

A Tax-Subsidy Scheme for Efficient Investment in Renewable Generation Capacity

Mohammad Reza Karimi Gharigh^a, Lamia Varawala^b, Mohammad Reza Hesamzadeh^c, and György Dán^d

ABSTRACT

The impact of energy production significantly affects system sustainability, which has enabled a shift towards renewable energy sources. Thus, producer behavior is crucial in electricity markets to achieve sustainability goals. In this paper, we address two key challenges comprising electricity markets and generation investment. Firstly, electricity markets typically are operated with competitive market clearing and merit-order dispatch, which neglects negative externalities from pollution. A Pigouvian tax is proposed in order to investigate the impacts of these externalities on electricity prices and resolve this issue. Secondly, renewable energy sources entail low operational costs, which result in lower system prices and reduced profits for producers. Furthermore, producers face high investment costs when moving into renewable energy resources, which leads to strategic investment decisions. In order to mitigate this strategic behavior, subsidies are proposed equal to producers' contribution to consumer surplus. These subsidies incentivize producers to decrease prices and increase consumer surplus, so, producers would be motivated to invest in socially optimal generation capacity. Finally, we demonstrate that implementing the proposed tax and subsidy does not increase the regulator's information burden.

Keywords: Renewable energy, electricity generation capacity, market power, environmental externalities, incentives.

JEL: D43, D62, H21, H23, L11, L13, O21, Q41

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Motivation

Electricity generation significantly contributes to environmental pollution Ritchie et al. (2020) and according to the measurements, power plants emit substantial carbon by consuming fossil fuels. However, global environmental sustainability goals endeavor to utilize cleaner electricity generation, which includes those by the United Nations (United Nations, 2022). For example, in Britain, the Office of Gas and Electricity Markets (Ofgem) aims for zero pollution by 2050 (Ofgem, 2022). Indeed, British power systems are shifting toward renewable sources (WWEA, 2018), which reflects broader European Commission advocacy for market mechanisms to reduce emissions (European Commission, 2019). We face a context where most governments have introduced auctions for Contract-for-Differences (CfDs), Power Purchase Agreements (PPAs), and capacity payments to ensure efficient investment in renewable generation capacity. The CfD contracts are used to hedge the risk for producers against the volatility of carbon prices in the future, as implemented by California's cap-and-trade program (Bruninx and Ovaere, 2022). On the other hand, PPAs are contracts between

^aCorresponding author. KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden. E-mail: mrkg@ee.kth.se.

^bKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden. E-mail: varawala@kth.se.

^cKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden. E-mail: mrhesa@kth.se.

^dKTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden. E-mail: gyuri@kth.se.

an Independent System Operator (ISO) and an off-taker, which ensure a profitable electricity price for renewable energy resources for a period of 3 to 5 years. This type of hedge contract is implemented in some EU countries such as Spain, Germany, and France (Mesa-Jiménez et al., 2023). Finally, capacity payment is another approach to support clean energy and to leverage sustainable development. In this scheme, the system operator pays money to each producer based on their capacity, even if they do not produce electricity; this is implemented by the UK and Sweden, for instance (Kozlova et al., 2023).

Besides these market policies, carbon markets and emission regulations have also been introduced to accelerate the energy transition in one form or another. Carbon futures could hedge the risk for participants through this market. However, given the fact that negative externalities do not have a straightforward relation to the output level of generation, it might be challenging to design an optimal hedge contract that would hedge the risk of participants against the volatility of carbon prices in the carbon market. For this reason, regulators proposed carbon taxes or carbon prices to penalize outputs, leading to that renewable resources enjoy several forms of subsidy support. These new carbon markets and emission regulations, through different tax-subsidy schemes, motivate reforms in spot-market design. According to the above motivation, there have been some endeavors among scholars to address this issue using different approaches.

1.2 Literature review

The Independent System Operator (ISO) manages technical aspects and performs competitive market clearing in liberalized electricity markets. Based on supply and demand curves, generation prices are determined from merit-order dispatch considering power-system constraints (Biggar and Hesamzadeh, 2014). Constraints regarding negative externalities are not considered in generation prices in a competitive market. There are two types of policies in order to address externalities, particularly carbon emissions: cap-and-trade and carbon tax. These policies aim to reduce carbon emissions. Currently, the carbon futures market is responsible for more than 90% of total carbon trade, indicating that participants use this market to hedge their risks (Xi et al., 2023). On the other hand, some countries, such as China, have a successful carbon trade market and are planning to implement a carbon tax scheme (Li et al., 2017). This decision might result from the inefficiency of the cap-and-trade mechanism in the long-term operation of the electricity market, particularly in terms of capacity investment. It is shown that if we impose some price control in cross-border trade, it could easily lead to a reduction in the investment of renewable energy resources. (Carlos Muñoz et al., 2024) tried to combine a price control mechanism with carbon policies, and they showed that a carbon tax with a price control mechanism may lead to an increase in investment in renewable energy resources without the aforementioned negative impact of the price control mechanism. However, implementing a carbon tax poses challenges because the total pollution levels do not directly correlate with individual generation levels, which makes it difficult to allocate the exact amount of these negative externalities. In order to overcome these challenges, some carbon tax schemes have been developed. For instance, carbon taxes (Maryniak et al., 2019) or carbon allowances (Limpaitoon et al., 2011; Kunsch et al., 2004) are used separately and can be traded in exclusive markets. ISOs optimize the market outcomes considering wind or solar generation units EWEA (2022) or hydro units in systems with hydro reservoirs (Rand, 2018). Thus, ISOs could address externalities as the part of market clearing mechanism by imposing a Pigouvian tax on producers, effectively resolving this issue.

The ISO can impose taxes on non-renewable energy sources with higher levels of pollution, which make these energy resources more expensive. This could resolve the lack of incentive for producers to invest in renewable energy sources. But, renewable energy sources consume free energy sources such as wind and solar to produce electricity, leading to decrease market clearing prices. As a result of reducing profits for producers, some producers therefore might withhold generation capacity or falsely declare higher costs to decrease generation, thereby increasing electricity prices and overall profits (Joskow and Tirole, 2005) and (Hesamzadeh and Biggar, 2012). For example,

(Fogelberg and Lazarczyk, 2019) proposed an algorithm to identify whether a generator or producer is exercising withholding of generation levels. Indeed, their algorithm shows whether they reduce their capacity for economic incentives or technical issues through their validation within the Swedish electricity market. Authors in (Moiseeva et al., 2017) discuss the generation flexibility and the potential for generators to exercise market power using their ramp-rate capabilities. In the European Union (European Commission, 2019), there are policies in place to force producers to generate at their full capacity and declare their true costs, which protects consumers from higher prices. Besides, price caps have also been proposed to mitigate strategic behavior (Vogelsang and Finsinger, 1979). (Downward, 2010) showed that a carbon price could lead to increased carbon emissions in a small power system comprising two nodes and two generators. Thus, the scheme of carbon charges imposed on each producer or generator is very substantial because it can easily lead to a system with a higher pollution level. Besides, (Kim and Chang, 1993) considers the problem of pollution and strategic behavior together by modeling pollution as a decreasing function of pollution volume. (Varawala et al., 2023) proposed an incentive framework to prevent strategic behavior related to pollution while considering transmission lines and nodal pricing in their mechanism.

Similar to strategic generation behavior, the system would suffer from strategic investment for the same reason and with the same effect, leading to an increase in electricity prices (Fogelberg and Lazarczyk, 2019) and (Tohidi et al., 2016). Indeed, shifting from traditional fossil-based power plants towards renewable energy plants requires high investment costs, which disincentivizes producers from adopting this generation technology. Consequently, strategic investments would occur in generation capacity. While strategic generation behavior can be prevented through policy measures, strategic investments cannot be prevented by similar policies. Therefore, the best solution is to turn to incentives. Some researchers have proposed a market mechanism with subsidies for monopolistic producers to incentivize them to maximize social welfare without detailing their cost functions (Loeb and Magat, 1979). For example, (Milstein et al., 2024) proposed a subsidy scheme based on their two-stage formulation for the investment cost of batteries in order to ensure that investors invest in the right mixture and amount of generation in the right locations, which maximizes the social welfare of participants in the long term. They showed how this subsidy could change the mixture of generation into carbon-free electricity systems through their simulation of the Israeli power system. Moreover, some scholars have extended this approach by using locational spot prices to determine consumer utilities in electricity markets. However, the entire surplus as a subsidy poses funding challenges in practice (Gans and King, 2000). Besides, (Holmberg and Tangerås, 2023) showed that allocating the right strategic reserves in the electricity market, compared to the capacity mechanism, especially for renewable energy resources, could incentivize producers to invest in carbon-free energy resources, such as those in Sweden. However, as discussed by (Gilmore et al., 2023), the power system needs to have some conventional generators in order to meet its demand at all times in the long term. As a result, they suggested a mixture of renewable energy resources with fuel-based technology, such as hydrogen, in their optimal mixture of generators. This mixture would align with zero carbon emissions if hydrogen is generated by renewable energy resources, which is called green hydrogen.

1.3 Contributions

At this research background, the current paper contributes to the relevant literature as follows: First, it proposes a tax-subsidy scheme for producers based on their marginal contribution to consumer surplus. The proposed scheme induces social-welfare decisions and it considers discrete generation technologies and costs¹. Second, the introduced tax-subsidy scheme addresses pollution externalities and strategic investment in its proposed formulation. It also respects the operational limits of power systems. Third, a detailed analytical example and a set of comprehensive numerical experiments are provided to carefully explain the operation of the tax-subsidy scheme.

¹This is inspired by the HRGV mechanism proposed in (Hesamzadeh et al., 2018) and studied in (Khastieva et al., 2020)

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present our model of the power system including buses, transmission lines, generators and pollution. Then, we compare the socially optimal spot market generation outcomes, which include consideration of pollution, to the competitive spot market clearing. Finally, in this section, we derive the tax part of the scheme which aligns the competitive market clearing with the socially optimal outcome. In Section 3, we model how investment in generation capacity would affect the social welfare created in the spot market and compare the producers' profit maximizing investment decisions to what is socially optimal. To align the producers' profit maximization with the social welfare maximization, we derive the subsidy part of the scheme. In Section 4, we present the properties of the tax and subsidy scheme and in Section 5 and Section 6, we present an analytical example and case study for illustrating the strength of the proposed scheme. Finally, we conclude in Section 7.

2. GENERATION IN WHOLESALE POWER MARKETS

2.1 Socially optimal spot market generation

We consider a wholesale electricity market over a power system with a set \mathcal{N} of buses connected to each other by a set \mathcal{L} of transmission lines. The market participants comprise a set \mathcal{I} of producers forming an oligopoly, along with a large set of consumers modeled as the aggregated utility functions. Each producer has a set \mathcal{J} of generating technologies, where units employing each technology may be present at multiple buses. We use indices $n, l, i,$ and j to refer to individual buses, lines, producers, and technologies, respectively. For simplicity, these variables vary over positive integer numbers (e.g., $n \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq n \leq |\mathcal{N}|$). Additionally, we consider dynamically varying constraints and the social welfare maximization problem in the electricity spot market over a planning horizon of T dispatch intervals. We use index t to represent a single dispatch interval, where $t \in \mathbb{N}, t \leq T$.

Additionally, we demonstrate the generated power output of producer j using technology j at bus n during time interval t as q_{tinj} and the corresponding generation capacity as k_{inj} . We assume that the generation capacity remains constant throughout the planning horizon. Specifically, for renewable energy sources like wind power plants, there exists an *availability factor* denoted by A_{tinj} , which represents the portion of available capacity during time interval t based on factors such as wind speed. Thus, we define the *relative generation* by r_{tinj} as the fraction of available capacity utilized for generation. Thus, the output power of these technologies would be represented as (1).

$$q_{tinj} = r_{tinj} A_{tinj} k_{inj} \leftrightarrow \omega_{tinj}, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, t \leq T, n \in \mathcal{N}, i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J} \quad (1)$$

where ω_{tinj} is the associated Lagrangian multiplier. The generation output must be positive and less than its corresponding capacity, which is represented by (2).

$$0 \leq r_{tinj} \leq 1 \leftrightarrow (\mu_{tinj}, \nu_{tinj}), \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, t \leq T, n \in \mathcal{N}, i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J} \quad (2)$$

Where μ_{tinj} and ν_{tinj} are the associated Lagrangian multipliers, each generation technology may also have its ramping limit denoted by R_{inj} . This limit constrains the relative output change between two neighboring time intervals. We would represent this limit as (3), where ρ_{tinj} and σ_{tinj} are two Lagrangian multipliers associated with the upper and lower limits of the ramping rate.

$$-R_{inj} \leq r_{tinj} - r_{t-1inj} \leq R_{inj} \leftrightarrow (\rho_{tinj}, \sigma_{tinj}), \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, 2 \leq t \leq T, n \in \mathcal{N}, i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}. \quad (3)$$

Basically, power generation is associated with the cost and pollution for the producers related to the technology they employed. The generation cost function and the amount of pollution created by power output at bus n for producer i with technology j at output level q_{tinj} are represented as $C_{inj}(q_{tinj})$ and $x_{tinj}(q_{tinj})$, respectively. We assume that these two functions are static over the

planning horizon, non-negative, non-decreasing, and convex with respect to q_{tinj} . As a result of these assumptions, these functions must be piece-wise first and second differentiable in q_{tinj} . They exhibit only jump discontinuities. Also, environmental pollution results in a negative externality, which is a function of the total pollution at each bus. The negative externality function at bus n is denoted by² $E_n(x_{tn})$ and is assumed to be static over the planning horizon. $E_n(x_{tn})$ is non-negative, non-decreasing and convex in x_{tn} . Since $E_n(x_{tn})$ is non-decreasing and convex, it must be piece-wise first and second differentiable in x_{tn} with only jump discontinuities.

The power consumption in interval t at bus n is represented as d_{tn} , where it is expected to be positive. We denote this representation as constraint (4). Correspondingly, the utility generated by a consumer in interval t at bus n through consumption d_{tn} is denoted by $\tilde{U}_{tn}(d_{tn})$. Notably, $\tilde{U}_{tn}(d_{tn})$ is non-decreasing and concave with respect to d_{tn} . Consequently, $\tilde{U}_{tn}(d_{tn})$ can be modeled as a piece-wise first and second differentiable function in d_{tn} , exhibiting only jump discontinuities.

$$0 \leq d_{tn} \leq D_{tn} \leftrightarrow (\alpha_{tn}, \beta_{tn}), \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, t \leq T, \forall n \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (4)$$

According to the power balance equation, the sum of power generated by producers is equal to the sum of power consumed by consumers in each time interval t . We represent this relationship as equation (5).

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} d_{tn} - \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} q_{tn} = 0 \leftrightarrow (\lambda_t), \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, t \leq T. \quad (5)$$

For transmission line l and bus n , we determine the flow of the line by considering the power generated by producers and the power consumed by consumers, using the power transfer distribution factor matrix (H_{ln}) with a linear expression (Hesamzadeh et al., 2014). The flow limitation of line l during time interval t is denoted by equation (6).

$$-F_l \leq \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} H_{ln}(d_{tn} - q_{tn}) \leq F_l \leftrightarrow (\tau_{tl}, \zeta_{tl}), \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, l \in \mathcal{L}. \quad (6)$$

In this paper, we represent vectors by square brackets with the running index as a subscript instead of using the set builder notation, e.g. $[q_{tinj}]_{tinj} := (q_{tinj} | t \in \mathbb{N}, t \leq T, n \in \mathcal{N}, i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J})$. Also, we assume that the running index runs over the entire set unless a condition is specified. By considering above constraints and parameters, and we could write social welfare maximization problem over a planning horizon of T as

$$W([k_{inj}]_{inj}) = \max_{[q_{tinj}, d_{tinj}]_{tinj}, [d_{tn}]_{tn}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_n \left(\tilde{U}_{tn}(d_{tn}) - \sum_{ij} C_{inj}(q_{tinj}) - E_n \left(\sum_{ij} x_{tinj}(q_{tinj}) \right) \right) \quad (7)$$

subject to the constraints (1) to (6). In the following, we are trying to remove dependency of social welfare maximization problem in respect to d_{tn} . First, we may separate the demand d_{tn} out from the social welfare maximization problem by defining an *aggregate* consumer utility as

$$U_t([q_{tn}]_{tn}) = \max_{[d_{tn}]_{tn}} \sum_n \tilde{U}_{tn}(d_{tn}) \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, t \leq T \quad (8)$$

subject to the constraints (4) to (6). According to constraint (5), it is clear that $\partial d_t / \partial q_{tn} = 1$, $\tilde{U}_{tn}(d_{tn})$ is non-decreasing and concave in d_{tn} , and $\partial d_{tn} / \partial q_{tn} \geq 0$, thus, $U_t([q_{tn}]_{tn})$ is non-decreasing and concave function in q_{tn} . By similar deduction, we may deduce that $U_t([q_{tn}]_{tn})$ would be a

²In this paper, we adopt the convention that omitting any index implies a summation over that index e.g. $x_{tin} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} x_{tinj}$.

piece-wise first and second differentiable function in q_{tn} with only jump discontinuities. Also, in order to overcome the jump discontinuities and to allow the derivative of $\partial U_t ([q_{tn}]_{tn}) / \partial q_{tn}$ with respect to q_{tn} to exist everywhere, we have only considered its right-hand derivative at every $[q_{tn}]_{tn}$. Moreover, we will follow this as a convention for all piece-wise differentiable functions.

By using an *aggregate* utility function with respect to q_{tn} in (7), the social welfare maximization problem would be

$$W \left([k_{inj}]_{inj} \right) = \max_{[q_{tinj}, r_{tinj}]_{tinj}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(U_t ([q_{tn}]_{tn}) - \sum_n \left(\sum_{ij} C_{inj} (q_{tinj}) + E_n (x_{tn}) \right) \right) \quad (9)$$

subject to the constraints (1) to (3) which do not depend on d_{tn} anymore.

According to the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions for the above social welfare maximization problem, we obtain (10) and (11) equation, which relate to r_{tinj} and q_{tinj} , respectively. In (11), we use the superscript * to represent the *optimal* values of the optimization variables in (9) and the KKT multipliers of the constraints (1) to (3).

$$A_{tinj} k_{tinj} \omega_{tinj}^* = -\mu_{tinj}^* + v_{tinj}^* - \rho_{tinj}^* + \sigma_{tinj}^* + \rho_{t+1inj}^* - \sigma_{t+1inj}^*, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, t \leq T, n \in \mathcal{N}, i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J} \quad (10)$$

$$\frac{\partial C_{inj}}{\partial q_{tinj}} \Big|_{[q_{tinj}]_{tinj}=[q_{tinj}^*]_{tinj}} + \omega_{tinj}^* = \frac{\partial U_t}{\partial q_{tinj}} \Big|_{[q_{tinj}]_{tinj}=[q_{tinj}^*]_{tinj}} - \frac{\partial E_n}{\partial x_{tinj}} \frac{\partial x_{tinj}}{\partial q_{tinj}} \Big|_{[q_{tinj}]_{tinj}=[q_{tinj}^*]_{tinj}}, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, t \leq T, n \in \mathcal{N}, i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J} \quad (11)$$

It is clear that r_{tinj} and q_{tinj} will depend on $[k_{inj}]_{inj}$ and consequently, $W \left([k_{inj}]_{inj} \right)$ therefore depends on $[k_{inj}]_{inj}$.

2.2 Competitive spot market clearing

The electricity market is managed by the ISO, which determine the market price at each location and time interval. According to (Varawala et al., 2023), the ISO faces information gaps, particularly regarding the specifics of individual producers' technology and pollution outputs that are $[q_{tinj}]_j$ and $[x_{tinj}]_j$, respectively. This leads to difficulties in accurately assessing the environmental impact. *Competitive* generation levels and pricing are derived from maximizing social welfare, excluding the externality term. We represent these optimal values by q_{tn}^\dagger and ω_{tinj}^\dagger , which obtain from (11) by eliminating $\frac{\partial E_n}{\partial x_{tinj}} \frac{\partial x_{tinj}}{\partial q_{tinj}}$ term. The current paper consistently positions producer costs on the left side of the equation (11) for clarity. The generation price at a given location and time interval is determined by the equation (11) minus $\frac{\partial E_n}{\partial x_{tn}} \frac{\partial x_{tinj}}{\partial q_{tinj}}$ term, which is negative externalities term. Thus, we obtain price in interval t at bus n by

$$P_{tn}^\dagger \left([k_{inj}]_{inj} \right) = \frac{\partial U_t ([q_{tn}]_{tn})}{\partial q_{tn}} \Big|_{[q_{tn}]_{tn}=[q_{tn}^\dagger]_{tn}}, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, t \leq T, n \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (12)$$

Since $U_t ([q_{tn}]_{tn})$ is non-decreasing in q_{tn} , $P_{tn}^\dagger \left([k_{inj}]_{inj} \right)$ is also non-negative. Furthermore, the ISO depends on producers to clearly declare their capacity and cost functions at bus n . Unlike

(Varawala et al., 2023), we assume producers cannot act strategically and must truthfully declare these values, operating as price-takers. Hence, the price in (12) is not influenced by $\left[q_{tn}^\dagger \right]_n$. It is clear that the maximum profits of producer i over the planning horizon of T dispatch intervals in a Cournot equilibrium is

$$\left[\bar{Y}_i \left([k_{inj}]_{inj} \right) \right]_i = \max_{[q_{tinj}, r_{tinj}]_{inj}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_n \left(P_{tn}^\dagger \left([k_{inj}]_{inj} \right) q_{tinj} - \sum_j C_{inj} (q_{tinj}) \right) \quad (13)$$

subject to the constraints (1) to (3). Therefore, by Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions, the producers' profit maximizing would be written as

$$\left. \frac{\partial C_{inj}}{\partial q_{tinj}} \right|_{q_{tinj}=q_{tinj}^\dagger} + \omega_{tinj}^\dagger = P_{tn}^\dagger \left([k_{inj}]_{inj} \right), \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, t \leq T, n \in \mathcal{N}, i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}. \quad (14)$$

which differs from the social welfare maximizing condition (11) except it lacks the non-negative term $\frac{\partial E_n}{\partial x_{tn}} \frac{\partial x_{tinj}}{\partial q_{tinj}}$, as designed in P_{tn}^\dagger . Consequently, as $\frac{\partial C_{inj}}{\partial q_{tinj}}$ increases with q_{tinj} , competitive generation levels are generally higher or equal to optimal levels, i.e. $q_{tinj}^\dagger \geq q_{tinj}^* \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, t \leq T, n \in \mathcal{N}, i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}$.

As discussed earlier, $C_{inj} (q_{tinj})$ is a convex, piece-wise second differentiable function in q_{tinj} . We consider k_{inj} is large enough number. Under this condition and considering constraints (1) to (3), the value of μ_{tinj}^\dagger remains independent of k_{inj} and other KKT multipliers are zero. So, q_{tinj}^\dagger is also independent of k_{inj} . On the other hand, as k_{inj} decreases and becomes small enough, q_{tinj}^\dagger varies linearly respect to k_{inj} . So, q_{tinj}^\dagger is continuous and piece-wise differentiable in k_{inj} . Notably, Since the objective function in (13) is continuous and piece-wise differentiable in q_{tinj} , the KKT multipliers of binding constraints and ω_{tinj}^\dagger from (10) are continuous and piece-wise differentiable in k_{inj} . Thus, $P_{tn}^\dagger \left([k_{inj}]_{inj} \right)$ is piece-wise differentiable in k_{inj} .

2.3 Proposed tax scheme

In this section, we propose a tax scheme in spot market, which maximizes the social welfare. Note that we use $*$ in the superscript to denote optimal values of the optimization variables in the profit maximization under the tax scheme. Similar to the (12), we can deduce that the price of generation in interval t at bus n would be modified to (15) for the social welfare maximizing with generation levels $\left[q_{tinj}^* \right]_{tinj}$.

$$P_{tn}^* \left([k_{inj}]_{inj} \right) = \left. \frac{\partial U_t \left([q_{tn}]_{tn} \right)}{\partial q_{tn}} \right|_{[q_{tn}]_{tn}=[q_{tn}^*]_{tn}}, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, t \leq T, n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (15)$$

It is clear that $P_{tn}^* \left([k_{inj}]_{inj} \right)$ in this scheme is non-negative. We assume that the tax imposed in interval t on producer i is represented by ϕ^{ti} . Consequently, the maximum profits of producer i over the planning horizon of T dispatch intervals, $[Y_i]_i \left([k_{inj}]_{inj} \right)$, would decrease by the amount of tax charged as

$$\max_{[q_{tinj}, r_{tinj}]_{inj}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_n \left(P_{tn}^* \left([k_{inj}]_{inj} \right) q_{tin} - \sum_j C_{inj} (q_{tinj}) - \phi_{ti} \right) \quad (16)$$

subject to the constraints (1) to (3). Similarly, the producers' profit maximizing condition is

$$\left(\frac{\partial C_{inj}}{\partial q_{tinj}} + \frac{\partial \phi_{ti}}{\partial q_{tinj}} \right) \Big|_{[q_{tinj}]_{tinj}=[q_{tinj}^*]_{tinj}} + \omega_{tinj}^* = P_{tn}^* \left([k_{inj}]_{inj} \right), \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, t \leq T, n \in \mathcal{N}, i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}. \quad (17)$$

By comparing (11) and (17), we easily obtain that the optimal tax would be feasible in the following equation

$$\frac{\partial \phi_{ti}}{\partial q_{tinj}} = \frac{\partial E_n}{\partial x_{tn}} \frac{\partial x_{tinj}}{\partial q_{tinj}}, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, t \leq T, n \in \mathcal{N}, i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}. \quad (18)$$

By integrating (18) over the box starting from zero for all q_{ti} to the $[q_{ti}]_{ti}$, the producer i 's tax is

$$\phi_{ti} - \phi_{ti}|_{[q_{tinj}]_{nj}=[0]_{nj}} = \sum_n (E_n(x_{tn}) - E_n(x_{tn} - x_{tin})), \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, t \leq T, i \in \mathcal{I}. \quad (19)$$

It is worth mentioning that the producer i 's tax in interval t is its marginal contribution to the negative externality due to pollution, i.e., it is a so-called *Pigouvian tax* (Sandmo, 2016). By adding the tax to the producers' profit maximizing condition, it is changed into (17).

$$\frac{\partial C_{inj}}{\partial q_{tinj}} \Big|_{q_{tinj}=q_{tinj}^*} + \omega_{tinj}^* + \frac{\partial E_n}{\partial x_{tn}} \frac{\partial x_{tinj}}{\partial q_{tinj}} \Big|_{q_{tinj}=q_{tinj}^*} = P_{tn}^* \left([k_{inj}]_{inj} \right), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, t \leq T, n \in \mathcal{N}, i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}. \quad (20)$$

Observe that the term $\frac{\partial E_n}{\partial x_{tn}} \frac{\partial x_{tinj}}{\partial q_{tinj}}$ is now on the left hand side of the equation since, due to the tax, it would be a cost to the generator. While it may appear that only producers are paying the tax, higher prices also reduce consumer surplus because producers control the taxed pollution source which they pay.

3. GENERATION CAPACITY INVESTMENT IN WHOLESALE POWER MARKETS

3.1 Socially optimal generation capacity investment

In this section, we try to formulate the problem of socially optimal generation capacity investment. We suppose that the existing capacity at bus n of producer i 's technology j is K_{inj} and the incremental capacity in generation is Δk_{inj} . It is clear that Δk_{inj} must be positive as

$$\Delta k_{inj} \geq 0 \leftrightarrow \tau_{inj} \forall n \in \mathcal{N}, i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J} \quad (21)$$

and also the capacity at bus n of producer i 's technology j would be the sum of the existing and the increase as

$$k_{inj} = K_{inj} + \Delta k_{inj}. \quad (22)$$

Increasing generation capacity incurs an investment cost linked to the technology used. We denoted it as $\mathfrak{C}_{inj}(\Delta k_{inj})$, which associates to the investment cost at bus n for producer i using technology j . Note that, this function is non-negative, non-decreasing, and convex in Δk_{inj} . This cost function should be piece-wise first and second differentiable with jump discontinuities. Now by considering

social welfare maximization over the investment timescale, it involves summing the social welfare generated in spot market intervals minus investment costs, it could be shown as

$$\mathfrak{B} = \max_{[\Delta k_{inj}]_{inj}} W \left([k_{inj}]_{inj} \right) - \sum_{nij} \mathfrak{C}_{inj} (\Delta k_{inj}) \quad (23)$$

subject to the constraint defined by equation (21) and the relationship provided in equation (22). Accordingly, given the modified price in (15), the equation representing the condition for maximizing social welfare is given by (24).

$$\left. \frac{\partial \mathfrak{C}_{inj}}{\partial \Delta k_{inj}} \right|_{\Delta k_{inj} = \Delta k_{inj}^*} + \tau_{inj}^* = \left. \frac{\partial W}{\partial k_{inj}} \right|_{[k_{inj}]_i = [k_{inj}^*]_i} \quad (24)$$

which results in

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \left(\frac{\partial C_{inj}}{\partial q_{tinj}} + \frac{\partial E_n}{\partial x_{tn}} \frac{\partial x_{tinj}}{\partial q_{tinj}} \right) \right) \Big|_{[q_{tinj}]_{inj} = [q_{tinj}^*]_{inj}} \frac{\partial q_{tinj}^*}{\partial k_{inj}} + \frac{\partial \mathfrak{C}_{inj}}{\partial \Delta k_{inj}} \Big|_{[\Delta k_{inj}]_i = [\Delta k_{inj}^*]_i} + \tau_{inj}^* \\ & = \sum_{t=1}^T P_{tn}^* \frac{\partial q_{tinj}^*}{\partial k_{inj}} \Big|_{[\Delta k_{inj}]_{inj} = [\Delta k_{inj}^*]_{inj}}, \forall n \in \mathcal{N}, i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}. \quad (25) \end{aligned}$$

3.2 Strategic generation capacity investment

Producers may manipulate spot market prices by declaring higher generation costs or withholding capacity, which leads to reduced generation levels and increased prices (Varawala et al., 2023), (Fogelberg and Lazarczyk, 2019). In Section 2.2, we assumed producers do not engage in such behavior, as a result generation level would be competitive generation levels. This assumption is reasonable due to policies preventing strategic behavior in critical infrastructures like power systems (European Union, 2022). However, while the modified price with considering pollution in (15) does not depend on $[q_{tn}^\dagger]_{tn}$, it can be changed by $[k_{inj}]_{inj}$. In a Cournot equilibrium, the maximum profit is achieved by all producers by (26).

$$\left[\bar{\mathcal{Y}}_i \right]_i = \left[\max_{[\Delta k_{inj}]_{nj}} \bar{Y}_i \left([k_{inj}]_{inj} \right) - \sum_{nj} \mathfrak{C}_{inj} (\Delta k_{inj}) \right]_i \quad (26)$$

subject to the constraint (21) given (22). Thus, from (16) given the tax in (19) the producers' profit-maximizing condition over the investment period in a Cournot equilibrium is

$$\left. \frac{\partial \mathfrak{C}_{inj}}{\partial \Delta k_{inj}} \right|_{\Delta k_{inj} = \Delta k_{inj}^\#} + \tau_{inj}^\# = \left. \frac{\partial Y_i}{\partial k_{inj}} \right|_{[k_{inj}]_i = [k_{inj}^\#]_i} \quad (27)$$

which results in

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \left(\frac{\partial C_{inj}}{\partial q_{tinj}} + \frac{\partial E_n}{\partial x_{tn}} \frac{\partial x_{tinj}}{\partial q_{tinj}} \right) \right) \Big|_{[q_{tinj}]_{inj}=[q_{tinj}^*]_{inj}} \frac{\partial q_{tinj}^*}{\partial k_{inj}} + \frac{\partial \mathfrak{C}_{inj}}{\partial \Delta k_{inj}} \Big|_{[\Delta k_{inj}]_i=[\Delta k_{inj}^\#]_i} + \tau_{inj}^\# \\
 & = \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\sum_{n'} \frac{\partial P_{tn'}}{\partial k_{inj}} q_{tin'}^* + P_{tn}^* \frac{\partial q_{tinj}^*}{\partial k_{inj}} \right) \Big|_{[\Delta k_{inj}]_{inj}=[\Delta k_{inj}^\#]_{inj}}, \forall n \in \mathcal{N}, i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}. \quad (28)
 \end{aligned}$$

The # superscript denotes the *strategic* values of optimization variables in producers' profit maximization (26) and the KKT multiplier of the investment constraint (21). Although the social welfare maximization condition is (25), this condition includes the additional term $\sum_{n'} \frac{\partial P_{tn'}}{\partial k_{inj}} q_{tin'}^*$ compared to optimal investment problem. Hence, strategic capacity increases differ from optimal ones, i.e. $\Delta k_{inj}^\# \neq \Delta k_{inj}^* \forall n \in \mathcal{N}, i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}$.

3.3 Proposed subsidy scheme

In this section, we propose a subsidy scheme aligning producers' profit maximization with social welfare over the investment period, with subsidies provided in the spot market. Denoting the subsidy to producer i in interval t as χ^{ti} , the maximum profits of all producers in a Cournot equilibrium increase by the subsidy amount. Producers' maximum profit over the investment period becomes the same maximization problem with greater objective function in comparison with problem proposed in Section 2.3. Consequently, the producers' profit-maximizing condition over the investment period in a Cournot equilibrium is:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left(\sum_{t=1}^T \left(\frac{\partial C_{inj}}{\partial q_{tinj}} + \frac{\partial E_n}{\partial x_{tn}} \frac{\partial x_{tinj}}{\partial q_{tinj}} - \frac{\partial \chi_{ti}}{\partial q_{tinj}} \right) \right) \Big|_{[q_{tinj}]_{inj}=[q_{tinj}^*]_{inj}} \frac{\partial q_{tinj}^*}{\partial k_{inj}} + \frac{\partial \mathfrak{C}_{inj}}{\partial \Delta k_{inj}} \Big|_{[\Delta k_{inj}]_i=[\Delta k_{inj}^*]_i} + \tau_{inj}^* \\
 & = \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\sum_{n'} \frac{\partial P_{tn'}}{\partial k_{inj}} q_{tin'}^* + P_{tn}^* \frac{\partial q_{tinj}^*}{\partial k_{inj}} \right) \Big|_{[\Delta k_{inj}]_{inj}=[\Delta k_{inj}^*]_{inj}}, \forall n \in \mathcal{N}, i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}. \quad (29)
 \end{aligned}$$

Here, the * superscript denotes expected profit maximization under the subsidy scheme. With the same logic as tax scheme, comparing (29) to the social welfare maximization condition (25), we design the subsidy so that the conditions align with the following condition.

$$\frac{\partial \chi_{ti}}{\partial q_{tinj}} \Big|_{[q_{tinj}]_{inj}=[q_{tinj}^*]_{inj}} \frac{\partial q_{tinj}^*}{\partial k_{inj}} = - \sum_{n'} \frac{\partial P_{tn'}}{\partial k_{inj}} q_{tin'}^*, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, t \leq T, n \in \mathcal{N}, i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}. \quad (30)$$

The subsidy must account for the additional term in comparison to (15):

$$\frac{\partial \chi_{ti}}{\partial q_{tinj}} \Big|_{[q_{tinj}]_{inj}=[q_{tinj}^*]_{inj}} \frac{\partial q_{tinj}^*}{\partial k_{inj}} = \sum_{n'} \left(\frac{\partial U_t}{\partial q_{tn'}} \frac{\partial q_{tin'j}^*}{\partial k_{inj}} - \frac{\partial (P_{tn'}^* q_{tin'j}^*)}{\partial k_{inj}} \right), \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, t \leq T, n \in \mathcal{N}, i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}. \quad (31)$$

Upon integration with respect to k_{inj} , iterating over j values, and finally, over n values, we obtain:

$$\chi_{ti} - \chi_{ti}|_{[q_{tinj}]_{nj}=[0]_{nj}} = \sum_n (U_t([q_{tn}]_n) - U_t([q_{tn} - q_{tin}]_n) - P_{tn}^* q_{tin}) \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, t \leq T, i \in I. \quad (32)$$

Notice that the subsidy in interval t equals the producer's marginal contribution to consumer surplus. From updated $[Y_i]_i$ ($[k_{inj}]_{inj}$) with subsidy, the producers' maximum profit, including the tax and subsidy is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{[q_{tinj}, r_{tinj}]_{inj}} \sum_{t=1}^T (U_t([q_{tn}]_n) - U_t([q_{tn} - q_{tin}]_n) \\ & - \sum_n \left(\sum_j C_{inj}(q_{tinj}) + E_n(x_{tn}) - E_n(x_{tn} - x_{tin}) \right) - \phi_{ti}|_{[q_{tinj}]_{nj}=[0]_{nj}} + \chi_{ti}|_{[q_{tinj}]_{nj}=[0]_{nj}}) \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

subject to constraints (1) to (3). Notice that all terms in producer i 's decisions $[q_{tinj}]_{nj}$ are contained in the maximum social welfare problem in (9). This ensures that producers maximize social welfare under this scheme. In comparison with (Varawala et al., 2023), we do not allow false declaration of generation cost function. Yet, both our tax and subsidy schemes are equivalent to theirs. This prevents the potential for producers to exercise strategic behavior through capacity withholding.

4. PROPERTIES OF THE PROPOSED SCHEME

Based on $\phi^{ti}|_{[q_{nj}^i]_{nj}=[0]_{nj}}$ and $\chi^{ti}|_{[q_{nj}^i]_{nj}=[0]_{nj}}$, the proposed scheme exhibits the following properties:

- **Individually Rational:**

If the social welfare in interval t does not decrease upon producer i 's participation, then the proposed scheme could ensure the individual rationality of producers. Producer i 's revenue would be adequate if:

$$\begin{aligned} (\chi_{ti} - \phi_{ti})|_{[q_{tinj}]_{nj}=[0]_{nj}} & \geq U_t([q_{tn} - q_{tin}]_n) - U_t([q_{tn}]_n) \\ & + \sum_n \left(\sum_j C_{inj}(q_{tinj}) + E_n(x_{tn}) - E_n(x_{tn} - x_{tin}) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Choosing $(\chi_{ti} - \phi_{ti})|_{[q_{tinj}]_{nj}=[0]_{nj}} \geq 0$ satisfies this condition for all possible values of $[q_{tinj}]_{inj}$ because of $U_t([q_{tn}]_n)$, $E_n(x_{tn})$, and $x_{tn}([q_{tinj}]_{tn})$ are non-decreasing and $C_{inj}(q_{tinj})$ is non-negative in term of their variables.

- **Robust to Information Asymmetry:**

The scheme is designed to depend only on aggregate values q_{tin} and x_{tin} , i.e. $\phi_{ti}|_{[q_{tinj}]_{nj}=[0]_{nj}}$ and $\chi_{ti}|_{[q_{tinj}]_{nj}=[0]_{nj}}$, which makes the proposed scheme to be robust to information asymmetry.

- **Non-discriminatory:**

If

$$\phi_{ti}|_{[q_{tinj}]_{nj}=[0]_{nj}} \equiv \phi_t|_{[q_{tinj}]_{nj}=[0]_{nj}}$$

$$\chi_{ti}|_{[q_{tinj}]_{nj=[0]_{nj}}} \equiv \chi_{ti}|_{[q_{tinj}]_{nj=[0]_{nj}}}$$

for every producer i , the functional forms for ϕ_{ti} and χ_{ti} would be the same for every producer. We may also choose $\phi_{ti}|_{[q_{tinj}]_{nj=[0]_{nj}}}$ and $\chi_{ti}|_{[q_{tinj}]_{nj=[0]_{nj}}}$ to satisfy all the two conditions above simultaneously.

- **Incentive Compatible with Respect to Direct Costs:**

The proposed scheme ensures that producers declare their costs and parameters accurately, e.g. generation and investment costs, generation capacity, ramping limits, and availability factor. Also, this scheme aligns profit maximization with social welfare maximization, which leads to a burden on the data utilized by the ISO. It is worth mentioning that ramp limits, ρ_{tinj} and σ_{tinj} , would affect producers' cost declarations and pollution externality, $E_n(x_{tn})$, via a tax, also change profit maximization problem (20). On the other hand, decreasing pollution externality effects can increase the probability of manipulating pollution levels. Thus, ISOs must measure pollution levels in this condition. Additionally, if the ISO incorporates pollution in the market clearing price (20), producers would strategically increase $E_n(x_{tn})$ or manipulate the price (20) and profits (13), which differs from the goal of maximizing social welfare.

- **Not Budget Balanced in General:**

If the scheme results in a net subsidy in any interval t , i.e., $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} (\chi_{ti} - \phi_{ti}) \geq 0$, the ISO may suffer from funding issues, that it can be resolved by adjusting fixed fees for market participants. Additionally, for every producer i , $(\phi_{ti} - \chi_{ti})|_{[q_{tinj}]_{nj=[0]_{nj}}}$ can be considered as a fixed fee. However, according to the (34), we need to set it to a reasonable number in order for the scheme to have individual rationality.

- **Producers' Profits Independent of Price:**

From (33), producers' profits under the scheme are independent of the price, which makes it compatible with price caps and overcoming their drawbacks.

5. ANALYTICAL EXAMPLE


In this section, we demonstrate the developed theory through a practical example. First of all, we examine the spot market timescale, comparing optimal spot market generation with competitive market clearing. We consider a simplified scenario of a one-bus system, denoted as $\mathcal{N} = \{1\}$, with two producers $\mathcal{I} = \{1, 2\}$ and one technology $\mathcal{J} = \{1\}$ over a planning horizon of $T = 3$. Since there are no transmission lines in a one-bus system, therefore, there are no constraints on power flow capacities (6). Table 1 shows the generation cost function, pollution factors, and existing generation capacities for each producer. Firstly, we neglected investment in generation capacity, which means the generation capacities are maintained at their existing levels. Additionally, we set $A_{ti11} = 1, R_{i11} = 1, \forall t \in \{1, 2, 3\}, i \in \{1, 2\}$ to simplify generation capacity constraints and to eliminate ramping constraints. By this assumption, the relative generation r_{ti11} is eliminated by merging constraints (1) and (2) into $0 \leq q_{ti11} \leq k_{i11} \forall t \in \{1, 2, 3\}, i \in \{1, 2\}$. Moreover, the negative externality function that represents pollution is expressed as $E_1(x_{t1}) = x_{t1}$. Finally, consumer utility is defined as $\tilde{U}_{t1}(dV) = c_t d_{t1} - d_{t1}^2/2 \forall t \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, where $c_1 = 6, c_2 = 12, c_3 = 20$.

From the power balance constraint (5), $d_{t1} = q_{t1} \geq 0, \forall t \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Thus, the aggregate consumer utility would be $U_{t1}(q_{t1}) = \tilde{U}_{t1}(q_{t1}), \forall t \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Figure 1 represents the optimal spot market generation for every interval. It is clear that the marginal utility is $c_t - q_{t1} \forall t \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, which represents a solid blue line in all the figures.

Also, the marginal costs including the pollution damage for producers $i = 1$ and $i = 2$ are $6 + \omega_{t111}^*$ and $4 + \omega_{t211}^*$ ($\forall t \in \{1, 2, 3\}$), respectively. Considering costs within each generator's capacity limits, i.e., $0 < q_{ti11} < k_{i11}$, the associated KKT multipliers are $\omega_{ti11}^* = 0; \forall t \in \{1, 2, 3\}, i \in \{1, 2\}$.

Table 1: Generation Cost Function, Pollution, Generation Capacity and Investment Cost Function

i	$C_{i11}(q_{i11})$	$x_{i11}(q_{i11})$ $\forall t \in \{1, 2, 3\}$	K_{i11}	$\mathcal{C}_{i11}(\Delta k_{i11})$
1	$2q_{i11}$	$4q_{i11}$	4	$9\Delta k_{i11}$
2	$4q_{i211}$	0	3	$9\Delta k_{i211}$

Figure 1: Optimal Spot Market Generation

According to the social welfare maximization in (9), which leads to a least-cost dispatch, producer $i = 2$ is prioritized for generation due to lower costs, with $i = 1$ generating only if $i = 2$ has reached maximum capacity. The marginal cost curves for $i = 2$ and $i = 1$ exhibit jumps at $q_{t1} = k_{211}$ and $q_{t1} = k_{211} + k_{111}$, respectively, which are characterized by the KKT multipliers ω_{i211}^* and ω_{i111}^* . Pollution damage is feasible to depict individually for each producer since the marginal pollution damage $\partial E_1 / \partial x_{i1}$ is independent of ∂x_{i1} , which is represented by the green shaded region. Optimal generation, determined at the intersection of the marginal cost and utility curves, gives maximum social welfare, depicted by the lightly shaded region. The detailed information comprising total generation, pollution damage, and maximum social welfare in each interval is summarized in Table 2.


Figure 2 illustrates competitive market clearing where pollution damage costs are ignored, consequently, dispatch relies only on marginal generation cost. For producers $i = 1$ and $i = 2$, marginal costs are $\frac{\partial C_{i11}}{\partial q_{i11}} + \omega_{i11}^\dagger$, $\forall i \in \{1, 2\}, \forall t \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Thus, producer $i = 1$ is prioritized in this case which determines the marginal cost curve for the system and it is as shown in the figures with the dotted line representing producer $i = 1$ where the jump at $q_{t1} = k_{111}$ from 2 to 4 is characterized by the KKT multiplier ω_{i111}^\dagger and the dashed line representing producer $i = 2$ where the jump at $q_{t1} = k_{211}$ is characterized by the KKT multiplier ω_{i211}^\dagger . Moreover, pollution damage is shaded darkly in each time step. Similar to the optimal market, optimal generation is determined at the intersection of marginal cost and utility curves. The social welfare is in the lightly shaded region, with price P_{t1}^\dagger as a solid line. It is worth mentioning that social welfare is negative for $t = 1$ and therefore cannot be represented. The total generation, prices, pollution damage, and social welfare are summarized in Table 2.

The competitive generation and pollution damage are not less than optimal: $q_{t11}^\dagger \geq q_{t11}^*$ and $E_1(x_{t11}^\dagger) \geq E_1(x_{t11}^*) \forall t \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. However, the competitive social welfare is not greater than optimal. The tax levied on producers $i = 1$ and $i = 2$ to align their profit maximization with the social welfare optimization is obtained by (19) and they are represented in Table 2, which is the same as the pollution damage in Figure 1. Also, the price following the tax from (15) aligns with optimal spot market generation, labeled as *Optimal*. Price P_{t1}^* is solid-lined in Figure 1 and the price is not lower than the one under competitive market clearing.

According to the information presented in Table 1, both producers have the same marginal investment cost and are linear functions. Since producer $i = 2$ has a lower marginal cost including pollution damage, only this producer increases generation capacity, i.e. $k_{111} = K_{111} = 4$. In order to compute the optimal generation capacity investment, we first represent the maximum social

Table 2: Comparison of Optimal Spot Market Generation and Competitive Market Clearing (SW - Maximum Social Welfare)

	t	q_{t111}	q_{t211}	q_{t11}	P_{t1}	$E_1(x_{t1})$	SW	$\phi_{t1} - \phi_{t1} _{q_{t111}=0}$
Optimal	1	0	2	2	4	0	2	0
	2	3	3	6	6	12	24	12
	3	4	3	7	13	16	79.5	16
Competitive	1	4	0	4	2	16	-8	-
	2	4	3	7	5	16	23.5	-
	3	4	3	7	13	16	79.5	-

Figure 2: Competitive Spot Market Clearing


welfare from the spot market as a function of generation capacity k_{111} . Social welfare is the area between marginal utility and marginal cost curves. Figure 1 and Table 3 provide generation levels for each producer and interval prices. With Δk_{211} small enough, the marginal utility curve intersects the marginal cost curve as in Figure 1. So, the total social welfare in the spot market is $W(K_{111}, k_{211}) = 68 + 14 \times k_{211} - 0.5 \times k_{211}^2$. The optimal increase in generation capacity from the social welfare maximization condition in (24) is $\Delta k_{211}^* = 2$.


Figure 3 represents market clearing prices from optimal investment in capacity, which indicates marginal utility, marginal cost, social welfare, and price. The striped region below the price line represents producer $i = 2$'s profit from (16) after tax. Table 4 tabulates each producer's generation, price from (15), tax for producer $i = 1$, maximum profit of producer $i = 2$, and maximum social welfare in the spot market. Now, we are going to determine the strategic generation investment by producer $i = 2$. Firstly, we represent producer 2's profit as a function of generation capacity k_{211} , which is the area between the price line and segments of the marginal cost curve for producer $i = 2$. Table 3 provides generation levels for each producer and interval prices. The total profit in the spot market for producer $i = 2$ and the profit maximization condition are

$$Y_2(K_{111}, k_{211}) = 14 \times k_{211} - k_{211}^2. \quad (35)$$

$$9 + \tau_{111}^\# = 14 - 2 \times (K_{211} + \Delta k_{211}). \quad (36)$$

Given $\Delta k_{211} \geq 0$ and convex optimization, strategic increase in generation capacity is $\Delta k_{211}^\# = 0$ with KKT multiplier $\tau_{111}^\# = -1$. Strategically, an increase in generation is not equal to optimal increase, i.e. $\Delta k_{211}^\# \neq \Delta k_{211}^*$. Table 4 lists each producer's generation, price from (15), tax for producer $i = 1$, maximum profit of producer $i = 2$, and maximum social welfare in the spot market. The subsidy granted to producer $i = 2$ is

$$\chi_{t1}(q_{t211}) = \begin{cases} 2 + \chi_{t1}|_{q_{t211}=0} & \text{if } t = 1, \\ 0.5 (k_{211}^*)^2 + \chi_{t1}|_{q_{t211}=0} & \text{if } t = 2, \\ 0.5 (k_{211}^*)^2 + \chi_{t1}|_{q_{t211}=0} & \text{if } t = 3. \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

Figure 3: Optimal Generation Capacity Investment

Table 3: Generation Levels and Price as Functions of the Generation Capacity k_{11}^1

	q_{t11}	q_{t211}	q_{t11}	$P_{t1}^*(K_{111}, k_{211})$
$t = 1$	0	2	2	4
$t = 2$	$6 - k_{211}$	k_{211}	6	6
$t = 3$	4	k_{211}	$4 + k_{211}$	$16 - k_{211}$

With the subsidy amount based on corresponding generation levels, the optimal capacity investment occurs. Table 4 indicates producer $i = 2$'s variable subsidy portion $\chi_{t2} - \chi_{t2}|_{q_{t211}=0}$ for each interval.

6. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS


In this section, we evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed tax-subsidy scheme on the IEEE 24-bus test system, which has 33 generators and 38 lines. The system comprises ten producers utilizing six types of technologies including renewable, hydro-power, nuclear, coal, fuel oil, and gas, which are distinguished by their cost function values. Before investment, the total installed generation capacity and load consumption in the first year are equal to 3405 MW and 2850 MW, respectively. Also, the cost functions for generators and utility functions for loads are linearized using piece-wise linear functions consisting of ten segments each. Similarly, the externality cost function is assumed to be linear, with the coefficient of the externality function for each technology type comprised of renewable, hydro-power, nuclear, coal, fuel oil, and gas are assigned to be 0, 0, 0, 90, 95, and 110 (\$/MWh), respectively. The reason for choosing these externality coefficients is to adjust the net cost functions of each technology in the following increasing order: renewable, hydro-power, nuclear, coal, gas, and fuel oil. These numbers show the contribution of each producer in a specific area to pollution costs. These costs, imposed on each producer, might be significant because it could change the net merit order list in the spot market. Additionally, the coefficient of utility function and power consumption are assumed to increase by 4 and 2.5 percentage per time step, respectively. Furthermore, k , the rated power limits of lines are reduced to 70 percentage of their nominal limits in order to experience line congestion in our simulations. Also, each generator is assigned to each of the ten producers in such a way that each producer has different technologies and the total capacity of generators for each producer ranges from 6% to 14% of the total installed capacity of generators. It is worth mentioning that the annual investment cost for each technology is obtained based on its lifetime and total investment costs, which include both fixed and variable investment costs (EIA, 2024). We assume that the investment cost per MW is the same for each technology. Finally, the simulation is conducted over 20 time steps.

As the utility functions are linear, we can transform the optimization problem related to utility function maximization with constraints (4) to (6), into a set of linear equations. This set of equations consists of the primal and dual constraints with linearized complementary slackness equations. We can determine the optimal values for load consumption and the Lagrangian multipliers corresponding to constraints (4) to (6) by solving this set of equations, which ultimately leads to have price of each node in power system. Similarly, the optimization problem linked to maximizing profit

Table 4: Comparison of Optimal and Strategic Generation Investment (PS₂ - Maximum Profit of Producer $i = 2$, SW - Maximum Social Welfare in Spot Market)

	t	q_{t111}	q_{t211}	q_{t11}	$P_{t1}^*(K_{111}, k_{211})$	ϕ_{t1}	PS ₂	SW	χ_{t1}
Optimal	1	0	2	2	4	0	0	2	2
	2	1	5	6	6	4	10	28	12.5
	3	4	5	9	11	16	10	95.5	12.5
Strategic	1	0	2	2	4	0	0	2	-
	2	3	3	6	6	12	12	24	-
	3	4	3	7	13	16	16	79.5	-

Figure 4: Comparison of Optimal and Competitive Spot Market





via investment capacity can be converted into a set of optimality conditions, which enables us to derive the amount of capacity investment for the strategic investment case study. The aforementioned formulation is described in more detail in the Appendix. Finally, we implement the proposed model in Python along with the Gurobi solver.

Figure 4a shows the average nodal price and social welfare for both optimal and competitive spot market models within twenty-time steps. As discussed in Section 2, we have established that the optimal spot market price surpasses that of the competitive spot market, and likewise, the optimal social welfare is greater than under the competitive model. Our results reveal that in the optimal model, total social welfare experiences a 0.23% increase compared to the competitive model. Moreover, Figure 4c shows the tax levied on the two producers under the proposed tax-subsidy scheme as a function of time. The figure shows that as the load increases, the tax levied on the two producers changes very differently. The reason for the difference is that producer 2 operates two nuclear units and one coal unit, while producer 4 operates two renewable units and one fuel oil unit. Given the higher externality cost coefficient for the fuel oil unit compared to the coal unit, producer 4 experiences a higher tax changes over time compared to producer 2.

Figure 5a illustrates the average nodal electricity price and social welfare for both the optimal and strategic investment models. As predicted in Section 3, the electricity price obtained from the optimal investment model is higher than that under the strategic investment model. Also, the annual social welfare in the optimal investment scenario is higher than in the strategic investment one. Our analysis shows that under optimal investment, social welfare is 4.36% higher compared to strategic investment. The total generation investment in the optimal and strategic models are 256.57MW and 1937.31MW, respectively. Also, Figure 5c displays the profit of producer 10 at each time step. It is clear that the profit of producer 10 increases with the increases of loads in the optimal investment scenario. However, in strategic investment, the profit does not exhibit a similar increase with load consumption due to the strategic game dynamics inherent in the strategic investment model. Additionally, our findings indicate that the total profit of all producers in the optimal investment scenario is greater than the strategic investment by 13.30%.

Finally, Figure 6 illustrates the subsidy paid to producers 2 and 4 at each time step in the optimal investment model. As depicted in the chart, the subsidy value increases with some fluctuation over time. As we observed previously, the profit of producers without our proposed subsidy does not exhibit a meaningful trend. With this subsidy, the profit of each producer might increase with the

Figure 5: Comparison of Optimal and Strategic Investments**Figure 6: Optimal Subsidy is Paid to two Sample Producers**

increment of loads. Thus, the profit of each producer would increase in the final optimal investment framework.

7. CONCLUSION

We identified two main challenges about the growing penetration of renewable energy sources in electricity markets. Firstly, the current competitive market mechanisms cannot consider pollution externalities accurately. We proposed a Pigouvian tax on producers as the function of their externalities that the tax aligns producers' profit maximization with the social welfare maximization problem. This tax leads to encouraging preferences for renewable energy sources in market clearing processes. Secondly, there is a lack of motivation for producers to invest in renewable due to their lower operational costs resulting in reduced electricity prices and ultimately reducing the total profits of producers. To tackle this, we proposed subsidies to producers equivalent to their marginal contribution to consumer surplus. This approach ensures that their profits remain unaffected by electricity prices, and ultimately incentivizes them to social-welfare maximizing investment in renewable energy capacity. Crucially, these proposed tax and subsidy mechanisms can be calculated using existing data within the ISO.

REFERENCES

- Biggar, D. R. and Hesamzadeh, M. R. (2014). *The economics of electricity markets*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Bruninx, K. and Ovaere, M. (2022). Covid-19, green deal and recovery plan permanently change emissions and prices in eu ets phase iv. *Nature communications*, 13(1):1165.
- Carlos Muñoz, J., Oliva H, S., and Sauma, E. (2024). Effect of combining carbon policies and price controls in cross-border trade of energy on renewable generation investments. *The Energy Journal*, 45(1):81–103.
- Downward, A. (2010). Carbon charges in electricity markets with strategic behavior and transmission. *The Energy Journal*, 31(4):159–166.
- EIA, U. (2024). Cost and performance characteristics of new generating technologies, annual energy outlook 2023.
- European Commission (2019). Clean energy for all Europeans package. https://energy.ec.europa.eu/topics/energy-strategy/clean-energy-all-europeans-package_en. Accessed: 2022–11–19.

- European Union (2022). Competition rules in the EU. https://europa.eu/youreurope/business/selling-in-eu/competition-between-businesses/competition-rules-eu/index_en.htm. Accessed: 2022-11-16.
- EWEA (2022). EWEA position paper on priority dispatch of wind power. https://www.ewea.org/fileadmin/files/library/publications/position-papers/EWEA_position_on_priority_dispatch.pdf. Accessed: 2022-11-19.
- Fogelberg, S. and Lazarczyk, E. (2019). Strategic withholding through production failures. *The Energy Journal*, 40(5):247–266.
- Gans, J. S. and King, S. P. (2000). Options for electricity transmission regulation in Australia. *Australian Economic Review*, 33(2):145–160.
- Gilmore, J., Nelson, T., and Nolan, T. (2023). Firming technologies to reach 100% renewable energy production in australia's national electricity market (nem). *The Energy Journal*, 44(6).
- Hesamzadeh, M. R. and Biggar, D. R. (2012). Merger analysis in wholesale power markets using the equilibria-band methodology. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 28(2):819–827.
- Hesamzadeh, M. R., Galland, O., and Biggar, D. R. (2014). Short-run economic dispatch with mathematical modelling of the adjustment cost. *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, 58:9 – 18.
- Hesamzadeh, M. R., Rosellón, J., Gabriel, S. A., and Vogelsang, I. (2018). A simple regulatory incentive mechanism applied to electricity transmission pricing and investment. *Energy Economics*, 75:423–439.
- Holmberg, P. and Tangerås, T. (2023). A survey of capacity mechanisms: Lessons for the swedish electricity market. *The Energy Journal*, 44(6):275–304.
- Joskow, P. and Tirole, J. (2005). Merchant transmission investment. *The Journal of Industrial Economics*, 53(2):233–264.
- Khastieva, D., Hesamzadeh, M. R., Vogelsang, I., and Rosellon, J. (2020). Transmission network investment using incentive regulation: A disjunctive programming approach. *Networks and Spatial Economics*, 20:1029–1068.
- Kim, J.-C. and Chang, K.-B. (1993). An optimal tax/subsidy for output and pollution control under asymmetric information in oligopoly markets. *Journal of Regulatory Economics*, 5:183–197.
- Kozlova, M., Huhta, K., and Lohrmann, A. (2023). The interface between support schemes for renewable energy and security of supply: Reviewing capacity mechanisms and support schemes for renewable energy in europe. *Energy Policy*, 181:113707.
- Kunsch, P. L., Springael, J., and Brans, J. P. (2004). The zero-emission certificates: A novel co2-pollution reduction instrument applied to the electricity market. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 153(2):386 – 399.
- Li, J., Su, Q., and Ma, L. (2017). Production and transportation outsourcing decisions in the supply chain under single and multiple carbon policies. *Journal of cleaner production*, 141:1109–1122.
- Limpaiboon, T., Chen, Y., and Oren, S. S. (2011). The impact of carbon cap and trade regulation on congested electricity market equilibrium. *Journal of Regulatory Economics*, 40:237–260.
- Loeb, M. and Magat, W. A. (1979). A decentralized method for utility regulation. *The Journal of Law & Economics*, 22(2):399–404.
- Maryniak, P., Trück, S., and Weron, R. (2019). Carbon pricing and electricity markets — the case of the Australian Clean Energy Bill. *Energy Economics*, 79:45–58.
- Mesa-Jiménez, J., Tzianoumis, A., Stokes, L., Yang, Q., and Livina, V. (2023). Long-term wind and solar energy generation forecasts, and optimisation of power purchase agreements. *Energy Reports*, 9:292–302.
- Milstein, I., Tishler, A., and Woo, C.-K. (2024). Carbon-free electricity supply in a cournot wholesale market: Israel. *The Energy Journal*, pages 01956574–45.
- Moiseeva, E., Wogrin, S., and Hesamzadeh, M. R. (2017). Generation flexibility in ramp rates: Strategic behavior and lessons for electricity market design. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 261(2):755–771.
- Ofgem (2022). Our role and responsibilities. Accessed: 2022-11-19.
- Rand, J. (2018). Overlooked trade-offs of environmentally protective hydropower operation: Impacts to ancillary services and greenhouse gas emissions. *River Research and Applications*, 34(9):1123–1131.
- Ritchie, H., Roser, M., and Rosado, P. (2020). CO₂ and greenhouse gas emissions. *Our World in Data*. <https://ourworldindata.org/co2-and-other-greenhouse-gas-emissions>.
- Sandmo, A. (2016). *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*. Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Tohidi, Y., Hesamzadeh, M. R., and Regairaz, F. (2016). Sequential coordination of transmission expansion planning with strategic generation investments. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 32(4):2521–2534.
- United Nations (2022). The 17 goals. <https://sdgs.un.org/goals#icons>. Accessed: 2022-11-19.
- Varawala, L., Hesamzadeh, M. R., Dán, G., Bunn, D., and Rosellón, J. (2023). A pricing mechanism to jointly mitigate market power and environmental externalities in electricity markets. *Energy Economics*, 121:106646.
- Vogelsang, I. and Finsinger, J. (1979). A regulatory adjustment process for optimal pricing by multiproduct monopoly firms. *Bell Journal of Economics*, 10(1):157–171.

WWEA (2018). World wind energy association report 2018. <https://wwindea.org/information--2/information>. Accessed: 2022-11-19.

Xi, Z., Pan, H., and Qin, T. (2023). Re-examining the efficiency of the eu carbon futures market in phase 2: price discovery and intertemporal arbitrage. *Frontiers in Energy Research*, 11:1-10.

APPENDIX

In this section, we developed our proposed model for the numerical experiments for linear utility, generation cost, and externality functions. These functions are achievable by approximating exact functions with their piece-wise linear approximations.

Firstly, we develop the mathematical formulation of the competitive electricity market. The competitive electricity market problem is formulated as (A1)-(A5), where (A1) represents the total social welfare of participants without externalities. In this equation, $P_{d,t}^D$ and $P_{g,t}^G$ represent the consumption level of demand d at time step t and the generation level of generator g at time step t , respectively. Additionally, $b_{d,t}^D$ and $b_{g,t}^G$ are the coefficients of the demand utility function and the generation cost function, respectively. It is worth mentioning that we assume $\Delta P_g^{G \max}$ is equal to zero for all $g \in \mathcal{N}_G$ in the competitive and optimal markets, which means the investment level is considered to be zero. This variable will be used in the optimal and strategic capacity investment, which leads to an increase in the capacity of generation units in the planning horizon. (A2) and (A3) represent the limitations of generation output level and consumption level and their associated Lagrange multipliers, respectively. Indeed, the maximum level of consumption for demand d at time step t and the generation capacity of generator g at time step t are represented by $P_{d,t}^{D \max}$ and $P_g^{G \max}$, respectively. The power balance equation and its associated Lagrange multiplier, i.e., electricity price, is formulated as (A4), and finally, the line flow limits are shown by (A5) where $H_{g,l}^G$ and $H_{d,l}^D$ are the Power Transfer Distribution Factors (PTDFs) for generation and demand, respectively. Finally, F_l^{\max} depicts the rated power of line l .

$$W(\Delta P_g^{G \max}) = \max \sum_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\sum_{d \in \mathcal{N}_D} b_{d,t}^D P_{d,t}^D - \sum_{g \in \mathcal{N}_G} b_{g,t}^G P_{g,t}^G \right) \quad (\text{A1})$$

subject to

$$0 \leq P_{g,t}^G \leq P_g^{G \max} + \Delta P_g^{G \max} \leftrightarrow (\mu_{g,t}^{G \min}, \mu_{g,t}^{G \max}), \forall g \in \mathcal{N}_G, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$0 \leq P_{d,t}^D \leq P_{d,t}^{D \max} \leftrightarrow (\mu_{d,t}^{D \min}, \mu_{d,t}^{D \max}), \forall d \in \mathcal{N}_D, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$\sum_{d \in \mathcal{N}_D} P_{d,t}^D = \sum_{g \in \mathcal{N}_G} P_{g,t}^G \leftrightarrow (\lambda_t), \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (\text{A4})$$

$$-F_l^{\max} \leq \sum_{g \in \mathcal{N}_G} H_{g,l}^G P_{g,t}^G - \sum_{d \in \mathcal{N}_D} H_{d,l}^D P_{d,t}^D \leq F_l^{\max} \leftrightarrow (\mu_{l,t}^{L \min}, \mu_{l,t}^{L \max}), \forall l \in \mathcal{N}_L, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (\text{A5})$$

On the other hand, the optimal market problem is represented with the objective function formulated as (A6) subject to (A2)-(A5), which considers negative externalities through the piece-wise linear externality functions with coefficient $e_{g,t}^G$ for the generator g at time step t .

$$W(\Delta P_g^{G \max}) = \max \sum_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\sum_{d \in \mathcal{N}_D} b_{d,t}^D P_{d,t}^D - \sum_{g \in \mathcal{N}_G} (b_{g,t}^G + e_{g,t}^G) P_{g,t}^G \right) \quad (\text{A6})$$

Now, we need to develop a formulation to compute the total consumer utility, which is used for determining the electricity price by another optimization problem or a set of equations. This problem is formulated with the objective function as (A7) subject to (A3)-(A5).

$$U_t^{PP} = \max \sum_d b_{d,t}^D P_{d,t}^D \quad (A7)$$

The dual problem of maximizing total consumer utility is as follows:

$$U_t^{DP} = \min \sum_{d,t} P_{d,t}^{D \max} \mu_{d,t}^{D \max} + \left(\sum_{g \in \mathcal{N}_G} P_{g,t}^G \right) \lambda_t - \sum_{l \in \mathcal{N}_L} \left(F_l^{\max} + \sum_{g \in \mathcal{N}_G} H_{g,l}^G P_{g,t}^G \right) \mu_{l,t}^{L \max} \\ + \sum_{l \in \mathcal{N}_L} \left(F_l^{\max} - \sum_{g \in \mathcal{N}_G} H_{g,l}^G P_{g,t}^G \right) \mu_{l,t}^{L \min} \quad (A9)$$

subject to

$$\mu_{d,t}^{D \min} + \mu_{d,t}^{D \max} + \lambda_t - \sum_{l \in \mathcal{N}_L} H_{d,l}^D \left(\mu_{l,t}^{L \min}, \mu_{l,t}^{L \max} \right) = b_{d,t}^D \leftrightarrow (P_{d,t}^D), \forall d \in \mathcal{N}_D, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (A10)$$

$$\mu_{d,t}^{D \min} \leq 0, \mu_{d,t}^{D \max} \geq 0, \forall d \in \mathcal{N}_D, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (A11)$$

$$\mu_{l,t}^{L \min} \leq 0, \mu_{l,t}^{L \max} \geq 0, \forall l \in \mathcal{N}_L, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (A12)$$

If we assume $P_{g,t}^G$ is a parameter, then the dual problem is a Linear Programming (LP) problem, and U_t^{DP} and U_t^{PP} are equal at each time step. Thus, if we consider the equations of the primal problem of maximizing total consumer utility, i.e., (A3)-(A5), with the equations of the dual problem, i.e., (A10)-(A12), plus the zero duality gap equations, i.e., $U_t^{PP} = U_t^{DP}$, we would have a set of equations leading to a solution for maximizing total consumer utility with its Lagrange multiplier. Based on the fact that $P_{g,t}^G$ is a variable in our problem, this set of equations is non-linear. This system of equations can be linearized by removing the strong-duality equations and considering the linearized complementary slackness condition with binary variables as defined by (A10)-(A12), where γ is an arbitrary positive number which is greater than one. In practice, γ equal to two has an appropriate performance with respect to getting a solution in a reasonable time.

$$P_{d,t}^D \leq \gamma P_{d,t}^{D \max} \left(1 - z_{d,t}^{D \min} \right), \forall d \in \mathcal{N}_D, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (A13)$$

$$\mu_{d,t}^{D \min} \geq -\gamma b_{d,t}^D z_{d,t}^{D \min}, \forall d \in \mathcal{N}_D, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (A14)$$

$$P_{d,t}^D \geq P_{d,t}^{D \max} - \gamma P_{d,t}^{D \max} \left(1 - z_{d,t}^{D \max} \right), \forall d \in \mathcal{N}_D, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (A15)$$

$$\mu_{d,t}^{D \max} \leq \gamma b_{d,t}^D z_{d,t}^{D \max}, \forall d \in \mathcal{N}_D, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (A16)$$

$$\sum_{g \in \mathcal{N}_G} H_{g,l}^G P_{g,t}^G - \sum_{d \in \mathcal{N}_D} H_{d,l}^D P_{d,t}^D \leq -F_l^{\max} + (\gamma + 1) F_l^{\max} \left(1 - z_{l,t}^{L \min} \right), \forall l \in \mathcal{N}_L, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (A17)$$

$$\mu_{l,t}^{L \min} \geq -\gamma \max_{d \in \mathcal{N}_D} \left(b_{d,t}^D \right) z_{l,t}^{L \min}, \forall l \in \mathcal{N}_L, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (\text{A18})$$

$$\sum_{g \in \mathcal{N}_G} H_{g,l}^G P_{g,t}^G - \sum_{d \in \mathcal{N}_D} H_{d,l}^D P_{d,t}^D \geq F_l^{\max} - (\gamma + 1) F_l^{\max} \left(1 - z_{l,t}^{L \max} \right), \forall l \in \mathcal{N}_L, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (\text{A19})$$

$$\mu_{l,t}^{L \max} \leq \gamma \max_{d \in \mathcal{N}_D} \left(b_{d,t}^D \right) z_{l,t}^{L \max}, \forall l \in \mathcal{N}_L, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (\text{A20})$$

$$z_{d,t}^{D \min}, z_{d,t}^{D \max} \in \{0, 1\}, \forall d \in \mathcal{N}_D, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (\text{A21})$$

$$z_{l,t}^{L \min}, z_{l,t}^{L \max} \in \{0, 1\}, \forall l \in \mathcal{N}_L, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (\text{A22})$$

By adding (A10)-(A22) to the competitive electricity markets or optimal electricity markets, we can obtain a Mixed Integer Linear Programming (MILP) problem, which enables us to directly compute the Lagrange multiplier of competitive electricity markets or optimal electricity markets. According to the value of the Lagrange multiplier, the electricity price at each node, each generator node, and each demand node is represented by (A23), (A24), and (A25), respectively. Moreover, $H_{n,l}^N$ shows the PTDF associated with the power changes in bus n .

$$Pr_{n,t}^N = \lambda_t - \sum_{l \in \mathcal{N}_L} H_{n,l}^N \left(\mu_{l,t}^{L \min} + \mu_{l,t}^{L \max} \right), \forall n \in \mathcal{N}_N, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (\text{A23})$$

$$Pr_{g,t}^G = \lambda_t - \sum_{l \in \mathcal{N}_L} H_{g,l}^G \left(\mu_{l,t}^{L \min} + \mu_{l,t}^{L \max} \right), \forall g \in \mathcal{N}_G, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (\text{A24})$$

$$Pr_{d,t}^D = \lambda_t - \sum_{l \in \mathcal{N}_L} H_{d,l}^D \left(\mu_{l,t}^{L \min} + \mu_{l,t}^{L \max} \right), \forall d \in \mathcal{N}_D, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (\text{A25})$$

Now, the capacity investment problem, i.e., optimal investment and strategic investment, will be presented using the model we developed earlier. The optimal capacity investment problem is represented by maximizing the objective functions as shown by (A26) subject to (A2)-(A5), (A10)-(A22), and (A27). In (A27), a limit on the capacity investment for generator g is shown by $P_g^{\Delta G \max}$.

$$\sum_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \left(\sum_{d \in \mathcal{N}_D} b_{d,t}^D P_{d,t}^D - \sum_{g \in \mathcal{N}_G} \left(b_{g,t}^G + e_{g,t}^G \right) P_{g,t}^G \right) - \sum_{g \in \mathcal{N}_G} c_g^{G \text{cap}} \Delta P_g^{\Delta G \max} \quad (\text{A26})$$

$$0 \leq \Delta P_g^{\Delta G \max} \leq P_g^{\Delta G \max} \leftrightarrow \left(\mu_g^{\Delta G \min}, \mu_g^{\Delta G \max} \right), \forall g \in \mathcal{N}_G \quad (\text{A27})$$

On the other hand, the strategic investment problem is a bi-level optimization problem with maximizing the objective function represented by (A1) subject to (A26), (A2)-(A5), (A10)-(A22), and (A27)-(A28).

$$\Delta P_g^{\Delta G \max} = \operatorname{argmax}_{0 \leq \Delta P_g^{\Delta G \max} \leq P_g^{\Delta G \max}} \left[\sum_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \left(Pr_{g,t}^G - b_{g,t}^G - e_{g,t}^G \right) P_{g,t}^G - c_g^{G \text{cap}} \Delta P_g^{\Delta G \max} \right], \forall g \in \mathcal{N}_G. \quad (\text{A28})$$

In order to have a single-level problem, we need to transform the optimization problem with the objective function (A28) and constraints (A2) and (A27) into a system of equations using a similar approach as before. Because $Pr_{g,t}^G$ and $P_{g,t}^G$ are not decision variables for the problem of maximizing

the profit of generators, they are determined after knowing the amount of capacity investment by solving the optimal markets problem. Thus, the dual problem of maximizing the profit of generators is represented by minimizing (A29) subject to (A30)-(A32).

$$\min \sum_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \left(P_g^{G \max} - P_{g,t}^G \right) \mu_{g,t}^{G \max} + P_g^{\Delta G \max} \mu_g^{\Delta G \max} \quad (\text{A29})$$

$$\mu_g^{\Delta G \min} + \mu_g^{\Delta G \max} - \sum_{t \in \mathbb{N}} \mu_{g,t}^{G \max} = -c_g^{G \text{cap}} \leftrightarrow (\Delta P_g^{G \max}), \forall g \in \mathcal{N}_G, \quad (\text{A30})$$

$$\mu_g^{\Delta G \min} \leq 0, \mu_g^{\Delta G \max} \geq 0, \forall g \in \mathcal{N}_G, \quad (\text{A31})$$

$$\mu_{g,t}^{G \max} \geq 0, \forall g \in \mathcal{N}_G, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (\text{A32})$$

We could similarly derive a system of equations that gives us the solution for maximizing the profit of generators in capacity investment by considering the linearized complementary slackness equations represented by (A33) to (A38). As a result of these linearizations, the strategic investment problem has the objective function represented by (A1) subject to constraints comprising (A26), (A2)-(A5), (A10)-(A22), (A27), and (A30)-(A38).

$$\Delta P_g^{G \max} \leq \gamma P_g^{G \max} \left(1 - z_{d,t}^{\Delta G \min} \right), \forall g \in \mathcal{N}_G, \quad (\text{A33})$$

$$\Delta P_g^{G \max} \leq \gamma P_g^{G \max} \left(1 - z_{d,t}^{\Delta G \min} \right), \forall g \in \mathcal{N}_G, \quad (\text{A34})$$

$$m \mu_g^{\Delta G \min} \geq -\gamma c_g^{G \text{cap}} z_{d,t}^{\Delta G \min}, \forall g \in \mathcal{N}_G, \quad (\text{A35})$$

$$\mu_g^{\Delta G \max} \leq \gamma c_g^{G \text{cap}} z_{d,t}^{\Delta G \max}, \forall g \in \mathcal{N}_G, \quad (\text{A36})$$

$$P_{g,t}^G - P_g^{G \max} - \Delta P_g^{G \max} \geq -\gamma P_g^{G \max} \left(1 - z_{g,t}^{G \max} \right), \forall g \in \mathcal{N}_G, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}, \quad (\text{A37})$$

$$\mu_{g,t}^{G \max} \leq \gamma c_g^{G \text{cap}} z_{d,t}^{G \max}, \forall g \in \mathcal{N}_G, \forall t \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (\text{A38})$$