

# Gaussian process surrogate model to approximate power grid simulators - An application to the certification of a congestion management controller

1<sup>st</sup> Pierre HOUDOUIN

*RTE*

PARIS, FRANCE

pierre.houdouin@centralesupelec.fr

2<sup>nd</sup> Manuel RUIZ

*RTE*

PARIS, FRANCE

manuel.ruiz@rte-france.com

3<sup>rd</sup> Lucas SALUDJIAN

*RTE*

PARIS, FRANCE

lucas.saludjian@rte-france.com

**Abstract**—With the digitalization of power grids, physical equations become insufficient to describe the network’s behavior, and realistic but time-consuming simulators must be used. Numerical experiments, such as safety validation, that involve simulating a large number of scenarios become computationally intractable. A popular solution to reduce the computational burden is to learn a surrogate model of the simulator with Machine Learning (ML) and then conduct the experiment directly on the fast-to-evaluate surrogate model. Among the various ML possibilities for building surrogate models, Gaussian processes (GPs) emerged as a popular solution due to their flexibility, data efficiency, and interpretability. Their probabilistic nature enables them to provide both predictions and uncertainty quantification (UQ). This paper starts with a discussion on the interest of using GPs to approximate power grid simulators and fasten numerical experiments. Such simulators, however, often violate the GP’s underlying Gaussian assumption, leading to poor approximations. To address this limitation, an approach that consists in adding an adaptive residual uncertainty term to the UQ is proposed. It enables the GP to remain accurate and reliable despite the simulator’s non-Gaussian behaviors. This approach is successfully applied to the certification of the proper functioning of a congestion management controller, with over 98% of simulations avoided.

**Index Terms**—Gaussian processes, Surrogate model, Certification, Congestion management

## I. INTRODUCTION

The energy transition complicates congestion management. With the large-scale integration of renewable energy sources (RES), production patterns evolve, becoming more variable and unpredictable. This poses operational challenges [1] for TSO as the lines’ power flows can no longer be anticipated as before. Congestion management must now be performed as close to real-time as possible, driving the need for automation.

To overcome this challenge and automate congestion management, RTE developed the NAZA controllers [2], [3], [4]. NAZA are zonal controllers that automatically take close-to-real-time actions to prevent congestion. An MPC algorithm integrated into each controller runs every 15 seconds to determine the actions to perform. It includes limiting RES production, managing batteries, and performing zonal topological modification. As the controllers are gradually deployed in the French transmission network, RTE aims to ensure that the

MPC does not threaten the grid’s safety and effectively avoids congestion.

A way to certify the MPC’s proper functioning consists in computing its failure probability [5]. In this case, it comes down to estimating the proportion of scenarios where congestion occurs despite the scenario being considered manageable for the MPC. To determine whether a scenario induced congestion or not, power grid simulators that include the MPC’s actions can be used. A naive solution to achieve the certification is then to randomly draw manageable scenarios, determine their outcome with the simulator, and estimate the failure probability when enough simulations have been performed. The problem, however, is that a simulation can last minutes, and there are potentially millions of scenarios to test. Such a brute-force approach is thus computationally intractable in practice.

A popular method in the literature to reduce the computational cost of experiments involving time-consuming simulators is to learn a surrogate model, an approximation, of this simulator with machine learning (ML) [6], [7], [8], [9], [10]. The experiment can then be conducted directly on the fast-to-evaluate surrogate model, leading to a huge time gain. However, if the model is inaccurate, trusting its prediction could considerably hinder the experiment’s results. To avoid this, an uncertainty-aware surrogate model that is able to assess its confidence is trained. The surrogate model replaces the simulator only when it exhibits enough confidence about its prediction, reducing the risk of trusting a flawed model.

Many approaches exist to build uncertainty-aware machine learning models. Standard ML models can be combined with model-free uncertainty quantification (UQ) techniques such as conformal predictions [11]. Another possibility is to adapt existing prediction models to enable them to quantify uncertainty, such as quantile regression [12]. A third increasingly popular option is to use Gaussian processes [13] (GPs). GPs are based on a statistical framework that provides a full probability distribution over the possible outcomes, enabling both prediction and UQ. GPs are also **flexible**, **data-efficient**, and **interpretable** ML models. They are increasingly used in

many industrial fields to approximate computationally intensive simulators.

This work is the prolongation of [14], where GPs were already successfully leveraged to estimate a failure probability with a fictitious simulator. In this paper, a more realistic version is considered with non-linear behaviors to replicate the MPC’s actions. These non-linearities violate the underlying GPs’ Gaussian assumption and are not properly captured by a vanilla GP. A new approach leverages the add-on of an adaptive residual uncertainty term to the Gaussian posterior to preserve the GP’s reliability despite the non-Gaussian behaviors. The paper is structured as follows:

- Section II contains the first contribution: a discussion on why GPs are well-suited to build uncertainty-aware surrogate models and details regarding their use to fasten the certification.
- Section III presents the second contribution: the new approach with the adaptive residual uncertainty to better deal with non-Gaussian behaviors.
- Section IV provides experimental results of the certification workflow tested on a real zone of the French power grid.
- Conclusions and perspectives are drawn in section V.

## II. GAUSSIAN PROCESSES, A POPULAR APPROACH FOR BUILDING SURROGATE MODELS

### A. Machine-learning techniques to build an accuracy-aware surrogate model

Learning a surrogate model to approximate complex simulators is a popular technique to accelerate numerical experiments. In many applications, however, trusting a flawed model can have severe consequences. To prevent this, a solution is to learn an uncertainty-aware surrogate model that is able to assess its own confidence. The simulator can then be replaced only when the model is sufficiently confident about its prediction, reducing the risk of trusting an inaccurate model. For this reason, uncertainty quantification has become a golden standard in many industrial applications. It can be achieved in several ways.

A first approach consists in combining standard ML algorithms with model-free UQ techniques. Standard ML algorithms already used in the literature to build surrogate models include gradient boosting methods, polynomial chaos expansion, random forest, response surface methods, and polynomial splines. It can be plugged with model-free UQ techniques such as Monte Carlo, conformal predictions, and various ensemble methods (Bootstrap prediction intervals, infinitesimal Jackknife, and Out-Of-Bag errors). This first approach offers great flexibility in the surrogate model selection, and UQ methods rely on mild assumptions that are often respected. The main drawback of these model-free UQ techniques is that they tend to produce overly large confidence intervals with small datasets. They also have a high computational cost, making them poorly suited to building fast-to-evaluate uncertainty-aware surrogate models.

A second possible approach consists in adapting existing prediction models to enable them to quantify uncertainty. For example, quantile regression (QR) methods modify the loss function so that the machine learning model predicts a specific quantile of the expected output. Predicting the median, the 5%, and the 95% quantiles allows obtaining a prediction and the associated 90% confidence interval. Other works also propose to combine the predictive power of artificial neural networks (ANN) with deep-learning-specific UQ techniques, such as the delta method, the mean-variance estimation, the lower upper bound estimation, and quality-driven ensemble methods. There are two drawbacks to this second approach. First, for both QR and ANN, a lot of data is required to train the models effectively. Second, the obtained surrogate model is black-box, which is undesirable for safety-critical applications such as ensuring power grid security.

A third increasingly adopted solution to build accuracy-aware surrogate models is Gaussian processes. Instead of a simple prediction, GPs provide a full posterior Gaussian distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\mu_*, \sigma_*^2)$  of the outcome, which is much more informative. The posterior mean  $\mu_*$  constitutes the prediction, and the posterior standard deviation  $\sigma_*$  is used for UQ. Many reasons explain the growing popularity of GPs.

- **GPs are flexible non-parametric models.** Many machine learning models are parametric. They learn an approximation  $\tilde{f}$  that belongs to a parametric set of functions  $\{\tilde{f}_\theta, \theta \in \Theta\}$  (polynomial regressors, neural networks...). The hyperparameters  $\theta$  are optimized with the train data that no longer contribute to the model afterward. All the exploited information is compressed into  $\theta$ . Unlike these models, the GP does not assume a fixed number of parameters to approximate the function. Instead, it automatically adapts the model’s complexity to the dataset size, which is very flexible.
- **GPs provide both prediction and UQ.** Instead of looking for one prediction that best fits the data, the GP assumes that many approximations could plausibly model the data. The GP then assigns to each approximation a probability of actually representing the true function. The most probable approximation constitutes the GP prediction; the other likely ones contribute to UQ. In practice, when asked to predict the outcome of a new scenario  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{new}}$ , the GP returns a posterior Gaussian distribution  $y_{\text{new}} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_*, \sigma_*^2)$  that depends on  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{new}}$ . A  $1 - \alpha$  confidence interval is derived using the posterior standard deviation  $\sigma_*$  and the  $1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}$  Gaussian quantile.

$$\mathcal{I}_{1-\alpha} = [\mu_* - q_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \sigma_*, \mu_* + q_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \sigma_*]$$

- **GPs are data efficient.** GPs can provide accurate predictions and narrow confidence intervals with very few samples. They rely on the intuition that close inputs have close outputs. If  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{new}}$  is close enough to previously simulated scenarios, confident predictions can be obtained even though the dataset is small.

- **GPs are not black-box**, predictions and UQ are interpretable. Given  $N$  simulated scenarios  $(\mathbf{x}_1, y_1), \dots, (\mathbf{x}_N, y_N)$  and a new scenario  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{new}}$ :

- The GP prediction  $\mu_* = \sum_{n=1}^N w_n y_n$  is obtained with a weighted linear combination of the observed outputs. The factor  $w_n$  depends on  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{new}}$ . It reflects how correlated  $\mathbf{x}_n$  is with  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{new}}$  and the propensity of  $\mathbf{x}_n$  to provide unique information regarding the rest of the dataset.
- The uncertainty  $\sigma_*^2 = \sigma_{\text{prior}}^2 - \sigma_{\text{reduction}}^2$  is the difference of the prior uncertainty with a variance reduction term. The more  $\mathbf{x}_n$  highly correlated with  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{new}}$  there are, the higher the variance reduction is. Intuitively, this reflects that when there is a lot of observed data close to the new input, the function's behavior is well-characterized, and the uncertainty around the prediction is small.

### B. Gaussian processes: a practical perspective

Intuitively, many scenarios do not require a simulation. For example, RES will not create congestion if there is no wind and no sun. The goal of the Gaussian process surrogate model is to replace the simulator for scenarios with obvious outcomes to avoid some simulations and save time. Rather than directly predicting the presence or absence of congestion, the GP predicts the maximum relative charge  $y$  observed on the lines of the zone. If  $y > 1$ , a line is overloaded, and congestion has occurred. If  $y < 1$ , all the lines are safe, and no congestion has occurred. Predicting the maximum relative charge enables transforming a classification problem into a smoother regression problem better handled by a GP. At each workflow iteration, the GP leverages the previous simulations to return the posterior distribution  $y_{\text{new}} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_*, \sigma_*^2)$  of the maximum relative charge induced by the new scenario  $\mathbf{x}_{\text{new}}$ . According to the GP, the probability for the scenario to create a congestion is  $p_{\text{congestion}} = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 - \text{erf} \left( \frac{1 - \mu_*}{\sqrt{2}\sigma_*} \right) \right]$ ,  $\text{erf}$  being the error function. The prediction is kept if the GP is sufficiently confident about the presence or absence of congestion, which means that  $p_{\text{congestion}}$  is close enough to 0 or 1. This is assessed by comparing the congestion probability to a user-defined confidence threshold  $\beta$ .

- If  $p_{\text{congestion}} < \beta$ , the GP confidently predicts the absence of congestion, the prediction is kept, and a simulation is avoided.
- If  $p_{\text{congestion}} > 1 - \beta$ , the GP confidently predicts the presence of congestion, the prediction is kept, and a simulation is avoided.
- If  $\beta < p_{\text{congestion}} < 1 - \beta$ , the GP is not confident enough about the scenario's outcome. The simulation is performed, and the new sample improves the GP for future iterations.

The simulation is avoided for scenarios that are not supposed to provide additional useful information for the failure probability estimation. In practice, the GP replaces the simu-

lator when  $\left| \frac{1 - \mu_*}{\sigma_*} \right| > \sqrt{2} \text{erf}^{-1}(1 - 2\beta)$ . This happens in two types of situations:

- The predicted maximum relative charge  $\mu_*$  is far from 1, the congestion threshold. According to the GP, the scenario is either very likely or very unlikely to create congestion. This is the case of a scenario with no wind, for example.
- The posterior standard deviation  $\sigma_*$  is very small. This means that although  $\mu_*$  is close to the congestion threshold, there are enough simulated scenarios nearby for the GP to be sufficiently confident about the outcome.

The success of this surrogate-model-based approach hinges on two key elements. First is the GP's ability to accurately approximate the simulator's behavior and provide reliable predictions. Second, the GP must learn fast to avoid enough simulations and ensure an efficient certification.

Realistic power grid simulators, however, do not always respect the underlying GP's Gaussian assumption, which can hinder the GP's accuracy. An adaptation of the standard GP model to preserve a reliable UQ is proposed in the next part.

### III. ADAPTIVE RESIDUAL UNCERTAINTY TO DEAL WITH NON-GAUSSIAN BEHAVIORS

To illustrate the second contribution of this paper and for the experiments, a fictitious power grid simulator using the load flow equations is implemented. In this section, a simple zone with a single line and a single RES production unit is considered.

- Given the production  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  and the Power Transfer Distribution Factor  $m \in \mathbb{R}$ , the line's power flow  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  is determined by the linear relationship :  $y = m \times x$ .
- A  $\min$  function is then introduced to model the MPC production limitation order. Production is limited to ensure that the power flow remains below a user-defined threshold  $F_{\text{max}}$ :  $y = m \times \min(x, F_{\text{max}}/m)$ .

The simulator's function is plotted in Fig. 1. Although simple and univariate, it is the type of non-linear behavior expected with a realistic power grid simulator when the MPC limits RES production.




Fig. 1: Simulator's function

### A. Limitations of the vanilla GP

Mathematically, a GP is a random function whose realizations are called trajectories. These trajectories have Gaussian behavior: they are smooth and oscillate around the same mean value  $\mu_0$  with similar variation speeds  $\rho$ . An example of five random GP trajectories is plotted in Fig. 2.




Fig. 2: GP trajectories with  $\mu_0 = 1$  and  $\rho = 4$

To build an approximation, the GP interpolates the observed points and then fills the gaps by inferring the most likely Gaussian behavior. The Gaussian behavior inference contributes all the more to the prediction as few observations are available, which grants the GP its data efficiency.




Fig. 3: GP approximation of the simulator's function after 3 simulations

In this use case, the power grid simulator exhibits a non-linearity with a breakpoint at  $x = F_{\max}/m$ . Such non-linearity is however not a Gaussian behavior, which is why the GP produces an inaccurate prediction near the breakpoint, as illustrated in Fig. 3. When more samples are available, the GP gives more importance to the data, and the prior Gaussian assumption becomes less predominant, leading to a better prediction. Fig. 4 highlights the GP's behavior near the breakpoint when more scenarios are simulated.

A way to circumvent the non-Gaussian behavior is to ensure that enough scenarios are simulated close to the breakpoint. This is unfortunately not guaranteed by the workflow. If the first few simulated scenarios happen to be all on the same side of the breakpoint, a GP overconfidence problem arises and prevents any other simulations from being performed. If the first simulations do not reveal the non-linearity, the GP generalizes a fully linear behavior, cf. Fig. 5, for every possible scenario, and with enough confidence to replace the simulator. For all subsequent iterations, no other simulations are thus




Fig. 4: GP approximation of the simulator's function after 4 simulations near the breakpoint

performed. For all scenarios  $x \geq 1$ , the GP confidently but inaccurately predicts congestion, ignoring the RES production limitation orders of the MPC. A wrong failure probability is thus estimated, leading to an erroneous certification. To avoid such undesirable results, the non-linearity induced by the MPC actions must be discovered.





Fig. 5: Undesirable GP's fully linear generalization

### B. Adaptive residual uncertainty


To ensure the non-linearity discovery, a first solution could be to randomly simulate scenarios, even if the GP is sufficiently confident about the outcome. At some point, scenarios near the breakpoint will be simulated, revealing the non-linearity. The only downside is that most randomly performed simulations will be useless. For most scenarios, indeed, the absence of congestion can be accurately predicted simply because there is not enough RES production to overload the lines, regardless of the non-linearity discovery. Enforcing the simulation of these harmless scenarios is a waste of time.

Another idea to enforce interesting simulations is to reduce the GP's confidence so that it replaces the simulator less often. This can be achieved by increasing the posterior uncertainty  $\sigma_*$  by a residual uncertainty term  $\sigma_{ru}$  and obtain the posterior distribution  $\mathcal{N}(\mu_*, \sigma_* + \sigma_{ru})$ . The new GP predictions are plotted in Fig. 6. For harmless scenarios far away from overloading the lines, the GP has a strong enough certainty about the outcome to remain sufficiently confident to replace the simulator despite the uncertainty increase. For scenarios close to the breakpoint, the GP is no longer confident enough, and the simulation is

performed. Adding this residual uncertainty term thus enforces only useful simulations near the breakpoint and enables the GP to remain reliable despite the non-linearity.



(a) GP prediction after 3 simulations



(b) GP prediction after 4 simulations


Fig. 6: GP prediction with the residual uncertainty

However, this early advantage for the GP is also an asymptotic drawback for the workflow. The residual uncertainty creates a region close to the breakpoint where the GP cannot be confident enough to replace the simulator. It corresponds to all predictions where  $|1 - \mu_*| < \sqrt{2}\sigma_{ru} \operatorname{erf}^{-1}(1 - 2\beta)$ , which represents in the example above around 27% of the simulations that cannot be avoided. A possibility to preserve the workflow's asymptotical performances is to adapt the residual uncertainty with the workflow's progress. The idea is to add a large residual uncertainty at the beginning of the workflow to discover the non-Gaussian behaviors and then gradually decrease it when they have been properly characterized. The goal is to end up with no residual uncertainty so that the GP can asymptotically avoid all simulations. In the first version of this paper, we start with a simple exponential decrease strategy:  $\sigma_{ru}(n) = \frac{\sigma_{ru}^0}{\alpha^n}$ . Hyperparameters  $\sigma_{ru}^0$  and  $\alpha$  are crucial as they directly control the trade-off between GP discovery and workflow asymptotical efficiency. More complex adaptive residual uncertainty strategies are currently developed to sidestep such critical hyperparameter choices.


#### IV. COMPUTATIONAL RESULTS

In the first version of this paper, only limited computational results are presented. The goal for the final version is to apply the proposed method to certify the proper functioning of the MPC on a real zone of the french transmission grid. For now, we keep the simple 1D example with one production unit and


one line presented in section III. The workflow terminates after 2000 iterations, and the goal is to properly estimate the congestion probability with minimal amount of simulations. Since  $F_{\max}$  is set to 0.99 for all scenarios, the MPC always successfully limits the production. No congestion can occur, and  $p_{\text{congestion}}$  is thus equal to 0. We obtain the following certification results.



(a) Congestion probability estimation



(b) Percentage of performed simulations during the workflow



(c) Real max charge vs GP prediction

Fig. 7: Certification results

We can see on Fig 7.a that the congestion probability is

accurately estimated, and the certification is successful. It is estimated with only 36 simulations, which represents a 98.2% (Fig 7.b) reduction in the number of simulations compared to the brute-force workflow. Finally, Fig 7.c shows the GP prediction along with the associated 95% confidence interval as a function of the real max charge. The gray confidence intervals almost always contain the ground truth (the green line  $y = x$ ), which indicates that the GP is reliable. The adaptive residual uncertainty thus enables the GP to effectively learn the non-linearity without degrading asymptotic workflow performances.

## V. CONCLUSIONS AND PERSPECTIVES

This paper aims to certify the proper functioning of an MPC algorithm responsible for managing power grid congestion. The certification is achieved by testing the ability of the MPC to properly manage congestion in various scenarios. If all scenarios are simulated with a realistic, and thus computationally intensive, simulator, the workflow cannot terminate in a reasonable amount of time. A surrogate model of the simulator is thus learned in parallel with the certification to avoid some simulations and speed up the workflow.

Among the various ML models commonly used to build the surrogate model, GPs are a very popular choice. GPs are flexible, data-efficient, and interpretable ML models that jointly provide prediction and uncertainty quantification. Uncertainty quantification enables using the surrogate model only when it is confident enough about the outcome, and limits the chance of trusting a flawed model. GPs, however, fail to learn non-smooth behaviors, such as those exhibited by the network simulator. To preserve the reliability of the surrogate model, a new approach is proposed in which a residual uncertainty is added to the posterior distribution to account for potential non-Gaussian behaviors. The residual uncertainty enforces more simulations in the early stage of the workflow, which provides enough data to the GP to accurately and reliably characterize the non-linear behavior of the simulator. The residual uncertainty is then gradually decreased to allow the GP to reach sufficient confidence to replace the simulator for every possible scenario. The proposed approach is tested on a real zone of the French transmission grid with a simple network simulator. It accurately and reliably approximates the simulator after a few tens of iterations and enables the avoidance of all the simulations asymptotically, achieving the goal of considerably accelerating the certification workflow.

Ensuring a reliable uncertainty quantification despite non-Gaussian behaviors is a challenge in the GP literature. The chosen approach aims to add a constantly decreasing variance term to enlarge the confidence intervals and afford some irregularities in the function's behavior. More complex works look to overcome this limitation by mixing GPs with model-free UQ techniques such as conformal predictions [15]. It is another possibility to explore to enable more reliable confidence intervals.

## REFERENCES

- [1] B. Meyer et al., "Power Transmission Technologies and Solutions: The Latest Advances at RTE, the French Transmission System Operator" in *IEEE Power and Energy Magazine*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 43-52, March-April 2020.
- [2] T. Hoang, S. Oлару, A. Iovine, J. Maeght, P. Panciatici and M. Ruiz, "Power Congestion Management of a sub-Transmission Area Power Network using Partial Renewable Power Curtailment via MPC" 60th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC), Austin, TX, USA, 2021, pp. 6351-6358.
- [3] T. Hoang, S. Oлару, A. Iovine, J. Maeght, P. Panciatici and M. Ruiz, "Predictive Control for Zonal Congestion Management of a Transmission Network" 29th Mediterranean Conference on Control and Automation (MED), PUGLIA, Italy, 2021, pp. 220-225.
- [4] C. Straub, S. Oлару, J. Maeght and P. Panciatici, "Zonal Congestion Management Mixing Large Battery Storage Systems and Generation Curtailment" 2018 IEEE Conference on Control Technology and Applications (CCTA), Copenhagen, Denmark, 2018, pp. 988-995.
- [5] Robert J. Moss, Mykel J. Kochenderfer, Maxime Gariel and Arthur Dubois, "Bayesian Safety Validation for Failure Probability Estimation of Black-Box Systems" in *Journal of Aerospace Information Systems*, vol. 21, 2024
- [6] Bertrand Iooss and Amandine Marrel, "Advanced methodology for uncertainty propagation in computer experiments with large number of inputs" *Nuclear Technology*, 205(12), 1588–1606, 2018
- [7] Amandine Marrel, Bertrand Iooss, Francois Van Dorpe and Elena Volkova, "An efficient methodology for modeling complex computer codes with Gaussian processes" *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, vol. 52, 2008
- [8] Bertrand Iooss and Amandine Marrel, "Probabilistic surrogate modeling by Gaussian process: A review on recent insights in estimation and validation" *Reliability Engineering & System Safety*, vol.247, 2024
- [9] Leonardo S. Bastos and Anthony O'Hagan, "Diagnostics for Gaussian Process Emulators", *Technometrics*, vol. 51, 2009
- [10] Carvalho TM, van Rosmalen J, Wolff HB, Koffijberg H, Coupé VMH, "Choosing a Metamodel of a Simulation Model for Uncertainty Quantification", *Medicis making*, 2022
- [11] Glenn Shafer, Vladimir Vovk, "A Tutorial on Conformal Predictions", *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, Vol. 9, 2008
- [12] Koenker, Roger, "Quantile Regression: 40 Years On", *Annual Review of Economics*, Vol. 9, 2017
- [13] Carl Edward Rasmussen, "Gaussian Processes in Machine Learning", Springer, 2004
- [14] Pierre Houdouin, Manuel Ruiz, Lucas Saludjian and Patrick Panciatici, "Certification of MPC-based zonal controller security properties using accuracy-aware machine learning proxies", *Electric Power Systems Research*, 2024
- [15] Edgar Jaber, Vincent Blot, Nicolas Brunel, Vincent Chabridon, Emmanuel Remy, Bertrand Iooss, Didier Lucor, Mathilde Mougeot and Alessandro Leite, "Conformal Approach To Gaussian Process Surrogate Evaluation With Coverage Guarantees", arXiv, 2024