

Electricity Market-Clearing With Extreme Events

Tomás Tapia, Charalambos Konstantinou, Yury Dvorkin

Abstract—Extreme events jeopardize power network operations, causing beyond-design failures and massive supply interruptions. Existing market designs fail to internalize and systematically assess the risk of extreme and rare events. With the increasing deployment of renewable generation, electric power systems become increasingly dependent on weather changes. Efficiently maintaining the reliability of renewable-dominant power systems during extreme weather events requires co-optimizing system resources, while differentiating between large/rare and small/frequent deviations from forecast conditions. To address this research and practice gap, we propose efficiently managing the uncertainties associated with extreme weather events through the integration of large deviation theory into chance constraints (LDT-CC). We integrate extreme event statistics into market-clearing, via including LDT-CC to model and price reserve to cope with extreme events, and use weighted chance constraints (WCC) to reduce solution conservatism. We prove that the proposed market design is capable of producing a competitive equilibrium. Numerical experiments on an illustrative system and a modified 8-zone ISO New England system demonstrate the usefulness of the proposed pricing mechanism.

I. INTRODUCTION

RARE and extreme events are situations that occur with a low probability but can lead to catastrophic system impacts, provoking cascading blackouts and affecting both the economy and society [1]. For example, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission reports that during the extreme cold winter storm in Texas in February 2021, cold temperatures severely impacted power generation capacity, leading to energy shortages and causing damages estimated between \$80 to \$ 130 billion [2]. Also, during the three-day storm, wholesale electricity prices often surged to the offer price cap of \$9,000/MWh [3]. After this episode, the Public Utility Commission of Texas lowered the offer price cap from \$9,000/MWh to \$5,000/MWh and imposed strict weatherization standards on generation and natural gas companies [4], [5]. While seemingly beneficial to consumers, the offer price cap measure may cause market participants and investors to perceive electricity prices as lower than they would be in a fully risk-complete market. This misalignment between private (investor) and social (system) risk attitudes may exacerbate the missing money problem. In the long term, this measure may also negatively impact resource adequacy, leading to insufficient capacity investment to ensure system reliability during future extreme events [6].

Other weather events such as wildfires, heatwaves and hurricanes, dunkelflaute phenomena, and cyber-attacks are also classified as extreme events and are shown to affect electricity market outcomes [7]. Current electricity markets set reserve requirements exogenously and then enforce them in scheduling routines without an explicit treatment of extreme events. As a result, these (often heuristic) reserve rules do not

cover extreme events or prioritize resources for rare or large deviations from forecast or design conditions, resulting in risk-incomplete market outcomes. This incompleteness, in turns, leads to widespread outages and costly operating regimes and inadequate dispatch and price signals to market participants. Accounting for extreme events within market mechanisms is crucial given the expected increase in the frequency, intensity, and duration of these events due to climate change [1].

Over the past few decades, optimization techniques for managing uncertainty in power systems and markets have evolved rapidly [8], including stochastic programming [9], robust optimization techniques [10], chance (probabilistic) constraints, and distributionally robust optimization [11]. Still, the current industry practice remains largely deterministic and aims to cope with growing uncertainty through incremental improvements, thereby increasing complexity and opaqueness of operating procedures and software [12]. In contrast, stochastic electricity market designs make it possible to internalize uncertainty and provide efficient market signals.

These market designs achieve competitive equilibrium under various uncertainty factors and assumptions, with market signals—primarily derived from prices—playing a critical role in market clearing mechanisms to align private and social risk perspectives [6]. However, scenario-based stochastic programming faces significant limitations for market clearing routines due to scenario dependency and computational barriers [13]. It requires the use of *nontransparent* scenario selection techniques and scenario weighting to avoid biasing the results [14], as well as the inability to accurately predict scenarios for extreme events [15]. Alternatively, robust and distributionally robust optimization can capture extreme events but typically lead to *overly conservative* solutions, resulting in suboptimal asset- and system-level operations.

Chance constraints (CCs) are a reliable method to manage and price resources effectively, addressing risks by employing (often) affine control policies to determine the necessary reserve capacity in response to a priori postulated uncertainty [11]. CCs also position the system to cope with anticipated uncertainty realizations by limiting constraint violations to only a small fraction of the time [11]. This method has been extended further to robust CCs [16], distributionally robust CCs [17], and used for endogenous electricity pricing [18], [19], [20], [21], [22], [23]. Despite their strengths, CCs are generally indifferent to the explicit risk associated with the impact or size of constraint violations, particularly overlooking the risk of *large* or *rare* deviations. This can lead to risk-incomplete solutions that are both costly and ineffective in managing extreme events.

Notably, [24] introduces weighted chance constraints (WCC) with general (non-affine) and, importantly for pricing, convex control policies that differentiate the response of gen-

erators between large and small deviations due to uncertainty. Related to [24], [25] presents a sample-based model for calculating additional manual reserves. However, these approaches yield an NP-hard problem and require approximations to be computed efficiently. Such approximations have been studied in recent literature, e.g., [26], [27], [28], [29]. Still, these approximations complicate the solving process due to the use of non-convex or scenario-based methods, particularly when trying to account for rare events.

Traditional methods for quantifying and incorporating rare and extreme events are computationally demanding due to intensive sampling requirements [30]. Inspired by recent work on large deviation theory [31], [15] introduced a *sample-free* method for solving so-called rare CCs by integrating large deviation theory (LDT-CC). This method leads to a bi-level optimization formulation that is independent of the rarity of the event. To cope with the bi-level structure, the lower-level problem is replaced with its first-order optimality conditions, resulting in a convex model that can be computed by off-the-shelf optimization solvers.

Figure 1 compares the use of “regular” CCs (as in [11]) and LDT-CC approaches to internalize uncertainty. The red area represents the occurrence of deviations under regular operations, where the cumulative probability $(1 - \epsilon)$ is hedged by the regular CCs. Meanwhile, the yellow area corresponds to worst-case scenarios, where the LDT-CC robustly hedges the uncertainty of extreme events by only using a dominating point (Ω^*) to characterize the rare event set in the tail of the distribution (ϵ). Ω^* simplifies the extreme event analysis to one point that captures the essential behavior of the system, reducing the complexity and size of the problem [30]. For comparison, we include the Value-at-Risk (VaR) and Conditional Value-at-Risk (CVaR) metrics [28] in the figure.




Fig. 1: Operation regimes under uncertainty with regular (red) and extreme (yellow) chance constraints.

This paper extends chance-constrained pricing in [18], [21], [19] by leveraging LDT-CC to effectively handle uncertainty arising from rare and extreme events in market-clearing procedures. The resulting LDT-CC market design is convex with respect to power generation variables and can be solved by off-the-shelf solvers. Furthermore, this paper extends the market-clearing formulations above by internalizing extreme uncertainty realizations and risk parameters in the price formation process. Additionally, due to potentially conservative results that LDT-CC may yield, we also propose an anticipative approach to endogenize extreme-event statistics via LDT-CC results and alleviate solution conservativeness with WCC. We refer to this ability of exploiting a priori rare event statistics

on possible future extreme event realizations as anticipative preparedness.

The contributions of this paper are:

- It proposes a stochastic electricity market design that includes reserves for both regular and extreme operations, where the latter modeled using LDT-CC.
- The proposed market design enables pricing of rare and extreme events in an anticipatory manner. We use WCC to reduce the conservatism of the obtained market outcomes.
- This paper rigorously demonstrates that the resulting dispatch decisions and prices are efficient and constitute a competitive equilibrium.

The paper is organized as follows. Section II reviews two CC approaches from the literature and the proposed LDT-CC formulation along with its algorithmic approximation. Section III describes the electricity pricing formulation. Section IV extends the formulation and price derivations to consider power flow constraints. Section V presents two case studies based on an illustrative system and an 8-zone ISO New England system. Section VI concludes the paper.

II. MATHEMATICAL FORMULATION

A. Literature formulations

1) *Chance Constraint for Economic Dispatch (ED)*: We refer to the chance-constrained approach presented in [11], [21], [18], [19] as regular. This approach internalizes uncertainty through the incorporation of probabilistic constraints that must be satisfied for a specified fraction of the time. Here, thermal generators respond through reserve deployment to handle wind or load uncertainty fluctuations. This approach will serve as a benchmark to compare with and motivate the proposed formulation.

To simplify notation, we assume that power generation of wind farm n' can be expressed as $w_{n'} = \hat{w}_{n'} + \omega_{n'}$, where $\hat{w}_{n'}$ is a forecast value and $\omega_{n'}$ is a related forecast error. Furthermore, the aggregated wind generation forecast is given as $\hat{W} = \sum_{n' \in \mathcal{W}} \hat{w}_{n'}$, while the aggregated forecast error corresponds to $\Omega = \sum_{n' \in \mathcal{W}} \omega_{n'}$.

The regular CC-ED formulation can be summarized as:

$$\min_{p, g, \delta} \mathbb{E}_{\Omega} \left[\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} C_n(g_n(\Omega)) \right] \quad (1a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } p_n \geq 0 \quad \forall n \quad (1b)$$

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} g_n(\Omega) = D - \hat{W} - \Omega \quad (1c)$$

$$g_n(\Omega) = p_n + \delta_n(\Omega) \quad \forall n \quad (1d)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\Omega} [g_n(\Omega) \leq p_n^{\max}] \geq 1 - \epsilon_n \quad \forall n \quad (1e)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\Omega} [p_n^{\min} \leq g_n(\Omega)] \geq 1 - \epsilon_n \quad \forall n \quad (1f)$$

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \delta_n(\Omega) = \Omega, \quad (1g)$$

The objective in (1a) is to minimize the expected cost of production under uncertainty. Constraint (1c) corresponds to the power balance under regular uncertainty. Eq. (1d) postulates an affine control policy $g(\Omega)$, where p_n is the scheduled generation and $\delta_n(\Omega)$ describes how generators responds to wind fluctuations. Generation limits are formulated as CCs in

(1e) and (1f), with a target violation probability of ϵ . Finally, (1g) represents the reserve deployment under wind fluctuations, where $\delta(\Omega) = \alpha_n \Omega$ and $\alpha_n \in [0, 1]$ is a participation factor of generator n . Therefore, (1g) can be expressed as $\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \alpha_n = 1$ [11]. Applying the convex reformulation in [11], eqs. (1e) and (1f) can be expressed as:

$$p_n^{\min} + \alpha_n \hat{\sigma}_n \leq p_n \leq p_n^{\max} - \alpha_n \hat{\sigma}_n, \quad \forall n$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_n = \Phi^{-1}(1 - \epsilon_n) \sigma_\Omega$ is a given parameter, and $\Phi^{-1}(\cdot)$ is the inverse cumulative distribution.

2) *Weighted Chance Constraint for Economic Dispatch*: WCC is a generalization of regular CCs, which allows for the inclusion of more general than affine control policies and differentiates responses for uncertainties realization of different sizes [24]. WCC is presented generally as:

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(y(\Omega)) P(\Omega) d\Omega \leq \epsilon, \quad (2)$$

where $P(\Omega)$ is a distribution of the uncertain variable, $y(\Omega)$ denotes the magnitude of the constraint violation, e.g., an overloaded component. For (1e), the overload function is $y(\Omega) = p_n(\Omega) - p_n^{\max}$, where $y(\cdot) > 0$ represents a violation of the maximum limit constraint. Finally, $f(\cdot)$ corresponds to a weight function, which is nonzero only if $y(\cdot) > 0$.

Theorem 1 in [24] proves that choosing a convex weight function results in a corresponding WCCs being convex under general control policies (e.g., continuous or piece-wise continuous). Consequently, the convexity of the WCC enables the derivation of globally optimal control policies and prices. For the formulation proposed in Section II-B, we are interested in the WCC with a linear weight function and piece-wise affine control policy. For a random variable $\Omega \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_\Omega, \sigma_\Omega^2)$, eq. (2) can be reformulated as the expectation of a truncated Gaussian distribution:

$$\tilde{\mu}_n \left(1 - \Phi^{-1} \left(\frac{\tilde{\mu}_n}{\tilde{\sigma}_n} \right) \right) + \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_n}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\tilde{\mu}_n}{\tilde{\sigma}_n} \right)^2} \leq \epsilon_n, \quad (3)$$

where, $\tilde{\mu}_n$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_n^2$ correspond to the mean and variance of the overload function. For instance, assuming that the forecast error does not have a systematic offset error ($\mu_\Omega = 0$), the mean and variance of the maximum generation output are $\tilde{\mu}_n = \tilde{\mu}_n^{\max} = p_n - p_n^{\max}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}_n^2 = (\tilde{\sigma}_n^{\max})^2 = \alpha_n^2 \sigma_\Omega^2$, respectively. The minimum output constraint follows the same structure, and its mean and variance are $\tilde{\mu}_n^{\min}$ and $(\tilde{\sigma}_n^{\min})^2$ respectively. Then, the model in (1) can be expressed with WCC constraints as:

$$\min_{p, \alpha} \mathbb{E}_\Omega \left[\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} C_n(p_n, \alpha_n) \right] \quad (4a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \forall n \left\{ \alpha_n, p_n \geq 0 \right. \quad (4b)$$

$$(\nu_n^+) : \tilde{\mu}_n^{\max} \left(1 - \Phi^{-1}(z_n^{\max}) \right) + \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_n^{\max}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} (z_n^{\max})^2} \leq \epsilon_n \quad (4c)$$

$$(\nu_n^-) : \left. \tilde{\mu}_n^{\min} \left(1 - \Phi^{-1}(z_n^{\min}) \right) + \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_n^{\min}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} (z_n^{\min})^2} \leq \epsilon_n \right\} \quad (4d)$$

$$(\pi) : \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} p_n = D - \hat{W} \quad (4e)$$

$$(\rho) : \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \alpha_n = 1, \quad (4f)$$

where $z_n^{\max} = \frac{-\tilde{\mu}_n^{\max}}{\tilde{\sigma}_n^{\max}}$ and $z_n^{\min} = \frac{-\tilde{\mu}_n^{\min}}{\tilde{\sigma}_n^{\min}}$. Now, consider a piece-wise linear control policy as follows:

$$p_n(\Omega) = \begin{cases} p_n + g_n^-(\Omega), & \Omega \leq \Omega_\epsilon \\ p_n + g_n^+(\Omega), & \Omega_\epsilon < \Omega \end{cases}$$

where $g_n^+(\cdot)$ and $g_n^-(\cdot)$ are general control functions for each region of the piece-wise affine policy. Ω_ϵ corresponds to the threshold value of Ω where the policy changes the control response. Under this policy, considering the linearly WCCs on (4c) or (4d), we can write the WCC as:

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\Omega_\epsilon} \int_0^\infty y P(y|\Omega) dy d\Omega + \int_{\Omega_\epsilon}^\infty \int_0^\infty y P(y|\Omega) dy d\Omega \leq \epsilon_n.$$

B. Proposed formulation

1) *Large Deviation Theory Chance Constraints*: Motivated by the need to differentiate between small and large deviations and account for rare/extreme events probabilities, we derive large deviation theory chance constraints (LDT-CC). LDT-CC provides a tractable formulation for a control policy function using Taylor's approximations to estimate the true probability over rare realizations of the uncertainty parameter Ω .

The incorporation of large deviation theory into chance-constrained problems leads to a nonlinear bi-level optimization problem [15]. The upper-level corresponds to a dispatch problem which includes Taylor's approximation of chance constraints in the neighborhood of Ω^* . The goal of the lower-level problem is to find the dominant point Ω^* or the LDT-CC minimizer in the rare event set that characterizes extreme events (see Fig. 1). To cope with this bi-level problem, the lower-level optimization problem is replaced with its first order optimality conditions. The resulting formulation enables the use off-the-shelf solvers, is independent of samples/scenarios, and provides an analytical expression for electricity pricing.

We formulate the LDT-CC problem as follows:

$$\min_{p, \alpha, \beta} \mathbb{E}_\Omega \left[\sum_n C_n(p_n, \alpha_n, \beta_n) \right] \quad (5a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } \alpha_n, \beta_n, p_n \geq 0 \quad \forall n \quad (5b)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_\Omega [p_n^{\min} \leq p_n + \alpha_n \Omega] \geq 1 - \epsilon_n \quad \forall n \quad (5c)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_\Omega [p_n + \alpha_n \Omega \leq p_n^{\max}] \geq 1 - \epsilon_n \quad \forall n \quad (5d)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\Omega^*} [p_n^{\min} \leq p_n + \delta_n(\Omega^*)] \geq 1 - \epsilon_n^{\text{ext}} \quad \forall n \quad (5e)$$

$$\mathbb{P}_{\Omega^*} [p_n + \delta_n(\Omega^*) \leq p_n^{\max}] \geq 1 - \epsilon_n^{\text{ext}} \quad \forall n \quad (5f)$$

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} p_n = D - \hat{W} \quad (5g)$$

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \alpha_n = 1 \quad (5h)$$

$$\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \beta_n = 1, \quad (5i)$$

In (5), we use two types chance constraints, (5c)-(5d) and (5e)-(5f), which differ in risk quantification for regular and extreme forecast deviations and in the control policies associated with these deviations. Accordingly, the accepted violation

probability are ϵ_n and $\epsilon_n^{\text{ext}} \in [0, 1]$ respectively, where $\epsilon_n \ll 1$ and $\epsilon_n^{\text{ext}} \lll 1$. Eqs. (5c) and (5d) correspond to the regular CC and respond to regular deviations within Ω with a linear policy using a participation factor α_n for generator n . Eqs. (5e) and (5f) correspond to the LDT-CC and respond to extreme realizations Ω^* using participation factor β_n for generator n . Eq. (5i) corresponds to reserve balancing under extreme realizations, analogous to (5h) under regular forecast deviations. To prevent overlapping in the provision of regular and extreme reserve, we define the extreme reserve policy as:

$$\delta(\Omega) = (\alpha_n - \beta_n)\hat{\sigma}_\Omega + \beta_n\Omega.$$

Motivated by Theorem 3.4 in [15], and using the tails of the probability distributions of rare and extreme events, eq. (5f) can be reformulated as:

$$P_k(p_n, \delta_n, \alpha_n, \beta_n, \Omega^*) \leq 1 - \epsilon_n^{\text{ext}} \quad \forall n, k \quad (6a)$$

$$\Omega^* \in \arg \min_{\Omega} \{I(\Omega) : p_n + \delta_n(\Omega) \geq p_n^{\text{max}}\}, \quad (6b)$$

where function $P_k(\cdot)$ is the k th-order Taylor's approximation of (5f) and the expression in (6b) is the lower-level problem that defines a dominant point Ω^* in the uncertainty set Ω that characterizes the extreme event region. $I(\Omega)$ is a rate function that characterizes the behavior of rare probabilities in Ω . The rate function is commonly used in LDT to quantify the asymptotic probability of rare events. $I(\cdot)$ is a conjugate function of the cumulant-generating function of the distribution, where cumulant-generating functions are a set of quantities that provides an alternative to the moments of the distribution [15], [32]. Lower values of $I(\cdot)$ indicate more probable events, while higher values indicate less probable events.

Assuming that wind forecast errors follow Gaussian distribution, i.e. $\Omega \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_\Omega, \sigma_\Omega^2)$, where μ_Ω is the mean and σ_Ω^2 is the variance, then the rate function can be computed through the Legendre transformation of the cumulant function as $I(\Omega) = \frac{1}{2}(\Omega - \mu_\Omega)^2(\sigma_\Omega^2)^{-1}$ [15]. Using the first-order probability estimate $P_1(\cdot) = \Phi(-\sqrt{2I(\Omega^*)})$ [15], and assuming zero forecast systematic error offset ($\mu_\Omega = 0$), the LDT-CC formulation in (5) can be reformulated as a bi-level optimization problem:

$$\min_{p, \alpha, \beta} \mathbb{E}_\Omega \left[\sum_n C_n(p_n, \alpha_n, \beta_n) \right] \quad (7a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad (5b), (5g) - (5i) \quad (7b)$$

$$p_n - p_n^{\text{max}} + \alpha_n \hat{\sigma}_n \leq 0 \quad \forall n \quad (7c)$$

$$\Phi\left(-\sqrt{\Omega^{*2}(\sigma_\Omega^2)^{-1}}\right) \leq 1 - \epsilon_n^{\text{ext}} \quad \forall n \quad (7d)$$

$$\Omega^* \in \arg \min_{\Omega} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\Omega^2(\sigma_\Omega^2)^{-1} : p_n + (\alpha_n - \beta_n)\hat{\sigma}_n + \beta_n\Omega \geq p_n^{\text{max}} \right\}. \quad (7e)$$

Eq. (7e) can be replaced with its first-order optimality conditions. Then, the LDT-CC model in (7) can be expressed as:

$$\min_{p, \alpha, \beta, \Omega^*, \lambda^*} \mathbb{E}_\Omega \left[\sum_n C_n(p_n, \alpha_n, \beta_n) \right] \quad (8a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \alpha_n, \beta_n, p_n \geq 0, \lambda_n^* > 0 \quad \forall n \quad (8b)$$

$$(\delta_n^+) : p_n - p_n^{\text{max}} + \alpha_n \hat{\sigma}_n \leq 0 \quad \forall n \quad (8c)$$

$$(\mu_n^+) : p_n + (\alpha_n - \beta_n)\hat{\sigma}_n + \beta_n \Omega^* = p_n^{\text{max}} \quad \forall n \quad (8d)$$

$$(\nu) : -(\sigma_\Omega^2)^{-1/2}\Omega^* - \Phi^{-1}(1 - \epsilon_n^{\text{ext}}) \leq 0 \quad (8e)$$

$$(\xi_n) : (\sigma_\Omega^2)^{-1}\Omega^* - \beta_n \lambda_n^* = 0 \quad \forall n \quad (8f)$$

$$(\pi) : \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} p_n = D - \hat{W} \quad (8g)$$

$$(\rho) : \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \alpha_n = 1 \quad (8h)$$

$$(\chi) : \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \beta_n = 1, \quad (8i)$$

where λ^* is the dual variable associated with the generator limit constraint in the lower-level problem (6b). The LTD constraint in (6) is represented with eqs. (8d)-(8f). Equation (8c) corresponds to the approximation of the regular CC (5d) based on [11]. The minimum output constraint follows the same structure. Greek letters in parentheses on the left denote dual multipliers of constraints.

Although (8) provides a powerful sampling-free analytical formulation, the nature of rare and extreme events tends to result in overly conservative solutions, leading to out-of-merit reserve dispatch and higher costs.

2) *Algorithmic Approximation for LDT-CC*: To reduce conservatism in (8), we propose an algorithmic approximation model that uses the LDT minimizer (Ω^*) and anticipates extreme realizations to improve system performance. This approximation leverages WCC to compute extreme reserves using LDT-CC. We refer to this model as LDT-WCC. This formulation is convex if the selected weight function is convex. Thus, adjusting the control policy for different regions of the uncertainty set will lead us to a more flexible reserve policy compared with the original LDT-CC.

Consider the WCC with a piece-wise affine policy to differentiate the extreme event region in the set of Ω . Then, for the maximum output constraint in (5f), the proposed LDT-WCC formulation is:

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(p_n(\Omega) - p_n^{\text{max}})P(p_n(\Omega) - p_n^{\text{max}}|\Omega)P(\Omega)d\Omega$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\Omega_\epsilon} \int_0^{\infty} f(p_n(\Omega) - p_n^{\text{max}})P(\Omega)d\Omega$$

$$+ \int_{\Omega_\epsilon}^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} f(p_n(\Omega) - p_n^{\text{max}})P(\Omega)d\Omega \leq \epsilon_n, \quad (9)$$

where the control policy corresponds to:

$$p_n(\Omega, \Omega^*) = \begin{cases} p_n + \alpha_n \Omega, & \Omega \leq \Omega_\epsilon \\ p_n + \beta_n \Omega^* + (\alpha_n - \beta_n) \Omega, & \Omega_\epsilon < \Omega \end{cases}$$

The final version of the piece-wise affine policy with linear WCCs will correspond to the expectation of a truncated Gaussian distribution in (3) with its respective mean and variance. For (9), the mean and variance are:

$$\mathbb{E}[y(\cdot)] = \begin{cases} p_n - p_n^{\text{max}} - \alpha_n \sigma_\Omega \frac{\phi(z_{\Omega^*})}{\Phi(z_{\Omega^*})}, & \Omega \leq \Omega_\epsilon \\ p_n - p_n^{\text{max}} + \beta_n \Omega^* + (\alpha_n - \beta_n) \sigma_\Omega \frac{\phi(z_{\Omega^*})}{1 - \Phi(z_{\Omega^*})}, & \Omega_\epsilon < \Omega \end{cases}$$

$$\mathbb{V}[y(\cdot)] = \begin{cases} (\alpha_n \sigma_\Omega)^2 \left(1 - z_{\Omega^*} \frac{\phi(z_{\Omega^*})}{\Phi(z_{\Omega^*})} - \left(\frac{\phi(z_{\Omega^*})}{\Phi(z_{\Omega^*})}\right)^2\right), & \Omega \leq \Omega_\epsilon \\ \left((\alpha_n - \beta_n) \sigma_\Omega\right)^2 \left(1 + z_{\Omega^*} \frac{\phi(z_{\Omega^*})}{1 - \Phi(z_{\Omega^*})} - \left(\frac{\phi(z_{\Omega^*})}{1 - \Phi(z_{\Omega^*})}\right)^2\right), & \Omega_\epsilon < \Omega, \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where $z_{\Omega^*} = \frac{\Omega^*}{\sigma_\Omega}$, and $\phi(\cdot)$ is a probability density function of a Gaussian distribution. The minimum output constraint can be reformulated analogously. Then, the approximation for (8) can be expressed as:

$$\min_{p, \alpha, \beta} \mathbb{E}_\Omega \left[\sum_n C_n(p_n, \alpha_n, \beta_n) \right] \quad (11a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad (8g) - (8i) \quad (11b)$$

$$\alpha_n, \beta_n, p_n \geq 0 \quad \forall n \quad (11c)$$

$$(\nu_n^+) : \begin{aligned} & \int_{-\infty}^{\Omega_\epsilon} \int_0^\infty f(p_n(\Omega) - p_n^{\max}) P(\Omega) d\Omega \\ & + \int_{\Omega_\epsilon}^\infty \int_0^\infty f(p_n(\Omega) - p_n^{\max}) P(\Omega) d\Omega \\ & \leq \epsilon_n, \end{aligned} \quad \forall n \quad (11d)$$

Base on the above, the proposed anticipative preparedness model approximation involves the following steps:

- Step 1: Obtain Ω^* from the uncertainty set of the aggregated wind forecast error solving the LDT-CC model in (8).
- Step 2: Using a WCC and considering a piece-wise affine policy in (9), we fix $\Omega_\epsilon < \Omega^*$. This enables assigning reserve β_n to the extreme event region where $\Omega \geq \Omega_\epsilon$.
- Step 3: Solve the LDT-WCC in (11) that includes a linear weight function and piece-wise affine policy as described in (9), using a cutting-plane algorithm (see Algorithm 1).

In Fig. 2 we summarize the difference between the CC benchmark in (1) and the proposed models (LDT-CC and LDT-WCC) in (8) and (11), respectively.




Fig. 2: Comparison: benchmark (CC) vs. proposed models (LDT-CC and LDT-WCC)

In Fig. 2, CC hedge against deviations under regular operations with a cumulative probability of $(1 - \epsilon)$ and consider a uniform weight function for constraint violations. LDT-CC and LDT-WCC internalize characteristics of the tail of the distribution (ϵ). LDT-CC covers deviations up to Ω^* , which characterizes the extreme operations, while LDT-WCC prepares the system for these extreme operations by incorporating information about Ω^* into the control policy and linearly weighting the constraint violations.

C. Cutting-plane algorithm to solve WCC and LDT-WCC

The analytical reformulations of the WCC and LDT-WCC presented in (4) and (11), respectively, are nonlinear. They consider variables inside the inverse of the cumulative distribution function, multiplied by the maximum or minimum generation output limit mean. To solve this problem with off-the-shelf optimization solvers, we use a cutting-plane method. For instance in (11), the cutting-plane approach iteratively solves a sequence of relaxations without output limit constraint (11d). This results in problem with linear constraints that can be solved using commercial solvers. At each iteration we must verify whether eq. (11d) is satisfied by the solution.

If the solution of the relaxed problem satisfies eq. (11d), then the algorithm ends. Otherwise, the solution is used to find the corresponding $(\tilde{\mu}_n^*, \tilde{\sigma}_n^*)$ (related to p_n^* , α_n^* , and β_n^*) that violates (11), and we add a linearization of eq. (11d). To simplify notation, suppose eq. (11d) has the form:

$$f(\tilde{\mu}_n, \tilde{\sigma}_n) = \tilde{\mu}_n \left(1 - \Phi\left(\frac{-\tilde{\mu}_n}{\tilde{\sigma}_n}\right)\right) + \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_n}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{\frac{-1}{2}\left(\frac{-\tilde{\mu}_n}{\tilde{\sigma}_n}\right)^2},$$

Note that we use $f(\cdot)$ as a truncated Gaussian distribution and $\frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial p_n}$, $\frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \alpha_n}$, and $\frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \beta_n}$ for each region of Ω with their respective mean and variance presented in (10). Then, its derivatives with respect to $\tilde{\mu}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}$ are:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n} &= \left(1 - \Phi(\tilde{z}_n)\right) + \tilde{\mu}_n \left(\frac{-1}{\tilde{\sigma}_n} \phi(\tilde{z}_n)\right) - \frac{\tilde{z}_n}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{\frac{-1}{2}(\tilde{z}_n)^2} \\ \frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_n} &= -\frac{\tilde{\mu}_n^2}{\tilde{\sigma}_n^2} \phi(\tilde{z}_n) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{\frac{-1}{2}(\tilde{z}_n)^2} \left(1 + \frac{\tilde{\mu}_n^2}{\tilde{\sigma}_n^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{z}_n = \frac{-\tilde{\mu}_n}{\tilde{\sigma}_n}$. Then, the first-order approximation of the corresponding constraint has the form:

$$\begin{aligned} & f(\tilde{\mu}_n^*, \tilde{\sigma}_n^*) + \frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n} \frac{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n}{\partial p_n} (p_n - p_n^*) \\ & + \frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n} \frac{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n}{\partial \alpha_n} (\alpha_n - \alpha_n^*) + \frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n} \frac{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n}{\partial \beta_n} (\beta_n - \beta_n^*) \\ & + \frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_n} \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_n}{\partial \alpha_n} (\alpha_n - \alpha_n^*) + \frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_n} \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_n}{\partial \beta_n} (\beta_n - \beta_n^*) \leq \epsilon_n \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

See Algorithm 1 for an illustration of the iterative cutting-plane method in (11). Although the cutting-plane algorithm typically does not guarantee polynomial-time convergence [16], the convexity of the proposed models, along with the compactness and non-emptiness of the feasible region, ensures convergence to the optimal solution [11].

Algorithm 1 Cutting plane approach method

- 1: Solve (11) without (11d), and obtain $(p_n^*, \alpha_n^*, \beta_n^*)$.
- 2: Check if $(p_n^*, \alpha_n^*, \beta_n^*)$ satisfies the constraint (11d).
- 3: **if** eq. (11d) **is not** satisfied by $(p_n^*, \alpha_n^*, \beta_n^*)$ **then**
- 4: Add a linearization of this constraint approximated by its first-order Taylor approximation with the form (12).
- 5: Go to **step 1**
- 6: **else**
- 7: Exit
- 8: **end if**

III. CHANCE CONSTRAINT PRICING

We derive electricity prices for both LDT-CC in (8) and LDT-WCC in (11) and analyze their market properties.

A. Pricing based on the LDT-CC formulation in eq. (8)

In the following, we use the KKT conditions for (8) in Propositions 1 to highlight individual price components. This facilitates the analysis of how constraints affect the prices. Also, we analyze how the derived electricity prices lead in to an equilibrium problem in Theorem 1.

Proposition 1. Consider the model in (8). Let π , ρ , and χ be the active power and reserves prices defined as the dual multipliers of constraint (8g), (8h), and (8i) respectively. Then π , ρ , and χ are given by:

$$\pi = \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial p_n} + \mu_n^+ + \delta_n^+ \quad (13a)$$

$$\rho = \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial \alpha_n} + \mu_n^+ \hat{\sigma}_\Omega + \delta_n^+ \hat{\sigma}_n \quad (13b)$$

$$\chi = \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial \beta_n} + \mu_n^+(\Omega^* - \hat{\sigma}_n) - \xi \lambda_n^* \quad (13c)$$

Proof. The stationary conditions for the model in (8) are:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial p_n} : \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial p_n} + \mu_n^+ + \delta_n^+ - \pi = 0 \quad (14a)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \alpha_n} : \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial \alpha_n} + \mu_n^+ \hat{\sigma}_\Omega + \delta_n^+ \hat{\sigma}_n - \rho = 0 \quad (14b)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \beta_n} : \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial \beta_n} + \mu_n^+(\Omega^* - \hat{\sigma}_n) - \xi \lambda_n^* - \chi = 0 \quad (14c)$$

Notably, π , ρ , and χ can be expressed directly from (14). ■

Using a production cost function $C_n(p_n, \alpha_n, \beta_n) = C_{1,n}(p_n + \Omega \alpha_n) + C_{2,n}(p_n + \Omega \alpha_n)^2 + C_n^\beta \beta_n$, $\mathbb{E}_\Omega[C_n(\cdot)]$ can be replaced with the following expression:

$$\mathbb{E}_\Omega[C_{1,n}(p_n + \Omega \alpha_n)] = C_{1,n}(p_n + \mu_\Omega \alpha_n) \quad (15a)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_\Omega[C_{2,n}(p_n + \Omega \alpha_n)^2] = C_{2,n}(p_n^2 + 2\mu_\Omega p_n + \sigma_\Omega^2 \alpha_n^2) \quad (15b)$$

$$\mathbb{E}_\Omega[C_n^\beta \beta_n] = C_n^\beta \beta_n \quad (15c)$$

Considering $\mu_\Omega = 0$, the expected total system cost is:

$$\mathbb{E}_\Omega \left[\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} C(p_n, \alpha_n, \beta_n) \right] = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} (C_{2,n}(p_n^2 + \sigma_\Omega^2 \alpha_n^2) + C_{1,n} p_n + C_n^\beta \beta_n) \quad (16)$$

Using the total expected system cost expression in the KKT stationary conditions in (14a)-(14c), we can express p_n , α_n and β_n as functions of π , ρ and ξ , respectively. Replacing these expressions in (8g), (8h) and (8i) respectively leads to:

$$\pi = \left[D - W - \sum_n \frac{(C_{1,n} + \mu_n^+ + \delta_n^+)}{2C_{2,n}} \right] / \sum_n \frac{1}{2C_{2,n}}$$

$$\rho = \left[1 - \sum_n \frac{(\mu_n^+ \hat{\sigma}_\Omega + \delta_n^+ \hat{\sigma}_n)}{2C_{2,n} \sigma_\Omega^2} \right] / \sum_n \frac{1}{2C_{2,n} \sigma_\Omega^2}$$

$$\chi = C_n^\beta + \mu_n^+(\Omega^* - \hat{\sigma}_n) - \xi \lambda_n^*$$

Note that π is independent of uncertainty and risk parameter, while ρ internalizes σ_Ω and χ accounts for both Ω^* and σ_Ω .

Theorem 1. Market equilibrium: Let $\{p_n^*, \alpha_n^*, \beta_n^*, \Omega^*, \lambda_n^*\}$ be the optimal solution of the problem in (8) and let $\{\pi^*, \rho^*, \chi^*\}$ be the dual variables. Then $\{\{p_n^*, \alpha_n^*, \beta_n^*, \lambda_n^* \forall n\}, \Omega^*, \pi^*, \rho^*, \chi^*\}$ constitutes a market equilibrium, i.e.:

- The market clears at $\sum p_n^* - \hat{W} = D$, $\sum \alpha_n^* = 1$, and $\sum \beta_n^* = 1$
- Each producer maximizes its profit under the payment $\Gamma_n = \pi^* p_n^* + \rho^* \alpha_n^* + \chi^* \beta_n^*$

Proof. Given an optimal pair (Ω^*, λ_n^*) , if $\{p_n^*, \alpha_n^*, \beta_n^* \forall n\}$ is feasible and solved to optimality, the optimal values $\{p_n^*, \alpha_n^*, \beta_n^* \forall n\}$ must satisfy the equality constraints from (8). As the result, we have $\sum p_n^* - \hat{W} = D$, $\sum \alpha_n^* = 1$, and $\sum \beta_n^* = 1$. For a given optimal solution (Ω^*, λ_n^*) from (8), the producer's problem corresponds to a linear optimization problem expressed as:

$$\max_{p, \alpha, \beta} -C_n(p_n, \alpha_n, \beta_n) + l_0 p_n + b_0 \alpha_n + w_0 \beta_n \quad (17a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } p_n, \alpha_n, \beta_n \geq 0 \quad (17b)$$

$$(\hat{\mu}_n^+) : -p_n^{\max} + p_n + (\alpha_n - \beta_n) \hat{\sigma}_n + \beta_n \Omega^* = 0 \quad (17c)$$

$$(\hat{\delta}_n^+) : p_n - p_n^{\max} + \alpha_n \hat{\sigma}_n \leq 0 \quad (17d)$$

$$(\hat{\xi}_n) : (\sigma_\Omega^2)^{-1} \Omega^* - \beta_n \lambda_n^* = 0 \quad (17e)$$

The Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) optimality conditions are:

$$-l_0 + \hat{\mu}_n^+ + \hat{\delta}_n^+ + \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial p_n} = 0$$

$$-b_0 + \hat{\mu}_n^+ \Omega^* + \hat{\delta}_n^+ \hat{\sigma}_n + \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial \alpha_n} = 0$$

$$-w_0 + \hat{\mu}_n^+(\Omega^* - \hat{\sigma}_n) - \hat{\xi}_n \lambda_n^* + \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial \beta_n} = 0$$

$$(-p_n^{\max} + p_n + (\alpha_n - \beta_n) \hat{\sigma}_n + \beta_n \Omega^*) \perp \hat{\mu}_n^+ = 0$$

$$(p_n - p_n^{\max} + \alpha_n \hat{\sigma}_n) \perp \hat{\delta}_n^+ = 0$$

$$((\sigma_\Omega^2)^{-1} \Omega^* - \beta_n \lambda_n^*) \perp \hat{\xi}_n = 0$$

$$\hat{\delta}_n^+ \geq 0, \hat{\mu}_n^+ \in \mathbb{R}, \hat{\xi}_n \in \mathbb{R}$$

Using the KKT conditions, we can express (l_0, b_0, w_0) as:

$$l_0 = \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial p_n} + \hat{\mu}_n^+ + \hat{\delta}_n^+ \quad (18a)$$

$$b_0 = \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial \alpha_n} + \hat{\mu}_n^+ \Omega^* + \hat{\delta}_n^+ \hat{\sigma}_n \quad (18b)$$

$$w_0 = \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial \beta_n} + \hat{\mu}_n^+(\Omega^* - \hat{\sigma}_n) - \hat{\xi}_n \lambda_n^* \quad (18c)$$

These functions correspond to the same structure that the operator's optimality conditions from (14a)-(14c), where the dual values (π, ρ, χ) are equivalents to (l_0, b_0, w_0) . ■

Based on the results from Theorem 1, we analyze market design properties such as cost recovery and revenue adequacy.

1) *Cost recovery:* Cost recovery refers to the ability of producers to recover their operational cost from the market outcomes. It is formalized as, $\Pi_n \geq 0, \forall n \in \mathcal{N}$, where $\Pi_n = \pi p_n + \rho \alpha_n + \chi \beta_n - C_{1,n} p_n - C_{2,n}(p_n^2 + \sigma_\Omega^2 \alpha_n^2) - C_n^\beta \beta_n$. Theorem 1 guarantees full cost recovery for each producer, i.e., $\Pi_n^* = 0$, under the competitive equilibrium. Since each producer problem in (17) is convex, we can apply the strong

duality theorem to calculate the optimal market outcomes as discussed in [18].

2) *Revenue adequacy*: Revenue adequacy refers to the market ability to ensure that the total payments received from consumers are sufficient to cover the total payments to producers. The proposed market design follows the same principles as those in [18], and results in a revenue inadequate market. The total market revenue deficit is given by:

$$\Delta^* = -\min \left[0, \sum_n \Gamma_n + \pi^* \hat{W} - \pi^* D \right] \quad (19)$$

From Theorem 1 we define $\Gamma_n = \pi^* p_n + \rho^* \alpha_n^* + \chi^* \beta_n^*$, and establish that $\sum_n \alpha_n^* = 1$, $\sum_n \beta_n^* = 1$, and $\sum_n p_n^* = (D - \hat{W})$. Then, (19) can be expressed as:

$$\Delta^* = -\min \left[0, -\rho^* - \chi^* \right] \quad (20)$$

Since ρ^* and $\chi^* \geq 0$, the market revenue in (19) results in a deficit $\Delta^* \geq 0$. Hence, the market design requires further allocation among customers [18].

B. Pricing based on the LDT-WCC formulation in eq. (11)

Similarly, we use the KKT conditions for the model in (11) to analyze price formation as detailed in Proposition 2, and the resulting market equilibrium, as described in Theorem 2. To find the first-order conditions of (11), we need to compute the derivatives of (11). This requires considering different regions of Ω and their mean and variance in (10). We use $(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\sigma})$ as a general form for the conditional mean and variance.

$$\begin{aligned} f(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\sigma}) &= g(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\sigma}) \Big|_{\Omega \leq \Omega_\epsilon} + g(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\sigma}) \Big|_{\Omega_\epsilon < \Omega} \\ g(\tilde{\mu}, \tilde{\sigma}) &= \tilde{\mu} \left(1 - \Phi \left(\frac{-\tilde{\mu}}{\tilde{\sigma}} \right) \right) + \frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{-\tilde{\mu}}{\tilde{\sigma}} \right)^2}, \\ \frac{\partial g(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\mu}} &= \left(1 - \Phi \left(\frac{-\tilde{\mu}}{\tilde{\sigma}} \right) \right) + \tilde{\mu} \left(\frac{-1}{\tilde{\sigma}} \phi \left(\frac{-\tilde{\mu}}{\tilde{\sigma}} \right) \right) - \frac{\tilde{\mu}}{\sqrt{2\pi} \tilde{\sigma}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{-\tilde{\mu}}{\tilde{\sigma}} \right)^2} \\ \frac{\partial g(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\sigma}} &= -\frac{\tilde{\mu}^2}{\tilde{\sigma}^2} \phi \left(\frac{-\tilde{\mu}}{\tilde{\sigma}} \right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{-\tilde{\mu}}{\tilde{\sigma}} \right)^2} \left(1 + \frac{\tilde{\mu}^2}{\tilde{\sigma}^2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2. Consider the model in (11). Let π , ρ , and χ be the active power and reserve prices defined as the dual multipliers of the power balance and reserves balance constraints in (11b). Then π , ρ , χ are given by:

$$\pi = \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial p_n} + \nu_n^+ \frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n} \frac{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n}{\partial p_n} \quad (21a)$$

$$\rho = \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial \alpha_n} + \nu_n^+ \frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n} \frac{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n}{\partial \alpha_n} + \nu_n^+ \frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_n} \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_n}{\partial \alpha_n} \quad (21b)$$

$$\chi = \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial \beta_n} + \nu_n^+ \frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n} \frac{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n}{\partial \beta_n} + \nu_n^+ \frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_n} \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_n}{\partial \beta_n}, \quad (21c)$$

Proof. Similarly to LDT-CC, the first-order conditions are:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial p_n} : \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial p_n} + \nu_n^+ \frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n} \frac{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n}{\partial p_n} - \pi = 0 \quad (22a)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \alpha_n} : \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial \alpha_n} - \rho + \nu_n^+ \left(\frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n} \frac{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n}{\partial \alpha_n} + \frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_n} \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_n}{\partial \alpha_n} \right) = 0 \quad (22b)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \beta_n} : \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial \beta_n} - \chi + \nu_n^+ \left(\frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n} \frac{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n}{\partial \beta_n} + \frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_n} \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_n}{\partial \beta_n} \right) = 0, \quad (22c)$$

Then, π , ρ and χ can be expressed directly from (22) ■

Due the structure of the truncated Gaussian distribution of the LDT-WCC, the prices π , ρ and χ depend on $\Phi(\cdot)$ and $\phi(\cdot)$ over $\tilde{\mu}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}$, and cannot be simplified analogously to (8).

Theorem 2. *Equilibrium payments:* Lets $\{p_n^*, \alpha_n^*, \beta_n^*\}$ be the optimal solution of the problem in (11) and let $\{\pi^*, \rho^*, \chi^*\}$ be the dual variables. Then $\{\{p_n^*, \alpha_n^*, \beta_n^* \forall n\}, \pi^*, \rho^*, \chi^*\}$ constitutes a market equilibrium, i.e.:

- The market clears at $\sum p_n^* - \hat{W} = D$, $\sum \alpha_n^* = 1$, and $\sum \beta_n^* = 1$.
- Each producer maximizes its profit under the payment $\Gamma_n = \pi^* p_n^* + \rho^* \alpha_n^* + \chi^* \beta_n^*$.

Proof. If $\{p_n^*, \alpha_n^*, \beta_n^* \forall n\}$ is feasible and solved to optimality, optimal values $\{p_n^*, \alpha_n^*, \beta_n^* \forall n\}$ must satisfy equality constraints from (11). Then, we have: $\sum p_n^* - \hat{W} = D$, $\sum \alpha_n^* = 1$, and $\sum \beta_n^* = 1$. The producer's problem corresponds to:

$$\max_{p, \alpha, \beta} -C_n(p_n, \alpha_n) + l_0 p_n + b_0 \alpha_n + w_0 \beta_n \quad (23a)$$

$$\text{s.t. (11d)}$$

$$\alpha_n, \beta_n, p_n \geq 0 \quad \forall n \quad (23b)$$

Suppose ν_n^+ is a dual variable related to (11d). Then, the KKT stationarity conditions for (23) can be expressed as:

$$l_0 = \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial p_n} + \nu_n^+ \frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n} \frac{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n}{\partial p_n} \quad (24a)$$

$$b_0 = \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial \alpha_n} + \nu_n^+ \left(\frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n} \frac{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n}{\partial \alpha_n} + \frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_n} \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_n}{\partial \alpha_n} \right) \quad (24b)$$

$$w_0 = \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial \beta_n} + \nu_n^+ \left(\frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n} \frac{\partial \tilde{\mu}_n}{\partial \beta_n} + \frac{\partial f(\cdot)}{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_n} \frac{\partial \tilde{\sigma}_n}{\partial \beta_n} \right) \quad (24c)$$

The resulting functions have the same structure as the optimality conditions from (22a)-(22c), where the dual variables (π, ρ, χ) corresponds to (l_0, b_0, w_0) . ■

Similarly, due to the convexity of the producer's problem in (23), using strong duality, Theorem 2 ensures full cost recovery by each producer under a competitive equilibrium. Also, the proposed market design follows the same principles as those in (19), resulting in a revenue inadequate market with a total deficit $\Delta^* = -\min[0, -\rho^* - \chi^*]$.

IV. NETWORK-CONSTRAINED EXTENSION

In this section, we introduce DC power flow constraints into the LDT-CC model in (8) and demonstrate that (i) energy prices take the form of locational marginal prices (LMPs) and (ii) the results of Propositions 1 and Theorem 1 remain valid. The network LDT-CC OPF model is given by:

$$\min_{p, \alpha, \beta, \Omega^*, \lambda^*} \mathbb{E}_\Omega \left[\sum_n C_n(p_n, \alpha_n, \beta_n) \right] \quad (25a)$$

$$\text{s.t. (8b) - (8f), (8i) - (8h)}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (\pi_i) : \quad & \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}_i} p_n + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{L}_i^+} f_{jk} \\ & - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{L}_i^-} f_{jk} = d_i \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I} \quad (25b) \end{aligned}$$

$$(\eta_{jk}^-) : \quad -f_{jk}^{\max} \leq f_{jk} \quad \forall (j, k) \in \mathcal{L} \quad (25c)$$

$$(\eta_{jk}^+): f_{jk} \leq f_{jk}^{\max} \quad \forall (j, k) \in \mathcal{L} \quad (25d)$$

$$(\eta_{jk}^0): B_{jk}(\theta_j - \theta_k) = f_{jk} \quad \forall (j, k) \in \mathcal{L}, \quad (25e)$$

where \mathcal{L}_i^+ and \mathcal{L}_i^- are the sets of lines that are connected from the node i and to the node i , respectively. Eq. (25b) is the power balance constraint that replaces (8g). Eq. (25c) and (25d) define the line power flow limits, and eq. (25e) relates the node angles and line power flow.

Theorem 3. Consider the model in (25). Then (i) energy prices π from Proposition 1 (energy price) become LMPs π_i and (ii) the results of Propositions 1 (reserve prices) and Theorem 1 (market equilibrium) remain valid.

Proof. The KKT stationary conditions of (25) are:

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial p_n}: \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial p_n} + \mu_n^+ + \delta_n^+ - \pi_i = 0 \quad (26a)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \alpha_n}: \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial \alpha_n} - \mu_n^+ \hat{\sigma}_\Omega + \delta_n^+ \hat{\sigma}_n - \rho = 0 \quad (26b)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \beta_n}: \frac{\partial C_n(\cdot)}{\partial \beta_n} - \mu_n^+ (\Omega^* - \hat{\sigma}_n) + \xi_n \lambda_n^* - \chi = 0 \quad (26c)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \theta_j}: B_{jk} \eta_{jk}^0 = 0 \quad (26d)$$

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial f_{jk}}: B_{jk}(\pi_j - \pi_k) + \eta_{jk}^+ - \eta_{jk}^- - \eta_{jk}^0 = 0, \quad (26e)$$

The KKT stationary conditions associated with energy and reserve balances in (26a)-(26c) are analogous to those in (14). Thus, π_i can be obtained directly from (26a), while ρ and χ can be derived from (26b) and (26c), respectively. Consequently, Proposition 1 remains valid for (25). ■

Additionally, our proposed model can be modified to incorporate location specific reserve, i.e. each node $i \in \mathcal{I}'$ with wind generation requires both regular and extreme reserves based on the aggregated nodal wind fluctuations Ω_i :

$$\min_{\Xi} \mathbb{E}_\Omega \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} C_n(p_n, A_n, B_n) \quad (27a)$$

$$\text{s.t. } A_n, B_n, p_n \geq 0, \lambda_n^* > 0 \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (27b)$$

$$(\delta_n^+): p_n - p_n^{\max} + G(A_n) \leq 0 \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (27c)$$

$$(\mu_n^+): p_n + G(A_n - B_n) + B_n \Omega^* = p_n^{\max} \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (27d)$$

$$(\nu): -\Sigma_\Omega^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Omega^* - \Phi^{-1}(1 - \epsilon^{\text{ext}}) \leq 0 \quad (27e)$$

$$(\xi_n): \Sigma_\Omega^{-1} \Omega^* - B_n \lambda_n^* = 0 \quad \forall n \in \mathcal{N} \quad (27f)$$

$$(\eta_{jk}^-): -f_{jk}^{\max} \leq f_{jk} \quad \forall (j, k) \in \mathcal{L} \quad (27g)$$

$$(\eta_{jk}^+): f_{jk} \leq f_{jk}^{\max} \quad \forall (j, k) \in \mathcal{L} \quad (27h)$$

$$(\eta_{jk}^0): B_{jk}(\theta_j - \theta_k) = f_{jk} \quad \forall (j, k) \in \mathcal{L} \quad (27i)$$

$$(\pi_i): \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}_i^+} p_n + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{L}_i^+} f_{jk} - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{L}_i^-} f_{jk} = d_i \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I} \quad (27j)$$

$$(\rho_i): \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} A_{ni} = 1 \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}' \quad (27k)$$

$$(\chi_i): \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} B_{ni} = 1 \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}', \quad (27l)$$

where Ξ is the set of variables $\{p, A, B, \Omega^*, \lambda^*\}$, $\sum_{n' \in \mathcal{W}_i} \hat{w}_{n'} = \hat{W}_i$ and $\sum_{n' \in \mathcal{W}_i} \omega_{n'} = \Omega_i$. Σ_Ω is the covariance matrix with diagonal $\sigma_{(\Omega, i)}^2$. Ω^* is a vector of

dominant points in the set Ω for each node i . For simplicity, we use $G(X_n) = \Phi^{-1}(1 - \epsilon_n) \sqrt{X_n^\top \Sigma_\Omega X_n}$.

The model in (27) extends the formulation in (8) by differentiating both regular and extreme reserves requirements based on the accumulated uncertainty at each node with wind generation. A_n and B_n are matrices representing the participation of the generator n to control wind deviations at i . For clarity, we use $A_n = A_{(n, \cdot)}$ and $B_n = B_{(n, \cdot)}$ to denote the columns of A and B , respectively, where the n -th column refers to generators. Similarly, $A_{(\cdot, i)}$ and $B_{(\cdot, i)}$ represent the i -th row, which corresponds to buses.

V. CASE STUDY

All simulations were carried out in Python using the Gurobi solver [33] and Algorithm 1. The code is available in [34]. Since all our models are convex, all problems were solved with a duality gap $< 0.01\%$.

A. Illustrative example

We consider an illustrative single-node system with three controllable generators and one wind farm (Fig 3). The total demand is 270 MW, while the cost of energy not served is 9000 \$/MWh. The quadratic component of the cost is $C_2^\top = [0.01, 0.05, 0.025]$ \$/MWh², the linear component is $C_1^\top = [10, 35, 50]$ \$/MWh, and the extreme reserve cost is $C_\beta^\top = [700, 300, 600]$ \$. The maximum generation capacities are $(p^{\max})^\top = [75, 160, 120]$ MW. Finally, the wind power forecast is $\hat{W} = 150$ MW, and the forecast error is zero-mean with $\sigma_\Omega = 50$ MW. We set $\epsilon_n = 0.05$ and $\epsilon_n^{\text{ext}} = 5 \times 10^{-5}, \forall n$.




Fig. 3: Illustrative single-node system.

TABLE I: Illustrative example optimal dispatch results

Model	Energy (p) & Reserves (α, β) dispatch			
	Variables	G1	G2	G3
CC	p^* [MW]	75	45	0
	α^* [%]	0	33	67
LDT-WCC	p^* [MW]	75	45	0
	α^* [%]	0	44	56
	β^* [%]	0	100	0
LDT-CC	p^* [MW]	75	45	0
	α^* [%]	0	0	100
	β^* [%]	0	75	25

Table I compares the optimal dispatch for each model in terms of the energy, regular and extreme reserve allocations. All models assign the same energy dispatch but differ in reserve allocations, which are driven by different model conservatism. Recall that the LDT-WCC and LDT-CC models incur an additional cost at the scheduling stage due to the provision of extreme reserves. We note that LDT-WCC allocates slightly more regular reserve to G2 than the CC model, with G2 providing 44% of the regular reserve and 100% of the extreme reserve. In contrast, LDT-CC assigns only 75% of the extreme

reserve to G2, while G3, with a higher production cost, complements this. The less restrictive requirements in LDT-WCC allows for minimizing the cost of reserve provision by allowing G2 to provide more than 40% of the regular and the whole extreme reserve requirement. In contrast, LDT-CC is more restrictive in its reserve constraints, causing both G2 and G3 to provide extreme reserve.

TABLE II: Optimal prices and total system cost

Model	Energy (π) & Reserves (ρ, χ) prices			T. Cost [\$]
	π^* [\$/MW]	ρ^* [\$/%]	χ^* [\$/%]	
CC	39.20	83.33	-	2524.17
LDT-WCC	39.50	109.25	300.00	2826.16
LDT-CC	41.47	125.74	601.37	2919.15

Table II presents energy and reserve prices along with the total system cost. As expected, the total system cost at the scheduling stage increases with model conservatism. Specifically, the cost for the LDT-WCC and LDT-CC models are 12.0% and 15.6% higher than the CC benchmark, respectively. The differences between the energy dispatch and reserve allocation in Table I are reflected in the prices in Table II. Compared to the CC model, the energy price increases slightly for LDT-WCC and LDT-CC by 0.7% and 5.6%, while the regular reserve price increases by 31.1% and 50.8%, respectively.

B. ISO New England case study

Figure 4 shows the 8-zone ISO New England system used in this study with the data from [35]. The wind power forecast is $\hat{W} = 3600$ MW, and the forecast error is zero-mean with $\sigma_\Omega = 1100$ MW. We set $\epsilon_n = 0.05$ and $\epsilon_n^{\text{ext}} = 5 \times 10^{-5}, \forall n$.




Fig. 4: 8-zones ISO New England system [35]

Figure 5 summarizes the optimal dispatch for all three models in terms of energy, regular and extreme reserve allocated to generators in each zone. We observe that the energy dispatch remains consistent across all three models. The zones allocated to provide regular and extreme reserve are the same, but the allocations differ based on how the model addresses the burden of coping with extreme events. For instance, compared to CC, LDT-WCC increases the regular reserve allocation in ME, while LDT-CC increases it in RI. However, the allocation of extreme reserve remains unchanged. LDT-CC diversifies the reserve provision by assigning more than 75% to three different zones, whereas LDT-WCC allocates this reserve only in ME, leveraging cheaper generators.




Fig. 5: Energy dispatch, regular and extreme reserve comparison

Table III compares the energy and reserve prices. All three formulations yield the same energy prices, matching the dispatch outcomes in Fig. 5a. LDT-WCC increases the regular reserve price by 11% relative to CC, while LDT-CC raises the regular reserve price by 48%. Compared to LDT-WCC, LDT-CC results in an 800% increase in the extreme reserve price. Table IV summarizes the optimal revenues, total costs, and profits obtained for the outcomes detailed in Table III and Fig. 5. We observe that the difference between LDT-WCC and LDT-CC is reflected in the total cost in ME, but not in other zones. This difference also results in a higher total profit for all zones, attributed to the increase in energy and reserve prices in the more conservative models.

TABLE III: Optimal dual results π^* [\$/MW], ρ^* & χ^* [\$/%]

	Price	CC	LDT-WCC	LDT-CC
Energy	π_{CT}^*	58.23	58.26	58.33
	π_{ME}^*	135.96	136.01	136.05
	$\pi_{NEMASSB}^*$	162.62	162.66	162.68
	π_{NH}^*	135.96	136.01	136.05
	π_{RI}^*	33.01	33.08	33.20
	π_{SEMAsS}^*	259.89	259.92	259.85
	π_{VT}^*	123.65	123.72	123.76
	π_{WCMAsS}^*	105.20	105.27	105.32
Regular Reserve	ρ^*	713.93	792.65	1056.58
Extreme Reserve	χ^*	-	131.34	1182.41

TABLE IV: Optimal daily revenue, cost and profit (in \$)

Model	Value	Zones							
		CT	ME	NEMASSB	NH	RI	SEMAsS	VT	WCMAsS
CC	Revenue	113822	231180	0	212810	57849	538071	53683	30019
	Cost	79641	32280	0	47055	41939	229079	5291	9084
	Profit	34181	198900	0	165764	15910	308991	48389	20935
LDT-WCC	Revenue	113914	231433	0	212909	57982	538127	53710	30047
	Cost	79671	32414	0	47055	41960	229080	5294	9099
	Profit	34243	199019	0	165854	16022	309047	48416	20948
LDT-CC	Revenue	114612	231788	0	212962	58614	537990	53728	30184
	Cost	79837	32302	0	47055	42075	229079	5294	9105
	Profit	34776	199485	0	165907	16539	308910	48435	21079

To assess adaptability of the market outcomes under each formulation, we compare the cost performance across 3000

wind scenarios in Fig. 6. The blue bar represents the total cost of the scheduled operation, while the orange bar represents the average total cost of the 3000 out-sample scenarios. The red line indicates the standard deviation. We can observe that CC has the highest expected cost (2.30 million \$) with a standard deviation of 1.72 million \$. This high cost is because CC is incomplete relative extreme deviations, which results in insufficient reserve procurement and, consequently, unserved energy. In comparison to CC, LDT-WCC and LDT-CC have expected costs that are 47% and 26% lower with standard deviation of 0.43 and 0.83 million \$, respectively. Thus, LDT-WCC and LDT-CC reduce the exposure to extreme event realizations more effectively than the CC benchmark.




Fig. 6: Expected and standard deviation cost performance for the 3000 scenarios in the ISO New England system

VI. CONCLUSION

This paper introduces LDT-CC to internalize the uncertainty of rare and extreme events into wholesale electricity markets. Additionally, we introduce the LDT-WCC as an anticipatory preparedness model for extreme events, which integrates extreme event statistics via the LDT-CC model and uses WCC to reduce conservatism. We demonstrate that the resulting market outcomes constitute a competitive equilibrium and offer a reliable and computationally tractable framework to efficiently manage the uncertainties associated with extreme events. Future work will focus on extending the proposed pricing theory to multi-period and security-constrained market-clearing tools, as well as analyzing multi-period cost recovery and revenue adequacy properties. This could involve, for example, developing mixed-integer second-order conic or copositive programs that would require additional approximation methods to solve. Parallel work will include correlation analysis between different locations of uncertainty sources and the development of market designs ensuring a competitive equilibrium.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Panteli and P. Mancarella, "Influence of extreme weather and climate change on the resilience of power systems: Impacts and possible mitigation strategies," *Ele. Pow. Syst. Res.*, vol. 127, pp. 259–270, 2015.
- [2] N. FERC and R. E. Staff, "The february 2021 cold weather outages in texas and the south central united states," *FERC and NERC and Regional Entity Staff, Tech. Rep.*, 2021.
- [3] T. Levin *et al.*, "Extreme weather and electricity markets: Key lessons from the february 2021 texas crisis," *Joule*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1–7, 2022.
- [4] Texas Legislature, "Senate bill 3," 2021. 87th Texas Legislature.
- [5] U.S. Energy Information Administration, "Short-term energy outlook supplement: Sources," tech. rep., U.S. EIA, 2021.
- [6] J. Mays *et al.*, "Private risk and social resilience in liberalized electricity markets," *Joule*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 369–380, 2022.
- [7] C. Avraam, L. Ceferino, and Y. Dvorkin, "Operational and economy-wide impacts of compound cyber-attacks and extreme weather events on electric power networks," *Applied Energy*, vol. 349, p. 121577, 2023.
- [8] L. Roald *et al.*, "Power systems optimization under uncertainty: A review of methods and applications," *Elect. Power Syst. Res.*, vol. 214, p. 108725, 2023.
- [9] A. Papavasiliou, S. S. Oren, and R. P. O'Neill, "Reserve requirements for wind power integration: A scenario-based stochastic programming framework," *IEEE Trans. Pwr Syst.*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 2197–2206, 2011.
- [10] A. Lorca and X. A. Sun, "Adaptive robust optimization with dynamic uncertainty sets for multi-period economic dispatch under significant wind," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 1702–1713, 2014.
- [11] D. Bienstock, M. Chertkov, and S. Harnett, "Chance-constrained optimal power flow: Risk-aware network control under uncertainty," *Siam Review*, vol. 56, no. 3, pp. 461–495, 2014.
- [12] B. F. Hobbs and S. S. Oren, "Three waves of us reforms: Following the path of wholesale electricity market restructuring," *IEEE Power and Energy Magazine*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 73–81, 2019.
- [13] A. Papavasiliou, S. S. Oren, and B. Rountree, "Applying high performance computing to transmission-constrained stochastic unit commitment for renewable energy integration," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 1109–1120, 2014.
- [14] A. Papavasiliou and S. S. Oren, "Multiarea stochastic unit commitment for high wind penetration in a transmission constrained network," *Operations research*, vol. 61, no. 3, pp. 578–592, 2013.
- [15] S. Tong, A. Subramanyam, and V. Rao, "Optimization under rare chance constraints," *SIAM J. Opt.*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 930–958, 2022.
- [16] M. Lubin, Y. Dvorkin, and S. Backhaus, "A robust approach to chance constrained optimal power flow with renewable generation," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 3840–3849, 2015.
- [17] W. Xie and S. Ahmed, "Distributionally robust chance constrained optimal power flow with renewables: A conic reformulation," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 1860–1867, 2017.
- [18] Y. Dvorkin, "A chance-constrained stochastic electricity market," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 2993–3003, 2019.
- [19] X. Kuang *et al.*, "Pricing chance constraints in electricity markets," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 4634–4636, 2018.
- [20] X. Fang *et al.*, "Introducing uncertainty components in locational marginal prices for pricing wind power and load uncertainties," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 2013–2024, 2019.
- [21] R. Mieth, J. Kim, and Y. Dvorkin, "Risk-and variance-aware electricity pricing," *Elect. Power Syst. Res.*, vol. 189, p. 106804, 2020.
- [22] L. Werner *et al.*, "Pricing uncertainty in stochastic multi-stage electricity markets," in *2023 62nd IEEE Conf. Dec. Cont.*, pp. 1580–1587, 2023.
- [23] Z. Liang, R. Mieth, and Y. Dvorkin, "Inertia pricing in stochastic electricity markets," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 38, no. 3, pp. 2071–2084, 2022.
- [24] L. Roald *et al.*, "Optimal power flow with weighted chance constraints and general policies for generation control," in *2015 54th IEEE Conf. Dec. Cont.*, pp. 6927–6933, IEEE, 2015.
- [25] Á. Porras, L. Roald, J. M. Morales, and S. Pineda, "Integrating automatic and manual reserves in optimal power flow via chance constraints," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.05412*, 2023.
- [26] N. Jiang and W. Xie, "Also-x and also-x+: Better convex approximations for chance constrained programs," *Operations Research*, vol. 70, no. 6, pp. 3581–3600, 2022.
- [27] G. A. Hanasusanto, V. Roitch, D. Kuhn, and W. Wiesemann, "Ambiguous joint chance constraints under mean and dispersion information," *Operations Research*, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 751–767, 2017.
- [28] A. Nemirovski and A. Shapiro, "Convex approximations of chance constrained programs," *SIAM J. Opt.*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 969–996, 2007.
- [29] S. Ahmed and W. Xie, "Relaxations and approximations of chance constraints under finite distributions," *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 170, pp. 43–65, 2018.
- [30] S. Tong, E. Vanden-Eijnden, and G. Stadler, "Extreme event probability estimation using pde-constrained optimization and large deviation theory, with application to tsunamis," *Communications in Applied Mathematics and Computational Science*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 181–225, 2021.
- [31] G. Dematteis, T. Grafke, and E. Vanden-Eijnden, "Extreme event quantification in dynamical systems with random components," *SIAM/ASA J. on Uncertainty Quantification*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 1029–1059, 2019.
- [32] A. Dembo, *Large deviations techniques and applications*. Springer, 2009.
- [33] Gurobi Optimization, LLC, *Gurobi Optimizer Reference Manual*, 2022. Online; accessed 2024-06-25.
- [34] "Code Supplement." <https://github.com/tftapia/ChanceConstraints.git>, 2024. Online; accessed 29 July 2024.
- [35] D. Krishnamurthy, W. Li, and L. Tesfatsion, "An 8-zone test system based on iso new england data: Development and application," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 234–246, 2016.