of the individual flexibility sets of devices in the population. As calculating the Minkowski sum is in general NP hard,

most of the work in the literature focuses on computing inner or outer [3] approximations of the aggregate flexibility sets. Inner approximations are more common as they guarantee the feasibility of all aggregate charging profiles contained within them. Zonotopes are used to approximate individual flexibility sets in [4], from which Minkowski sums can be computed efficiently. In [5] a union-based approach is developed that can produce tight approximations, at the expense of added computational burden. As they do not contain all feasible aggregate charging profiles, inner approximations do not guarantee optimality. To date, only [6] provides an exact characterisation of the aggregate flexibility set in a population of EVs. This is accomplished by representing individual flexibility sets as *permutahedra*, a class of polytopes that permit quick Minkowski summation.

All of these methods assume full knowledge of the charging requirements of the EVs they aggregate. However, in most realistic scenarios the charging requirement of an EV will be unknown to the aggregator before it plugs in, and so aggregators will need to estimate the aggregate flexibility sets. We can assume aggregators have access to historic datasets of EV charging requirements, such as [7], to inform these estimates. Because of this, aggregators require techniques to characterise aggregate flexibility sets from historic data and uncertainty quantification methods for quantifying the confidence they have in these sets. In some scenarios, aggregators will be aggregating large populations, in which case, through the central limit theorem, uncertainties can largely be ignored. However, with the advent of local flexibility markets aggregators have to characterise the flexibility in small populations of EVs, where uncertainty quantification cannot be overlooked. To deal with these uncertainties, [8] approximates the aggregate flexibility set with an ellipsoid, which is built upon a convex quadratic classifier trained on a historic dataset. This data-driven approach provides an efficient method of calculating an approximated aggregate flexibility set, however the methods here do not establish any theoretical probabilistic guarantees. In [9], the uncertainties of EVs are modelled under a distributionally robust joint chance-constrained programming framework. However, the uncertainty sets constructed are not tight as they are derived from inner approximations of the Minkowski sum.

In the work presented here, we leverage theoretical results that enable us to extend the exact aggregation methods of [6] and establish strong probabilistic guarantees on the confidence of these sets. The guarantees provided yield tight bounds even in a low sample regime, which allow us to give a characterisation of distributionally robust aggregate flexibility sets even for small populations of EVs. The rest of

This work was supported by Réseau de Transport d'Électricité.

Karan Mukhi and Alessandro Abate are with the Department of Computer Science, University of Oxford, UK {karan.mukhi,alessandro.abate}@cs.ox.ac.uk

Chengrui Qu and Pengcheng You are with the College of Engineering, at Peking University, Beijing, China

the paper is structured as follows: Section II introduces the EV charging model and formalises the robust aggregation problem. Section III reviews and extends the work in [6] providing a exact characterisation of the charging requirements of EVs with known charging requirements. Moving to the stochastic setting in Section IV, we introduce measure concentration results from the literature that establish the probabilistic guarantees, and use them to derive conditions on the parameters that define the distributionally robust flexibility sets. In Section V we show explicitly how to calculate the parameters from these conditions. Numerical simulations are used to validate the theoretical results of this paper in Section VI, and finally we draw conclusions in Section VII.

II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

We consider an aggregator that has direct control over the charging profile of a population of EVs. We parameterise the charging requirements of each EV with the tuple

$$\xi = (\underline{e}, \overline{e}, a, d, m). \tag{1}$$

In this model a and d denote the arrival and departure times of the EV and m its power rating. The parameters \underline{e} and \overline{e} represent the lower and upper bounds of energy required by the EV at its departure time [1]. Let $u \in \mathbb{R}^T$ represent the piecewise constant charging profile for the EV over a finite time horizon of T steps, each of duration Δ , i.e. $u(\tau) = u_t$, $\forall \tau \in [\Delta(t-1), \Delta t), \forall t \in \{1, ..., T\}$. We only consider EVs that arrive and depart within this time horizon and so $1 \leq a < d \leq T$. In the following, we set $\Delta = 1$ without loss of generality. To satisfy the charging requirements, the charging profile must abide by the following power constraints:

$$u_t = 0, \quad \forall t \notin \{a, \dots, d\}, \\ 0 \le u_t \le m, \ \forall t \in \{a, \dots, d\},$$

i.e. it can draw a load up to its power rating m during the time intervals it is connected to the grid within arrival and departure times. The energy constraint $\sum_{t=1}^{T} u_t \in [\underline{e}, \overline{e}]$ specifies upper and lower bounds on the total amount of energy that must be drawn during the time it is charging.

From this, we define the *individual flexibility set* as the set of allowable charging profiles that may be taken by the EV, whilst satisfying the charging requirements, ξ , we denote this set as $\mathcal{F}(\xi)$. Trivially, it can be characterised as

$$\mathcal{F}(\xi) := \left\{ u \in \mathbb{R}^T \middle| \begin{array}{c} u_t = 0 \quad \forall t \notin \{a, ..., d\} \\ 0 \le u_t \le m \quad \forall t \in \{a, ..., d\} \\ \sum_t u_t \in [\underline{e}, \overline{e}] \end{array} \right\}.$$

For a population of N EVs with known charging requirements $\hat{\Xi}_N := \{\hat{\xi}_i\}_{i \leq N}$, we define the *aggregate flexibility set*, denoted $\mathcal{F}(\hat{\Xi}_N)$, as the set of feasible aggregate charging profiles that can be taken by the population as a whole. As shown in [10], geometrically this is the Minkowski sum of the individual flexibility sets

$$\mathcal{F}(\hat{\Xi}_N) = \sum_{\hat{\xi}_i \in \hat{\Xi}_N} \mathcal{F}(\hat{\xi}_i).$$
(2)

Aggregators need to characterise the aggregate flexibility sets of the vehicles they control, however they do not necessarily know *a priori* the exact charging requirements of the vehicles. Instead, we assume the charging requirements are i.i.d. according to a given distribution, $\hat{\xi}_i \sim \mathbb{P}$ for all *i*, and so $\hat{\Xi}_N \sim \mathbb{P}^N$. For example, \mathbb{P} could be empirical from history data. It is useful for aggregators to understand which aggregate charging profiles can be satisfied by the population within certain confidence levels: namely, we seek to characterise sets of the form

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{P},N}^{\beta} := \{ u \in \mathbb{R}^T \mid \mathbb{P}^N \{ \hat{\Xi}_N : u \in \mathcal{F}(\hat{\Xi}_N) \} \ge 1 - \beta \}.$$

Here $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{P},N}^{\beta}$ denotes the set of aggregate charging profiles for a population of N EVs with charging requirements sampled from \mathbb{P} , such that the probability all charging profiles in $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{P},N}^{\beta}$ can be tracked is $1 - \beta$.

III. Aggregate Flexibility

In this section we provide a characterisation of the aggregate flexibility set $\mathcal{F}(\hat{\Xi}_N)$, obtained by computing the Minkowski sum of the individual flexibility sets of the population, as per (2). For now we assume to know, with certainty, the charging requirements for all EVs in the population, i.e.

$$\hat{\Xi}_N := \left\{ \hat{\xi}_i = (\underline{e}_i, \overline{e}_i, a_i, d_i, m_i) \right\}_{i \le N}$$

is given. The main purpose of this work to show how flexibility can be aggregated under uncertainty. Hence, for the sake of notations and of brevity, we focus on populations of EVs that have homogeneous arrival and departure times and power ratings, therefore in the sequel we set $a_i = 1$, $d_i = T$ and $m_i = 1$ for all *i*. Similar but more involved results can be obtained for a fully heterogeneous population.

In general computing Minkowski sums is NP hard, nevertheless we can leverage the results of [6] that provide an exact characterisation of the aggregate flexibility set of a population of EVs with known charging requirements. However, that work restricted the required energy at departure time to take a single value, i.e. $e = \underline{e} = \overline{e}$. This constrains flexibility sets to lie in the T-1 subspace where $\sum_t u_t = e$. In the following, we review and then extend the work in [6], relaxing this constraint thereby allowing required energy at departure time to lie within the interval $[\underline{e}, \overline{e}]$.

We begin by defining the terms

$$q(e) := \lfloor e/m \rfloor,$$

$$r(e) := e - mq(e).$$

Here q(e) can be interpreted as the number of time steps the EV must charge at full power in order to be charged to e by departure time, whilst r(e) is the remaining required energy after charging at full power for q(e) time steps. We define $v(e) \in \mathbb{R}^T$ as the charging profile that supplies an amount of energy e in the fastest time possible. This can be written using q(e) and r(e) as:

$$v(e) := (\underbrace{m, ..., m}_{q(e)}, r(e), \underbrace{0, ..., 0}_{T-q(e)-1}).$$
(3)

Now, given two vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^T$, where $\sum_t^T x_t = \sum_t^T y_t$, we say x is strongly majorized by y, denoted $x \leq y$, if

$$\sum_{t=1}^{s} x_t \leq \sum_{t=1}^{s} y_t \quad \forall s \in \{1, ..., T\}$$

with equality when s = T. As defined above, $v_t(e) \ge v_{t+1}(e) \ \forall t$, and so v(e) is the unique, monotone charging profile that majorizes all other charging profiles that supply an amount of energy e.

Lemma 1. The individual flexibility set of an EV with charging requirements $\xi = (\underline{e}, \overline{e}, a = 1, d = T, m = 1)$ is

$$\mathcal{F}(\xi) = ConvexHull\left\{w_t^{\pi}(\xi) \mid t \in \{0, ..., T\}, \pi \in S_T\right\},\$$

where elements of $w_t(\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^T$ are given by

$$w_{ts}(\xi) = \begin{cases} v_s(\underline{e}) & t < s \\ v_s(\overline{e}) & t \ge s \end{cases} \forall t \in \{0, T\}, s \in \{1, T\}.$$
(4)

Proof. If the required energy at departure time takes the fixed value *e*, then, using [6, Theorem 1], the individual flexibility set is the permutahedron:

$$\Pi(v(e)) := ConvexHull\{v^{\pi}(e) | \pi \in S_T\}.$$

Here S_T is the symmetric group and $v^{\pi}(e)$ denotes the permutation of the elements of v(e) specified by π . Now, allowing the required energy to lie within a set, i.e. $e \in [\underline{e}, \overline{e}]$, we can give the following characterisation

$$\mathcal{F}(\xi) = ConvexHull\left\{v^{\pi}(e) \mid e \in [\underline{e}, \overline{e}], \pi \in S_T\right\}.$$

Notice that $v^{\pi}(e)$ is a vertex iff $e \in \{\underline{e}, q(\underline{e}) + 1, ..., q(\overline{e}), \overline{e}\}$. From its construction in (4) one can verify that, for values of e such that q(e) = t then $w_t(\xi) = v(e)$, and also $w_0(\xi) = v(\underline{e}), w_T(\xi) = v(\overline{e})$, concluding our proof. \Box

Now, defining $\underline{\nu}(\hat{\Xi}_N)$ and $\overline{\nu}(\hat{\Xi}_N) \in \mathbb{R}^T$ as

$$\underline{\nu}(\hat{\Xi}_N) := \sum_{i=N}^{N} v(\underline{e}_i), \tag{5a}$$

$$\overline{\nu}(\hat{\Xi}_N) := \sum_{i}^{N} v(\overline{e}_i), \tag{5b}$$

we provide a characterisation of the aggregate flexibility set.

Theorem 1. The aggregate flexibility set of a population of N EVs with charging requirements $\hat{\Xi}_N$ is given by

$$\mathcal{F}(\hat{\Xi}_N) = ConvexHull\left\{\mu_t^{\pi}(\hat{\Xi}_N) \middle| t \in \{0, ..., T\}, \ \pi \in S_T\right\}$$

where the elements of $\mu_t(\hat{\Xi}_N) \in \mathbb{R}^T$ are given by:

$$\mu_{ts} = \begin{cases} \underline{\nu}_s(\hat{\Xi}_N) & t < s\\ \overline{\nu}_s(\hat{\Xi}_N) & t \ge s \end{cases} \quad \forall t \in \{0, T\}, s \in \{1, T\}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. From this characterisation, $\mathcal{F}(\hat{\Xi}_N)$ can be interpreted as the convex hull of T+1 permutahedra that lie in different, but parallel, affine subspaces.

By [11, Theorem 3] the Minkowski sum of two permutahedra is given by: $\Pi(x+y) = \Pi(x) + \Pi(y)$, where x and y are monotone. Hence, if all EVs in the population charge to the lower bound of their required energy then the aggregate



Fig. 1: The green and red regions depict the aggregate flexibility sets for the two 'worst-case' populations, $\mathcal{F}(\hat{L}_N)$ and $\mathcal{F}(\hat{U}_N)$. The blue region is the distributionally robust aggregate flexibility set, $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{P},N}^{\beta}$, defined by the intersection of $\mathcal{F}(\hat{L}_N)$ and $\mathcal{F}(\hat{U}_N)$. The green and red thick lines represent the permutahedra that bound $\mathcal{F}(\hat{L}_N)$ and $\mathcal{F}(\hat{U}_N)$, where $\Pi(\underline{\nu}^{\epsilon,\mathbb{P},N})$ and $\Pi(\overline{\nu}^{\epsilon,\mathbb{P},N})$ are labelled to show the permutahedra that define $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{P},N}^{\beta}$.

flexibility set is the permutahedron $\Pi(\sum_{i}^{N} w_{0}(\xi_{i}))$, similarly if the all of the population were to charge to their upper bound the aggregate flexibility set would be $\Pi(\sum_{i}^{N} w_{T}(\xi_{i}))$. By considering which vertices of the summands sum to give vertices of the summation, we extend this to all intermediate values of $e_{i} \in (\underline{e}_{i}, \overline{e}_{i})$, to obtain $\Pi(\sum_{i}^{N} w_{t}(\xi_{i})) \quad \forall t \in$ $\{1, ..., T-1\}$, where we have used the characterisation of $\mathcal{F}(\xi_{i})$ from Lemma 1. From its definition, one can see that $\mu_{t} = \sum_{i}^{N} w_{t}(\xi_{i})$, and so it is trivial to show that $\mathcal{F}(\hat{\Xi}_{N})$ is the convex hull of $\Pi(\mu_{t}) \quad \forall t \in \{0, ..., T\}$, as required. \Box

Remark 1. Each of the permutahedra have majorization vertices given by $\mu_t(\hat{\Xi}_N)$, $\forall t \in \{0, ..., T\}$. Furthermore, each permutahedra has T! vertices and so there are (T+1)!vertices, see Fig 1. Most importantly for the purposes of this paper, we note that $\mathcal{F}(\hat{\Xi}_N)$ is fully parameterised by $\underline{\nu}(\hat{\Xi}_N)$ and $\overline{\nu}(\hat{\Xi}_N)$: to make this explicit we write $\mathcal{F}(\hat{\Xi}_N)$ as

$$\mathcal{F}(\hat{\Xi}_N) = \mathcal{F}(\underline{\nu}(\hat{\Xi}_N), \overline{\nu}(\hat{\Xi}_N)).$$
(6)

IV. AGGREGATION UNDER UNCERTAINTY

We now turn to the case in which charging requirements are uncertain, but i.i.d. according to a known distribution \mathbb{P} . We assume aggregators will have a large amount of historical data of charging requirements, from which they can construct \mathbb{P} . For a population of N EVs we then have $\hat{\Xi}_N \sim \mathbb{P}^N$.

In order to characterise the set of aggregate charging profiles $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{P},N}^{\beta}$, that can be tracked with confidence $1 - \beta$, we first characterise the set of sample populations, $\hat{\Xi}_N$, that will be realised with a given confidence. Let $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{\hat{\Xi}_N}$ denote the discrete empirical probability distribution generated by the sample population $\hat{\Xi}_N$:

$$\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{\hat{\Xi}_N} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\hat{\xi}_i},$$

where $\delta_{\hat{\xi}_i}$ is the Dirac distribution that concentrates mass on $\hat{\xi}_i$. Further, let $d_W(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{Q})$ denote the Wasserstein distance between two distributions \mathbb{P} and \mathbb{Q} . Intuitively, the Wasserstein distance represents the minimum *work* required to move the probability mass of \mathbb{P} to the distribution \mathbb{Q} . The reader is referred to [12] for a formal definition and more complete discussion of the Wasserstein distance. With these definitions we can tap into the following result.

Theorem 2. [13, Theorem 2- Measure concentration]:

$$\mathbb{P}^{N}\left\{\hat{\Xi}_{N}: d_{W}(\mathbb{P}, \hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{\hat{\Xi}_{N}}) \geq \epsilon\right\} \leq \beta$$

where for all $N \ge 1$

$$\beta = c_1 e^{-c_2 N \epsilon^2} \quad \forall \ 0 < \epsilon \le 1 \tag{7}$$

where c_1 and c_2 are positive constants that depend on \mathbb{P} .

We leverage this result to characterise, with confidence $1-\beta$, the ambiguity set over realisations of populations. Let $\mathbb{B}_{\epsilon}(\mathbb{P})$ denote the Wasserstein ball of radius ϵ centred on \mathbb{P} . We obtain

$$\mathbb{P}^{N}\left\{\hat{\Xi}_{N}:\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{\hat{\Xi}_{N}}\in\mathbb{B}_{\epsilon}(\mathbb{P})\right\}\geq1-\beta$$

Here, ϵ can be considered to be a *transportation budget*, such that the work exerted moving \mathbb{P} to $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{\hat{\Xi}_N}$ does not exceed ϵ .

Remark 2. This result is well suited to the problem we face. The measure concentration result provides a tight bound in a low-sample regime. In many relevant applications the number of EVs in the population, N, will be small and so we want guarantees that work well in such low-sample regimes.

This work can be compared to the likes of [14], with one key distinction. We assume to have perfect information about the distribution over charging requirements, and a finite (possibly small) population that samples the known distribution \mathbb{P} . Hence the ambiguity sets referred to in this paper are centred on \mathbb{P} and we are searching for "worstcase" empirical distributions, $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{\hat{\Xi}_N}$, within this set. This is opposed to [14], which instead centres the ambiguity set on the empirical distribution of the sampled data and searches for 'worst-cases' of the true distribution \mathbb{P} .

Using $\mathbb{B}_{\epsilon}(\mathbb{P})$ as our ambiguity set, we want to ensure that for all populations in $\mathbb{B}_{\epsilon}(\mathbb{P})$, the aggregate flexibility sets generated by them contain $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{P},N}^{\beta}$, namely

From this, we can then characterise $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{P},N}^{\beta}$ by calculating the flexibility sets for all elements of $\mathbb{B}_{\epsilon}(\mathbb{P})$ and taking their intersection. However, enumerating all elements of $\mathbb{B}_{\epsilon}(\mathbb{P})$ is

intractable. Instead, we proceed by looking for 'worst-case' populations, i.e. finding a set of populations such that the intersection of the flexibility sets generated by them is $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{P},N}^{\beta}$.

Lemma 2. There exists \hat{L}_N and \hat{U}_N such that

$$\bigcap_{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{\hat{\Xi}_N} \in \mathbb{B}_{\epsilon}(\mathbb{P})} \mathcal{F}(\hat{\Xi}_N) = \mathcal{F}(\hat{L}_N) \cap \mathcal{F}(\hat{U}_N)$$

where for all $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{\hat{\Xi}_N} \in \mathbb{B}_{\epsilon}(\mathbb{P})$, $\underline{\nu}(\hat{L}_N)$ and $\overline{\nu}(\hat{U}_N)$ satisfy:

$$\mathbf{1} \cdot \underline{\nu}_t(\hat{L}_N) \ge \mathbf{1} \cdot \underline{\nu}_t(\hat{\Xi}_N) \tag{9a}$$

$$\mathbf{1} \cdot \overline{\nu}_t(\hat{U}_N) \le \mathbf{1} \cdot \overline{\nu}_t(\hat{\Xi}_N) \tag{9b}$$

$$\underline{\nu}_t(\hat{L}_N) \preceq \underline{\nu}_t(\hat{\Xi}_N) \tag{9c}$$

$$\overline{\nu}_t(\hat{U}_N) \preceq \overline{\nu}_t(\hat{\Xi}_N),\tag{9d}$$

and the intersection is given by

$$\mathcal{F}(\hat{L}_N) \cap \mathcal{F}(\hat{U}_N) = \mathcal{F}(\underline{\nu}(\hat{L}_N), \overline{\nu}(\hat{U}_N)).$$

Proof. The reader is referred to Fig. 1 for a visual aid to this proof. We need to show that there exists \hat{L}_N, \hat{U}_N such that

$$\mathcal{F}(\hat{L}_N) \cap \mathcal{F}(\hat{U}_N) \subseteq \bigcap_{\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{\hat{\Xi}_N} \in \mathbb{B}_{\epsilon}(\mathbb{P})} \mathcal{F}(\hat{\Xi}_N).$$

 $\mathcal{F}(\underline{\nu},\overline{\nu})$ is bounded by $\mathbf{1} \cdot x \geq \mathbf{1} \cdot \underline{\nu}$ and $\mathbf{1} \cdot x \leq \mathbf{1} \cdot \overline{\nu}$, and so

$$\mathcal{F}(a,\overline{\nu}) \subset \mathcal{F}(b,\overline{\nu}) \implies \mathbf{1} \cdot a > \mathbf{1} \cdot b \tag{10a}$$
$$\mathcal{F}(a,\overline{\nu}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(a,\overline{\nu}) \implies \mathbf{1} \cdot a > \mathbf{1} \cdot b \tag{10b}$$

$$\mathcal{F}(\underline{\nu}, a) \subset \mathcal{F}(\underline{\nu}, b) \implies \mathbf{1} \cdot a < \mathbf{1} \cdot b, \tag{10b}$$

giving us our first conditions (9a) and (9b). From [15], it can be shown that for monotone x and y

$$\Pi(x) \subset \Pi(y) \iff x \prec y. \tag{11}$$

This can be extended to our definition of $\mathcal{F}(\underline{\nu}, \overline{\nu})$ to show

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(\underline{\nu}_1, \overline{\nu}) \subset \mathcal{F}(\underline{\nu}_2, \overline{\nu}) &\iff \underline{\nu}_1 \prec \underline{\nu}_2 \\ \mathcal{F}(\underline{\nu}, \overline{\nu}_1) \subset \mathcal{F}(\underline{\nu}, \overline{\nu}_2) &\iff \overline{\nu}_1 \prec \overline{\nu}_2 \end{aligned}$$

yielding (9c) and (9d), our second conditions on \hat{L}_N and \hat{U}_N . The inequalities of (9) set conditions on all elements of $\underline{\nu}(\hat{L}_N)$ and $\overline{\nu}(\hat{U}_N)$, hence if (9) is satisfied then

$$\mathcal{F}(\underline{\nu}(\hat{L}_N), \overline{\nu}) \subset \mathcal{F}(\underline{\nu}(\hat{\Xi}_N), \overline{\nu}) \ \forall \ \hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{\hat{\Xi}_N} \in \ \mathbb{B}_{\epsilon}(\mathbb{P})$$
$$\mathcal{F}(\underline{\nu}, \overline{\nu}(\hat{U}_N)) \subset \mathcal{F}(\underline{\nu}, \overline{\nu}(\hat{\Xi}_N)) \ \forall \ \hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{\hat{\Xi}_N} \in \ \mathbb{B}_{\epsilon}(\mathbb{P})$$

Finally, (10) can be trivially applied to find their intersection:

$$\mathcal{F}(\underline{\nu}(\hat{L}_N), \overline{\nu}(\hat{L}_N)) \cap \mathcal{F}(\underline{\nu}(\hat{U}_N), \overline{\nu}(\hat{U}_N)) = \mathcal{F}(\underline{\nu}(\hat{L}_N), \overline{\nu}(\hat{U}_N)).$$

Theorem 3. The aggregate flexibility set of a population of N EVs with charging requirements i.i.d. and sampled from \mathbb{P} , such that all aggregate charging profiles within the set can be tracked with probability $1 - \beta$ is

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{P}.N}^{\beta} = \mathcal{F}(\underline{\nu}(\hat{L}_N), \overline{\nu}(\hat{U}_N)).$$

Proof. The proof follows directly from applying Lemma 2 to (8), where the radius of the Wasserstein ball, ϵ , is determined by the confidence level, β , and the size of the population, N, using (7). The probability guarantees are established through Theorem 2.



Fig. 2: The \overline{e}_i^L are computed by pushing all mass to the boundary of the support in the positive direction, starting with point masses that are closest to the boundary, until the transport budget is exhausted.

V. COMPUTING WORST-CASE POPULATIONS

Theorem 3 defines a characterisation of the distributionally robust aggregate flexibility set $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{P},N}^{\beta}$, with Lemma 2 establishing conditions on $\underline{\nu}(\hat{L}_N)$ and $\overline{\nu}(\hat{U}_N)$ that parameterise $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{P},N}^{\beta}$. We now show how to calculate \hat{L}_N and \hat{U}_N from the conditions set out in (9). Recall that we have constrained the problem such that a_i , d_i and m_i are homogeneous for all i, and so we write \hat{L}_N and \hat{U}_N only in terms of \underline{e} and \overline{e} , i.e. $\hat{L}_N = \{(\underline{e}_i^L, \overline{e}_i^L)\}_{i \leq N}$, and $\hat{U}_N = \{(\underline{e}_i^U, \overline{e}_i^U)\}_{i \leq N}$. Here, we also stipulate that $\underline{e}_i^L \leq \underline{e}_{i+1}^L$ and $\overline{e}_i^U \leq \overline{e}_{i+1}^U$ for all i. We can write the empirical distribution generated by these population as

$$\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{\hat{L}_N} := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta(\underline{e} - \underline{e}_i^L) \delta(\overline{e} - \overline{e}_i^L),$$

and similarly for $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{\hat{U}_N}$. We use $\hat{P}_N = \{(\underline{e}_i^P, \overline{e}_i^P)\}_{i \leq N}$ to denote the support of the projection of \mathbb{P} onto an N point distribution, i.e. $\hat{P}_N := \operatorname{argmin} d_W(\mathbb{P}, \hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{\hat{\Xi}_N}).$

Proposition 1. \underline{e}_i^L and $\overline{e}_i^U \forall i \in \{1, ..., N\}$ are given by

$$\underline{e}_{i}^{L} = \begin{cases} mT & i > \underline{i}_{c} \\ \underline{e}_{i}^{P} + \underline{\kappa} & i = \underline{i}_{c} \\ \underline{e}_{i}^{P} & i < \underline{i}_{c} \end{cases}$$
$$\overline{e}_{i}^{U} = \begin{cases} \overline{e}_{i}^{P} & i > \overline{i}_{c} \\ \overline{e}_{i}^{P} - \overline{\kappa} & i = \overline{i}_{c} \\ 0 & i < \overline{i}_{c}. \end{cases}$$

where $\underline{i}_c, \overline{i}_c \in \{1, ..., N\}$ and $\underline{\kappa}, \overline{\kappa}$ are constants that depend solely on ϵ , \mathbb{P} and N. By defining $\underline{\nu}^{\epsilon, \mathbb{P}, N} := \underline{\nu}(\hat{L}_N)$ and $\overline{\nu}^{\epsilon, \mathbb{P}, N} := \overline{\nu}(\hat{U}_N)$ and using (5) we can then write

$$\begin{split} \underline{\boldsymbol{\nu}}^{\epsilon,\mathbb{P},N} &= \sum\nolimits_{i}^{N} \boldsymbol{v}(\underline{\boldsymbol{e}}_{i}^{L}) \\ \overline{\boldsymbol{\nu}}^{\epsilon,\mathbb{P},N} &= \sum\nolimits_{i}^{N} \boldsymbol{v}(\overline{\boldsymbol{e}}_{i}^{U}). \end{split}$$

Remark 3. Proposition 1 essentially describes a transport plan between \mathbb{P} and $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{\hat{L}_N}$ and $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{\hat{U}_N}$. The transport plan can

be interpreted as transforming \mathbb{P} in two steps. First, \mathbb{P} is projected onto the N point empirical distribution $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{\hat{P}_N}$. This is the N point distribution that minimises the Wasserstein distance between itself and \mathbb{P} , thereby expending as little of the transportation budget, ϵ , as possible. Then, the transport plan shifts the point masses of $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{\hat{P}_N}$ to the boundary of its support, starting with the mass that is closest to the boundary, until all remaining transport budget is exhausted, see Fig. 2. The transport plan for \underline{e}_i^L corresponds to moving mass of $\hat{\mathbb{Q}}_{\hat{P}_N}$ in the positive direction, whilst the plan for \overline{e}_i^U moves it in the negative direction. Note, there are some intricacies related to calculating the amount of transportation budget used when projecting \mathbb{P} onto an N point distribution, whilst moving these point masses around, that need to be considered.

In its interpretation above, Proposition 1 collectively shifts the mass of \mathbb{P} in the positive direction for \underline{e}_i^L , and negative for \overline{e}_i^U , until the transport budget is expended. From its definition in (3), $\sum_t^T v_t(\underline{e}_i) = \underline{e}_i$, and so it is trivial to show

$$\sum_{t}^{T} \underline{\nu}_{t}(\hat{\Xi}_{N}) = \sum_{i}^{N} \underline{e}_{i}, \qquad (14)$$

with a similar result for $\overline{\nu}_t(\hat{\Xi}_N)$. Using these identities one can readily verify that

$$\begin{split} \sum_{t}^{T} \underline{\nu}_{t}^{\epsilon,\mathbb{P},N} &= \sum_{i}^{N} \underline{e}_{i}^{L} \geq \sum_{t}^{T} \underline{\nu}_{t}(\hat{\Xi}_{N}) \\ \sum_{t}^{T} \overline{\nu}_{t}^{\epsilon,\mathbb{P},N} &= \sum_{i}^{N} \overline{e}_{i}^{U} \leq \sum_{t}^{T} \overline{\nu}_{t}(\hat{\Xi}_{N}), \end{split}$$

thus satisfying (9a) and (9b). Now, it can be shown using the so-called *Robin Hood transfers* from [15] and the definition of v(e) from (3) that

$$v(e_i) + v(e_j + \iota) \preceq v(e_i + \iota) + v(e_j) \quad \forall \ i < j$$
(15)

where $\iota > 0$ and, as stipulated before, $e_i \leq e_{i+1}$. Proposition 1 first moves the probability mass $e_N^P \to mT$, then e_{N-1}^P and so on, to construct the \underline{e}_i^L (similarly $e_1^P \to 0$, then e_2^P for \overline{e}_i^U). Applying this to (15) and the definitions of $\underline{\nu}(\hat{\Xi}_N)$ and $\overline{\nu}(\hat{\Xi}_N)$ from (5) we can show (9c) and (9d) are satisfied.

In summary, bringing all components together, we use the characterisation of the aggregate flexibility set from (6), along with the probabilistic guarantees of Theorem 3 and the construction of $\underline{\nu}^{\epsilon,\mathbb{P},N}$ and $\overline{\nu}^{\epsilon,\mathbb{P},N}$ from Proposition 1, to yield the following characterisation of the distributionally robust aggregate flexibility set:

$$\mathcal{A}^{\beta}_{\mathbb{P},N} = \mathcal{F}\left(\underline{\nu}^{\epsilon}_{\mathbb{P},N}, \overline{\nu}^{\epsilon,\mathbb{P},N}\right).$$
(16)

VI. APPLICATIONS AND NUMERICAL RESULTS

We now showcase the utility of the distributionally robust aggregation methods laid out in this work. To use the results, we assume aggregators will have access to historical data on charging requirements and hence the empirical distribution will be a good estimate of \mathbb{P} . From \mathbb{P} and N aggregators wish to quantify the confidence they have over the aggregate charging profiles that the population will be able to track. For example, they may be bidding into markets in which



Fig. 3: Empirical results showing the probability of not being able to satisfy all aggregate charging profiles within $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{P},N}^{\beta}$.

they are paid to track certain aggregate charging profiles, getting penalised if they deviate from the agreed charging profile. Hence, they may wish to quantify the confidence they have on the feasibility of tracking particular aggregate charging profiles, ideally providing tight bounds on this confidence. Therefore, in our experiments we demonstrate how the strong probabilistic guarantees of Theorem 2 hold for these purposes. To do so, we first synthesise a distribution \mathbb{P} over charging requirements, noting that this is simply a distribution over \underline{e} and \overline{e} as a, d and m are homogeneous. Now, fixing ϵ and N, we construct the distributionally robust aggregate flexibility set $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{P},N}^{\beta}$, using (16) and the explicit method of calculating $\underline{\nu}_{\mathbb{P},N}^{\epsilon}$ and $\overline{\nu}^{\epsilon,\mathbb{P},N}$ from Proposition 1. We then sample a population $\hat{\Xi}_N$ by drawing N charging requirements from \mathbb{P} . Using Theorem 1, we construct the aggregate flexibility set of the sampled population, namely $\mathcal{F}(\hat{\Xi}_N)$. Finally, we check if $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{P},N}^{\beta}$ is a subset of $\mathcal{F}(\hat{\Xi}_N)$. By repeating this process many times and keeping track of the number of times $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{P},N}^{\beta} \subseteq \mathcal{F}(\hat{\Xi}_N)$, we can compute an empirical estimate for β . We generate aggregate flexibility sets for populations of EVs with various sizes, over a time horizon with T = 24 steps. Constructing distributionally robust aggregate flexibility sets for difference values of ϵ , we calculate β for each of these sets. The guarantees of Theorem 2 from (7) establish an exponentially-decaying dependence of β on the square of ϵ . We show this relationship in Fig 3 by plotting $log(\beta)$ against ϵ^2 . Similar results can be shown for the exponential decay of β with N.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we have provided a theoretical framework to quantify the uncertainty of aggregate flexibility sets for populations of EVs with uncertain charging requirements. Building on previous work that characterises exact aggregate flexibility we leverage theoretical results that enable us to characterise flexibility sets so that we can attach a confidence to all aggregate charging profiles within these sets. The theoretical results used establish powerful finite sample guarantees, enabling us to provide tight bounds on this confidence. We show explicitly how to compute the variables that parameterise these sets. Finally we show with some numerical experiments the soundness of the characterisations we provide.

Future work will focus on the intricacies of adapting these methods to heterogeneous populations of EVs, and provide methods of optimising over these sets. This work could also be used to motivate the utility of aggregators for unlocking the flexibility in EVs. Using the results in this paper, one can show how the flexibility derived from populations is far more reliable than the flexibility of individual EVs. Furthermore there are various power systems problems that require uncertainty quantification techniques when aggregating EV flexibility. For example, one could consider news vendor like problems where aggregators bid the flexibility of uncertain populations of EVs into markets. This paper provides a theoretical framework for applications like this.

REFERENCES

- L. Zhao, H. Hao, and W. Zhang, "Extracting flexibility of heterogeneous deferrable loads via polytopic projection approximation," in 2016 IEEE 55th Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), 2016, pp. 6651–6656.
- [2] D. S. Callaway and I. A. Hiskens, "Achieving Controllability of Electric Loads," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 99, no. 1, pp. 184– 199, 2011.
- [3] S. Barot and J. A. Taylor, "A concise, approximate representation of a collection of loads described by polytopes," *International Journal* of Electrical Power & Energy Systems, vol. 84, pp. 55–63, 2017.
- [4] F. L. Müller, J. Szabó, O. Sundström, and J. Lygeros, "Aggregation and disaggregation of energetic flexibility from distributed energy resources," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 1205– 1214, 3 2019.
- [5] M. S. Nazir, I. A. Hiskens, A. Bernstein, and E. Dall'Anese, "Inner Approximation of Minkowski Sums: A Union-Based Approach and Applications to Aggregated Energy Resources," in 2018 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), 2018, pp. 5708–5715.
- [6] K. Mukhi and A. Abate, "An Exact Characterisation of Flexibility in Populations of Electric Vehicles," 2023 62nd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), pp. 6582–6587, 12 2023.
- [7] Z. J. Lee, T. Li, and S. H. Low, "ACN-Data: Analysis and Applications of an Open EV Charging Dataset," in *Proceedings of the Tenth ACM International Conference on Future Energy Systems*, ser. e-Energy '19. Association for Computing Machinery, 2019, pp. 139–149.
- [8] S. Taheri, V. Kekatos, S. Veeramachaneni, and B. Zhang, "Data-Driven Modeling of Aggregate Flexibility Under Uncertain and Non-Convex Device Models," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 4572–4582, 2022.
- [9] M. Zhang, Y. Xu, X. Shi, and Q. Guo, "A Fast Polytope-Based Approach for Aggregating Large-Scale Electric Vehicles in the Joint Market Under Uncertainty," *IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 701–713, 2024.
- [10] L. Zhao, W. Zhang, H. Hao, and K. Kalsi, "A Geometric Approach to Aggregate Flexibility Modeling of Thermostatically Controlled Loads," *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, vol. 32, no. 6, pp. 4721–4731, 2017.
- [11] G. Dahl, "Majorization permutahedra and (0,1)-matrices," *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, vol. 432, no. 12, pp. 3265–3271, 2010.
- [12] C. Villani, "Topics in Optimal Transportation Theory," vol. 58, 2 2003.
- [13] N. Fournier and A. Guillin, "On the rate of convergence in Wasserstein distance of the empirical measure," *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, vol. 162, no. 3-4, pp. 707–738, 8 2015.
- [14] P. Mohajerin Esfahani and D. Kuhn, "Data-driven distributionally robust optimization using the Wasserstein metric: performance guarantees and tractable reformulations," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 171, no. 1-2, pp. 115–166, 9 2018.
- [15] A. W. Marshall, I. Olkin, and B. C. Arnold, "Inequalities: theory of majorization and its applications," 1979.