

# Deep Learning for Energy Market Contracts: Dynkin Game with Doubly RBSDEs

Nacira Agram <sup>1</sup>, Ihsan Arharas <sup>2</sup>, Giulia Pucci <sup>1</sup> and Jan Rems <sup>3</sup>

March 4, 2025

## Abstract

This paper examines a Contract for Difference (CfD) with early exit options, a widely used risk management instrument in electricity markets. The contract involves a producer and a regulatory entity, both of whom can strategically exit based on evolving market conditions. The problem is formulated as a two-player Dynkin game, where electricity prices follow a mean-reverting stochastic process, and contract terminations incur penalties. The strategic interaction is modeled using Doubly Reflected Backward Stochastic Differential Equations (DRBSDEs), which characterize the fair value of the contract and optimal exit strategies. To solve the DRBSDEs, we develop a deep learning-based numerical method, leveraging neural networks for efficient approximation. The results provide insights into the role of exit penalties, price volatility, and market dynamics in optimizing CfD agreements, offering practical implications for policymakers and market participants.

**Keywords:** Deep learning, Doubly reflected doubly BSDEs; Contract for difference; Dynkin game

---

<sup>1</sup>Department of Mathematics, KTH Royal Institute of Technology 100 44, Stockholm, Sweden.  
Email: nacira@kth.se, pucci@kth.se.

Work supported by the Swedish Research Council grant (2020-04697) and the Slovenian Research and Innovation Agency, research core funding No.P1-0448.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Mathematics, Linnaeus University (LNU), Växjö, Sweden.  
Email: ihsan.arharas@lnu.se

<sup>3</sup>Department of Mathematics, University of Ljubljana, Ljubljana, Slovenia.  
Email: jan.rems@fmf.uni-lj.si. Work supported by Slovenian Research and Innovation Agency, research core funding No.P1-0448.

# 1 Introduction

Energy markets operate in a dynamic environment where electricity prices fluctuate due to changes in supply and demand, fuel costs, regulatory policies, and technological advances. The transition to a decarbonized energy system has led to a growing reliance on non-fossil fuel generators, such as wind and solar power. However, these energy sources require substantial capital investments, creating financial challenges, particularly for smaller and medium-sized producers who may struggle to secure funding without predictable revenue streams. Given these investment barriers, governments and regulatory bodies have introduced various financial instruments to reduce uncertainty and incentivize investment in renewable energy generation.

One widely used mechanism is the Contract for Difference (CfD), a financial agreement designed to stabilize revenues for electricity producers. Under a CfD, the producer receives a fixed price for the electricity they generate, regardless of market fluctuations. If the market price falls below the agreed strike price, the producer is compensated for the shortfall by the public entity overseeing the contract. In contrast, if the market price exceeds the strike price, the producer pays the excess amount. This mechanism ensures that generators receive stable revenues while allowing them to participate in competitive electricity markets.

Although CfDs provide financial security, they also introduce strategic decision-making considerations. One of the key complexities arises from the ability of either party to exit the contract before its maturity, subject to penalties. If the electricity price drops significantly, the entity responsible for guaranteeing the strike price may find it more cost-effective to terminate the contract rather than continuing to compensate the producer. Similarly, if electricity prices surge, the producer may choose to withdraw from the agreement to take advantage of higher market prices. These early exit options introduce a strategic interplay between the producer and the contracting entity, making the problem naturally suited for analysis within a stochastic game-theoretic framework. In this context, numerical methods for solving high-dimensional switching and stopping problems have been extensively studied (see, e.g., [1, 3]), particularly in financial and energy markets.

To formally model this interaction, we introduce a stochastic game in which both players must decide the optimal time to exit the contract. The problem is structured as a Dynkin game, a class of stopping games where each player determines the best moment to stop based on evolving market conditions. In this setting, the producer and the regulatory entity continuously evaluate the potential risks and rewards of contract continuation versus termination, taking into account expected future price trajectories, penalty costs, and the financial impact of their decisions.

The mathematical formulation of this problem can be equivalently expressed using Doubly Reflected Backward Stochastic Differential Equations (DRBSDEs), which allow us to characterize the value of the contract and determine the optimal exit strategies for both players. Cvitanifá and Karatzas [7] were the first to establish a connection between these Dynkin games and doubly reflected stochastic differential equations (DRBSDE) with driver  $\phi$  and barriers  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$ , in the Brownian setting where  $\xi$  and  $\zeta$  are continuous processes. This result proved to be crucial for subsequent research, which explores more general variants of zero-sum Dynkin games, see [12, 11, 9] and the references therein.

Solving these equations provides insights into the fair value of the contract, ensuring that energy producers can hedge against price volatility while regulatory entities manage financial exposure efficiently. Given the complexity of these equations, we develop a backward neural network-based algorithm, leveraging machine learning techniques to approximate the solution in a computationally efficient manner.

This framework provides valuable insights for both policymakers and market participants. It enables regulatory bodies to design CfD agreements that strike a balance between incentivizing renewable energy investments and controlling financial risks associated with market volatility. Additionally, it offers energy producers a strategic tool to optimize their contract participation decisions, ensuring profitability while managing exposure to price fluctuations.

By integrating stochastic game theory, DRBSDEs, and deep learning techniques, this paper contributes to the growing literature on financial instruments in electricity markets. Previous research has analyzed CfDs in the context of risk management [2, 4]. Our approach extends this studies by explicitly modeling the interaction between two strategic players under uncertainty, incorporating penalty clauses for unilateral early termination, as set out in the EU electricity market reform criteria [6] and by leveraging neural networks for efficient computation. This combination of financial modeling, game theory, and machine learning provides a robust framework for assessing and optimizing contract-based support schemes in the energy sector.

In Section 2, we introduce the necessary mathematical preliminaries, including key concepts from stochastic control, backward stochastic differential equations (BSDEs), and optimal stopping theory. Section 3 is devoted to the formulation of the stochastic model as a two-player Dynkin game, where the interaction between the energy producer and the public entity is modeled through optimal stopping rules. In Section 5, we apply this model to Contracts for Differences with early exit options and analyze its implications for energy markets. Finally, in Section 6, we present a deep learning-based approach to solving the associated DRBSDEs and demonstrate its effectiveness in computing optimal stopping strategies. Our code is available at

<https://github.com/giuliapucci98/DRBSDE-Dynkin-Game>.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce the necessary mathematical background required for our analysis. We review concepts related to doubly RBSDEs, optimal stopping problems and the theory of Dynkin games. These elements serve as the foundation for modeling contracts for differences with early exit options.

Let  $T > 0$  be a finite horizon. Consider a filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_t, P)$  satisfying the usual conditions and supporting a  $d$ -dimensional Wiener process  $W$ . Let  $b : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\sigma : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  be measurable functions, where  $d$  is a relatively large dimension. For  $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ , let  $(X_s^{t,x})_{s \in [0, T]}$  be the unique  $\mathbb{R}^d$ -valued process solution of the following standard SDE:

$$\begin{cases} X_s^{t,x} = x + \int_t^s b(r, X_r^{t,x}) dr + \int_t^s \sigma(r, X_r^{t,x}) dB_r, & t \leq s \leq T, \\ X_s^{t,x} = x, & s < t. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

The process  $(X_s^{t,x})_{s \in [0, T]}$  represents the underlying asset, such as the price process of a stock or a commodity,

**Assumption 2.1.** *We assume that the coefficients  $b$  and  $\sigma$  satisfy the global Lipschitz and linear growth conditions:*

$$\begin{aligned} |b(t, x) - b(t, y)| + |\sigma(t, x) - \sigma(t, y)| &\leq C_L |x - y|, \\ |b(t, x)|^2 + |\sigma(t, x)|^2 &\leq C_L^2 (1 + |x|^2), \end{aligned}$$

for every  $0 \leq t \leq T$ ,  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , where  $C_L$  is a positive constant.

It is clear, (cf. [14, Theorem 2.9, p. 289]) that, under the assumptions 2.1, the SDE (2.1) has a unique solution. Moreover, for every  $p \geq 2$ , there exists  $C_p > 0$ , such that for all  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{s \in [t, T]} |X_s^{t,x}|^p \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right] \leq C_p (1 + |x|^p). \quad (2.2)$$

The constant  $C_p$  depends only on the Lipschitz and the linear growth constants of  $b$  and  $\sigma$ .

Now let:

- $\mathcal{S}$  be the set of  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -adapted right-continuous with left limits processes  $(Y_t)_{t \leq T}$  with values in  $\mathbb{R}$ , and  $\mathcal{S}^2 := \{Y \in \mathcal{S}, \mathbb{E}[\sup_{t \leq T} |Y_t|^2] < \infty\}$ .
- $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{P}$ ) be the  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -progressive (resp. predictable) tribe on  $\Omega \times [0, T]$ .
- $\mathbb{L}^2$  be the set of  $F_T$ -measurable random variables  $\xi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with  $E[|\xi|^2] < \infty$ .
- $\mathcal{H}^{2,d}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{H}^d$ ) be the set of  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$ -measurable processes  $Z := (Z_t)_{t \leq T}$  with values in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and  $dP \otimes dt$ -square integrable (resp.  $P$ -a.s.  $Z(\omega) := (Z_t(\omega))_{t \leq T}$  is  $dt$ -square integrable).
- $S_{ci}$  (resp.  $S_{ci}^2$ ): the set of continuous  $\mathcal{P}$ -measurable non-decreasing processes  $A := (A_t)_{t \leq T}$  such that  $A_0 = 0$  (resp. and  $\mathbb{E}[(A_T)^2] < \infty$ ).
- $D[0, \infty)$  be the set of real-valued cadlag functions on  $[0, \infty)$ .  $D^-[0, \infty)$ , and  $D^+[0, \infty)$  will denote càdlàg functions on  $[0, \infty)$  taking values in  $\mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$  and in  $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ , respectively.
- $BV[0, \infty)$  and  $I[0, \infty)$  denote the subspaces of  $D[0, \infty)$  consisting of nondecreasing functions and functions with bounded variation on every finite interval, respectively.
- For a stopping time  $\tau$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_{\tau, T}$  denotes the set of stopping times  $\theta$  such that  $\theta \geq \tau$ .

We recall the existence result for the solution of DRBSDEs when the barriers are completely separated. To define the equation, we consider the following four objects:

- (i) Let  $\xi$  be a given random variable in  $\mathbb{L}^1$ .
- (ii)  $f : [0, T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a given  $\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ -measurable function that satisfies

$$E \int_0^T f^2(t, \omega, 0, 0) dt < \infty. \quad (2.3)$$

$$|f(t, \omega, y, z) - f(t, \omega, y', z')| \leq C(|y - y'| + \|z - z'\|), \quad (2.4)$$

$$\forall (t, \omega) \in [0, T] \times \Omega; \quad y, y' \in \mathbb{R}, \quad z, z' \in \mathbb{R}^d$$

for some  $0 < C < \infty$ .

- (iii) Consider also two continuous processes  $L, U$  in  $\mathcal{S}^2$  that are completely separated, i.e.,

$$L_t < U_t, \quad \forall 0 \leq t \leq T, \quad \text{and} \quad L_T \leq \xi \leq U_T \quad \text{a.s.} \quad (2.5)$$

**Definition 2.2.** A solution for the doubly reflected BSDE associated with  $(\varphi, \xi, L, U)$  is a quadruple of  $\mathcal{P}$ -measurable processes  $(Y_s, Z_s, A_s, C_s)_{t \leq T}$  from  $S^2 \times \mathcal{H}^{2,k} \times S_{ci} \times S_{ci}$  such that  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.:

(i) For each  $t \in [0, T]$ ,

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T \varphi(r, Y_s, Z_s) ds - \int_t^T Z_s dB_s + (A_T - A_t) - (C_T - C_t). \quad (2.6)$$

(ii)  $L_t \leq Y_t \leq U_t, \forall t \leq T$ .

(iii)  $\int_0^T (Y_s - L_s) dA_s = \int_0^T (U_s - Y_s) dC_s = 0$ .

We have the following existence result (see [10, Theorem 3.7]).

**Theorem 2.3.** Under the assumptions (2.3)-(2.5), there exists a unique  $\mathcal{P}$ -measurable process  $(Y_s, Z_s, A_s, C_s)_{t \leq T}$  solution of the DRBSDE (2.6), i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} Y \in S^2, Z \in \mathcal{H}^{2,k}, \text{ and } A, C \in S_{ci} \\ Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T \varphi(s, Y_s, Z_s) ds - \int_t^T Z_s dB_s + (A_T - A_t) - (C_T - C_t), \\ L_t \leq Y_t \leq U_t, \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \\ \int_0^T (Y_r - L_r) dA_r = \int_0^T (U_r - Y_r) dC_r = 0. \end{cases} \quad (2.7)$$

### 3 The Stochastic Model: Dynkin Game Formulation

We now introduce the stochastic model governing the contract for differences. The problem is formulated as a two-player zero-sum Dynkin game, where each player strategically selects an optimal stopping time to maximize their respective payoffs.

We consider a zero-sum Dynkin game between two players Player 1 and Player 2, who are interested in the same asset. The payoff is defined in terms of  $(X_s^{t,x})$  the underlying diffusion process (2.1), which models the asset dynamics. The admissible strategies of the players are stopping times with respect to the filtration  $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_t$ . The goal of this paper is to numerically solve the zero-sum Dynkin game problem.

Let  $t \in [0, T]$  be given and associate with Player 1 and Player 2 the stopping times  $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}$  and  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}$  respectively. The game between Player 1 and Player 2 is played from time  $t$  until  $\sigma \wedge \tau$ , where  $x \wedge y := \min(x, y)$ . During this time Player 1 pays Player 2 at a random rate  $\varphi(s, X_s^{t,x})$ , which depends on both time  $s$  and the underlying state process  $X_s^{t,x}$ .

For some Borel functions  $f_1, f_2$  and  $g$ , the payoff structure of the game is defined as follows: If Player 1 exits the game prior to time  $T$  and either before or simultaneously with Player 2, i.e.,  $\sigma < T$  and  $\sigma \leq \tau$ , Player 1 pays Player 2 an additional amount  $f_1(\sigma, X_\sigma)$ . Conversely, if Player 2 exits the game first, i.e.,  $\tau < \sigma$ , Player 2 pays Player 1 an amount  $f_2(\tau, X_\tau)$ . If neither player exits the game before  $T$ , the game terminates at  $\sigma = \tau = T$ , and Player 1 pays Player 2 a terminal amount  $g(X_T^{t,x})$ . The payoff for the Dynkin game on  $[t, T]$  is expressed in terms of the conditional expected cost to Player 1, as follows:

$$J_{t,x}(\sigma, \tau) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^{\sigma \wedge \tau} \varphi(s, X_s^{t,x}) ds + f_1(\sigma, X_\sigma^{t,x}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma \leq \tau, \sigma < T\}} - f_2(\tau, X_\tau^{t,x}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau < \sigma\}} + g(X_T^{t,x}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma \wedge \tau = T\}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right], \quad \sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}. \quad (3.1)$$

For  $t \in [0, T]$ , the payoff  $J_{t,x}(\sigma, \tau)$  is a cost for Player 1 and a reward for Player 2. Therefore, the objective of Player 1 is to choose a strategy  $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}$  to minimise the expected value  $J_{t,x}(\sigma, \tau)$ , while Player 2 aims to choose a strategy  $\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}$  that maximize it. This results in the upper and lower values for the game on  $[t, T]$ , denoted by  $\bar{V}(t, x)$  and  $\underline{V}(t, x)$ , respectively:

$$\bar{V}(t, x) = \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} J_{t,x}(\sigma, \tau), \quad \underline{V}(t, x) = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} J_{t,x}(\sigma, \tau). \quad (3.2)$$

The Dynkin game on  $[t, T]$  is considered “fair” and is said to have a value if the upper and lower values at time  $t$  are equal. This condition can be expressed as:

$$\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} J_{t,x}(\sigma, \tau) = V(t, x) = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} J_{t,x}(\sigma, \tau). \quad (3.3)$$

The shared value, denoted by  $V(t, x)$ , is referred to as the solution or the value of the game on  $[t, T]$ .

When studying Dynkin games, the first step is to verify whether the game is fair. Subsequently, one seeks admissible strategies for the players that provide the game’s

value or approximate, i.e., determine whether the game has a saddle point. This leads to the concept of a Nash equilibrium.

**Definition 3.1** (Nash Equilibrium). *A pair of stopping times  $(\sigma^*, \tau^*) \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T} \times \mathcal{T}_{t,T}$  is said to constitute a Nash equilibrium or a saddle point for the game on  $[t, T]$  if, for any  $\sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}$ :*

$$J_{t,x}(\sigma^*, \tau) \leq J_{t,x}(\sigma^*, \tau^*) \leq J_{t,x}(\sigma, \tau^*). \quad (3.4)$$

It is straightforward to verify that the existence of a saddle point  $(\sigma^*, \tau^*) \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T} \times \mathcal{T}_{t,T}$  ensures that the game on  $[t, T]$  is fair, and its value is given by:

$$\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} J_{t,x}(\sigma, \tau) = J_{t,x}(\sigma^*, \tau^*) = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} J_{t,x}(\sigma, \tau). \quad (3.5)$$

Let us now consider the functions

$$g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad f_1, f_2 : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad \varphi : [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

that satisfy the following assumptions:

**Assumption 3.2.** *1.  $g$  is continuous and bounded;  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  are also continuous and bounded and, for any  $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ ,*

$$-f_2(t, x) < f_1(t, x). \quad (3.6)$$

$$-f_2(T, x) \leq g(x) \leq f_1(T, x). \quad (3.7)$$

*2.  $\varphi$  is bounded, and there exists a constant  $C$  such that for any  $t, t' \in [0, T]$  and  $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^d$*

$$|\varphi(t, x) - \varphi(t, x')| \leq C|x - x'|,$$

$$|\varphi(t, x) - \varphi(t', x)| \leq C|t - t'|^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The following theorem shows that the game problem defined above has a value (see e.g., [8, Theorem 2.1, p. 686]).

**Theorem 3.3.** *Under the assumptions 3.2, there exists a continuous  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -adapted process  $(V(t, x))_{0 \leq t \leq T}$  such that for each  $t$ , the random variable  $V(t, x)$  gives the fair value of the Dynkin game on  $[t, T]$  assuming  $X_t = x$ . Furthermore, the debut times  $\tau_t^*$  and  $\sigma_t^*$  defined by*

$$\tau_t^* := \inf\{s \geq t : V(s, x) = -f_2(s, X_s^{t,x})\} \wedge T, \quad (3.8)$$

$$\sigma_t^* := \inf\{s \geq t : V(s, x) = f_1(s, X_s^{t,x})\} \wedge T, \quad (3.9)$$

*form a saddle point  $(\sigma_t^*, \tau_t^*)$  for the Dynkin game on  $[t, T]$ .*

It is well known that Dynkin game problems are closely linked to BSDEs with two reflecting barriers (see e.g., [7, 12, 11]). We further explore this connection in the next section.

## 4 Connection with Doubly Reflecting BSDEs

We focus on the links between the zero-sum Dynkin game from the last section and the solution of a corresponding doubly reflected BSDE with continuous barriers. The following theorem shows that, under Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 3.2, the game problem 3.1 has a value. Moreover, its value is characterized in terms of the first component of the solution of a doubly RBSDE (cf., [10, Theorem 3.8.]).

**Theorem 4.1.** *Under the above assumptions 2.1 and 3.2, for any  $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ , there exists a unique process  $(Y_s^{t,x}, Z_s^{t,x}, A_s^{t,x}, C_s^{t,x})_{s \leq T}$   $\mathcal{P}$ -measurable solution of the doubly reflected BSDE associated with*

$$\left( \varphi(\cdot, X^{t,x}), g(X_T^{t,x}), f_1(\cdot, X^{t,x}), -f_2(\cdot, X^{t,x}) \right),$$

that is,

$$(i) \ Y^{t,x} \in S^2, \ Z^{t,x} \in \mathcal{H}^{2,k}, \ A^{t,x} \in S_{ci}, \ \text{and } C^{t,x} \in S_{ci}.$$

$$(ii) \ \text{For each } s \in [t, T],$$

$$Y_s^{t,x} = g(X_T^{t,x}) + \int_s^T \varphi(r, X_r^{t,x}) dr - \int_s^T Z_r^{t,x} dB_r + (A_T^{t,x} - A_s^{t,x}) - (C_T^{t,x} - C_s^{t,x}); \quad (4.1)$$

$$(iii) \ -f_2(s, X_s^{t,x}) \leq Y_s^{t,x} \leq f_1(s, X_s^{t,x});$$

$$(iv) \ \int_t^T (Y_r^{t,x} - (-f_2(r, X_r^{t,x}))) dA_r^{t,x} = \int_t^T (f_1(r, X_r^{t,x}) - Y_r^{t,x}) dC_r^{t,x} = 0.$$

Moreover, the first component of the solution  $Y^{t,x}$  is the common value function of the Dynkin game (3.3) on  $[t, T]$ , i.e.,

$$Y_t^{t,x} = \bar{V}(t, x) = \underline{V}(t, x). \quad (4.2)$$

Furthermore, the pair of stopping times  $(\sigma_t^*, \tau_t^*)$  defined by

$$\tau_t^* := \inf\{s \geq t : Y_s^{t,x} = -f_2(s, X_s^{t,x})\} \wedge T, \quad (4.3)$$

$$\sigma_t^* := \inf\{s \geq t : Y_s^{t,x} = f_1(s, X_s^{t,x})\} \wedge T, \quad (4.4)$$

form a saddle point for the Dynkin game on  $[t, T]$ .

*Proof.* Given assumptions 2.1 and 3.2, the existence of a unique solution  $(Y_s^{t,x}, Z_s^{t,x}, A_s^{t,x}, C_s^{t,x})_{s \leq T}$  to (4.1) follows from Theorem 2.3.

On the other hand, to establish that  $Y_t^{t,x}$  is the value of the Dynkin game, we consider the associated payoff function  $J_{t,x}(\sigma, \tau)$  on  $[t, T]$ , as defined in (3.1), and verify the following

$$(i) \quad Y_t^{t,x} = J_{t,x}(\sigma_t^*, \tau_t^*).$$

$$(ii) \quad J_{t,x}(\sigma_t^*, \tau) \leq Y_t^{t,x} \leq J_{t,x}(\sigma, \tau_t^*), \text{ for any } \sigma, \tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}.$$

Indeed, since  $Y^{t,x}$  is continuous on  $[t, T]$ , then  $Y_{\sigma_t^*}^{t,x} = f_1(\sigma_t^*, X_{\sigma_t^*}^{t,x})$  on  $[\sigma_t^* < T]$  and  $Y_{\tau_t^*}^{t,x} = -f_2(\tau_t^*, X_{\tau_t^*}^{t,x})$  on  $[\tau_t^* < T]$ . By the Skorokhod conditions (iv), we obtain  $A_{\sigma_t^* \wedge \tau_t^*}^{t,x} - A_t^{t,x} = 0$  and  $C_{\sigma_t^* \wedge \tau_t^*}^{t,x} - C_t^{t,x} = 0$ . Moreover, we have:

$$Y_t^{t,x} = Y_{\sigma_t^* \wedge \tau_t^*}^{t,x} + \int_t^{\sigma_t^* \wedge \tau_t^*} \varphi(r, X_r^{t,x}) dr - \int_t^{\sigma_t^* \wedge \tau_t^*} Z_r^{t,x} dB_r + (A_{\sigma_t^* \wedge \tau_t^*}^{t,x} - A_t^{t,x}) - (C_{\sigma_t^* \wedge \tau_t^*}^{t,x} - C_t^{t,x}); \quad (4.5)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{\sigma_t^* \wedge \tau_t^*}^{t,x} &= Y_{\tau_t^*}^{t,x} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_t^* < \sigma_t^*\}} + Y_{\sigma_t^*}^{t,x} \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma_t^* \leq \tau_t^* < T\}} + g(X_T^{t,x}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma_t^* = \tau_t^* = T\}} \\ &= -f_2(\tau_t^*, X_{\tau_t^*}^{t,x}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_t^* < \sigma_t^*\}} + f_1(\sigma_t^*, X_{\sigma_t^*}^{t,x}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma_t^* \leq \tau_t^* < T\}} + g(X_T^{t,x}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma_t^* = \tau_t^* = T\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, taking the expectation w.r.t.  $\mathcal{F}_t$  in (4.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t^{t,x} &= E \left( \int_t^{\sigma_t^* \wedge \tau_t^*} \varphi(r, X_r^{t,x}) dr + f_1(\sigma_t^*, X_{\sigma_t^*}^{t,x}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma_t^* \leq \tau_t^* < T\}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - f_2(\tau_t^*, X_{\tau_t^*}^{t,x}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_t^* < \sigma_t^*\}} + g(X_T^{t,x}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma_t^* = \tau_t^* = T\}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right) \\ &= J_{t,x}(\sigma_t^*, \tau_t^*). \end{aligned}$$

Let now  $\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}$ . We have

$$Y_t^{t,x} = Y_{\sigma \wedge \tau_t^*}^{t,x} + \int_t^{\sigma \wedge \tau_t^*} \varphi(r, X_r^{t,x}) dr - \int_t^{\sigma \wedge \tau_t^*} Z_r^{t,x} dB_r + (A_{\sigma \wedge \tau_t^*}^{t,x} - A_t^{t,x}) - (C_{\sigma \wedge \tau_t^*}^{t,x} - C_t^{t,x}),$$

and since  $A_{\sigma \wedge \tau_t^*}^{t,x} - A_t^{t,x} = 0$ , and  $C_{\sigma \wedge \tau_t^*}^{t,x} - C_t^{t,x} \geq 0$ , it follows that

$$Y_t^{t,x} \leq Y_{\sigma \wedge \tau_t^*}^{t,x} + \int_t^{\sigma \wedge \tau_t^*} \varphi(r, X_r^{t,x}) dr - \int_t^{\sigma \wedge \tau_t^*} Z_r^{t,x} dB_r$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= Y_{\tau_t^*}^{t,x} \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_t^* \leq \sigma < T\}} + Y_{\sigma}^{t,x} \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma < \tau_t^*\}} + g(X_T^{t,x}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma_t^* = \tau_t^* = T\}} \\
&+ \int_t^{\sigma \wedge \tau_t^*} \varphi(r, X_r^{t,x}) dr - \int_t^{\sigma \wedge \tau_t^*} Z_r^{t,x} dB_r \\
&\leq -f_2(\tau_t^*, X_{\tau_t^*}^{t,x}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_t^* \leq \sigma < T\}} + f_1(\sigma, X_{\sigma}^{t,x}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma < \tau_t^*\}} + g(X_T^{t,x}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma_t^* = \tau_t^* = T\}} \\
&+ \int_t^{\sigma \wedge \tau_t^*} \varphi(r, X_r^{t,x}) dr - \int_t^{\sigma \wedge \tau_t^*} Z_r^{t,x} dB_r
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the conditional expectation, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_t^{t,x} &\leq E \left( \int_t^{\sigma \wedge \tau_t^*} \varphi(r, X_r^{t,x}) dr f_1(\sigma, X_{\sigma}^{t,x}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma < \tau_t^*\}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - f_2(\tau_t^*, X_{\tau_t^*}^{t,x}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_t^* \leq \sigma < T\}} + g(X_T^{t,x}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\sigma_t^* = \tau_t^* = T\}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right) \\
&= J_{t,x}(\sigma, \tau_t^*).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can show that  $J_{t,x}(\sigma_t^*, \tau) \leq Y_t^{t,x}$ . Therefore, by Definition 3.1, it follows from (i) and (ii) that  $Y_t^{t,x}$  is the value of the Dynkin game on  $[t, T]$ , i.e.,

$$\operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} J_{t,x}(\sigma, \tau) = Y_t^{t,x} = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}} J_{t,x}(\sigma, \tau). \quad (4.6)$$

and that  $(\sigma_t^*, \tau_t^*)$  is a saddle point for the game. □

Notice that given a solution  $(Y_s^{t,x}, Z_s^{t,x}, A_s^{t,x}, C_s^{t,x})$  to the doubly RBSDE (4.1) satisfying conditions (ii) to (iv), the problem corresponds, in a deterministic framework, to a Skorokhod problem with two time-dependent boundaries. Consequently, by applying some well-known properties of the Skorokhod problem, we can derive an explicit formula for the increasing processes  $A_s^{t,x}$  and  $C_s^{t,x}$ .

Recall the Skorokhod problem (SP) on a time-varying interval  $[\alpha, \beta]$ .

**Definition 4.2.** (*Skorokhod problem*) Let  $\alpha, \beta \in D[0, \infty)$  such that  $\alpha \leq \beta$ . Given  $x \in D[0, \infty)$ , a pair of functions  $(y, \eta) \in D[0, \infty) \times BV[0, \infty)$  is said to be a solution of the Skorokhod problem on  $[\alpha, \beta]$  for  $x$  if the following two properties are satisfied:

(i)  $y_t = x_t + \eta_t \in [\alpha_t, \beta_t]$ , for every  $t \geq 0$ .

(ii)  $\eta(0^-) = 0$ , and  $\eta$  has the decomposition  $\eta := \eta^l - \eta^u$ , where  $\eta^l, \eta^u \in I[0, \infty)$ ,

$$\int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}_{\{y_s < \beta_s\}} d\eta_s^u = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}_{\{y_s > \alpha_s\}} d\eta_s^l = 0. \quad (4.7)$$

If  $(y, \eta)$  is the unique solution to the SP on  $[\alpha, \beta]$  for  $x$ , then we will write  $y = \Gamma_{\alpha, \beta}(x)$ , and refer to  $\Gamma_{\alpha, \beta}$  as the associated Skorokhod map (SM).

Burdzy et al. in [5, Theorem 2.6] found an explicit representation for the so-called extended Skorokhod map (ESM), which is a relaxed version of the SP, see Definition 2.2 in [5]. They show that for any  $\alpha \in D^-[0, \infty)$  and  $\beta \in D^+[0, \infty)$  such that  $\alpha \leq \beta$ , there is a well-defined ESM  $\bar{\Gamma}_{\alpha, \beta} : D[0, \infty) \rightarrow D[0, \infty)$  and it is represented by

$$\bar{\Gamma}_{\alpha, \beta}(x) = x - \Xi_{\alpha, \beta}(x), \quad (4.8)$$

where  $\Xi_{\alpha, \beta}(x) : D[0, \infty) \rightarrow D[0, \infty)$  is given by

$$\Xi_{\alpha, \beta}(x)(t) = \max \left\{ \left[ (x_0 - \beta_0)^+ \wedge \inf_{0 \leq r \leq t} (x_r - \alpha_r) \right], \right. \\ \left. \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \left[ (x_s - \beta_s) \wedge \inf_{s \leq r \leq t} (x_r - \alpha_r) \right] \right\}. \quad (4.9)$$

Moreover, if  $\inf_{t \geq 0} (\beta(t) - \alpha(t)) > 0$ , the ESM  $\bar{\Gamma}_{\alpha, \beta}$  can be identified with the SM  $\Gamma_{\alpha, \beta}$ .

Slaby in [16] obtained an alternative form of the explicit formula (4.8) that is simpler to understand and that we will use in the following to derive an explicit expression for the processes  $A^{t, x}$  and  $C^{t, x}$ .

Let us first introduce the following notations: for  $x_t \in D[0, \infty)$ , we denote by  $T_\alpha$  and  $T_\beta$  the pair of times:

$$T_\alpha := \min\{s > 0 : \alpha_s - x_s \geq 0\}, \quad (4.10)$$

$$T_\beta := \min\{s > 0 : x_s - \beta_s \geq 0\}, \quad (4.11)$$

and the functions

$$H_{\alpha, \beta}(x)(t) = \sup_{0 \leq s \leq t} \left[ (x_s - \beta_s) \wedge \inf_{s \leq r \leq t} (x_r - \alpha_r) \right], \quad (4.12)$$

$$L_{\alpha, \beta}(x)(t) = \inf_{0 \leq s \leq t} \left[ (x_s - \alpha_s) \vee \sup_{s \leq r \leq t} (x_r - \beta_r) \right]. \quad (4.13)$$

The next result provides an alternative representation formula for (4.8) and corresponds to [16, Corollary 2.20].

**Corollary 4.3.** *Let  $\alpha \in D^-[0, \infty)$ ,  $\beta \in D^+[0, \infty)$  be such that  $\inf_{t \geq 0} (\beta(t) - \alpha(t)) > 0$ . Then, for every  $x \in D[0, \infty)$ ,*

$$\Xi_{\alpha, \beta}(x)(t) = I_{\{T^\beta < T^\alpha\}} I_{[T^\beta, \infty)}(t) H_{\alpha, \beta}(x)(t) + I_{\{T^\alpha < T^\beta\}} I_{[T^\alpha, \infty)}(t) L_{\alpha, \beta}(x)(t). \quad (4.14)$$

Now, our problem involves a Skorokhod problem, and we present the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.4.** *Under assumptions 2.1 and 3.2, let  $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $(Y_s^{t,x}, Z_s^{t,x}, A_s^{t,x}, C_s^{t,x})_{t \leq s \leq T}$  be a solution of the doubly RBSDE (4.1) satisfying conditions (ii) to (iv). Then, for each  $s \in [t, T]$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} A_s^{t,x} &= \mathbb{1}_{\{T_2 < T_1\}} \mathbb{1}_{[T_2, \infty)}(s) \left[ \inf_{0 \leq r \leq T-s} \left\{ (x_r - f_1(r, X_r^{t,x})) \vee \sup_{r \leq u \leq T-s} (x_u + f_2(u, X_u^{t,x})) \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \inf_{0 \leq r \leq T} \left\{ (x_r - f_1(r, X_r^{t,x})) \vee \sup_{r \leq u \leq T} (x_u + f_2(u, X_u^{t,x})) \right\} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_s^{t,x} &= -\mathbb{1}_{\{T_1 < T_2\}} \mathbb{1}_{[T_1, \infty)}(s) \left[ \sup_{0 \leq r \leq T-s} \left\{ (x_r + f_2(r, X_r^{t,x})) \wedge \inf_{r \leq u \leq T-s} (x_u - f_1(u, X_u^{t,x})) \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sup_{0 \leq r \leq T} \left\{ (x_r + f_2(r, X_r^{t,x})) \wedge \inf_{r \leq u \leq T} (x_u - f_1(u, X_u^{t,x})) \right\} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} x_s &= g(X_T^{t,x}) + \int_{T-s}^T \varphi(r, X_r^{t,x}) dr - \int_{T-s}^T Z_r^{t,x} dW_r, \\ T_2 &:= \min\{s > t : -f_2(s, X_s^{t,x}) - x_s \geq 0\}, \\ T_1 &:= \min\{s > t : x_s - f_1(s, X_s^{t,x}) \geq 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* First, we write the equation (4.1) in its forward form as

$$Y_s^{t,x} = Y_0^{t,x} - \int_0^s \varphi(r, X_r^{t,x}) dr + \int_0^s Z_r^{t,x} dB_r - K_s^{t,x}, \quad (4.17)$$

where  $K_s^{t,x} := A_s^{t,x} - C_s^{t,x}$ . Notice that by assumption 3.2, the pair  $(Y_{T-s}^{t,x}, K_{T-s}^{t,x} - K_T^{t,x})_{t \leq s \leq T}$  solves a Skorokhod problem on  $[t, T]$  and the solution pair  $(Y_{T-s}^{t,x}, K_{T-s}^{t,x} - K_T^{t,x})$  can be represented as

$$K_{T-s}^{t,x} - K_T^{t,x} = \Xi_{\alpha, \beta}(x_s) \quad (4.18)$$

$$Y_{T-s}^{t,x} = x_s - \Xi_{\alpha,\beta}(x_s), \quad (4.19)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} x_s &= g(X_T^{t,x}) + \int_{T-s}^T \varphi(r, X_r^{t,x}) dr - \int_{T-s}^T Z_r^{t,x} dW_r \\ \alpha(r) &= -f_2(r, X_r^{t,x}) \\ \beta(r) &= f_1(r, X_r^{t,x}) \\ \Xi_{\alpha,\beta}(x_s) &= I_{\{T_1 < T_2\}} I_{[T_1, \infty)}(s) H_{\alpha,\beta}(x)(s) + I_{\{T_2 < T_1\}} I_{[T_2, \infty)}(s) L_{\alpha,\beta}(x)(s). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} K_s^{t,x} &= \Xi_{\alpha,\beta}(x_{T-s}) - \Xi_{\alpha,\beta}(x_T) \\ &= I_{\{T_1 < T_2\}} I_{[T_1, \infty)}(s) \left[ H_{\alpha,\beta}(x)(T-s) - H_{\alpha,\beta}(x)(T) \right] \\ &\quad + I_{\{T_2 < T_1\}} I_{[T_2, \infty)}(s) \left[ L_{\alpha,\beta}(x)(T-s) - L_{\alpha,\beta}(x)(T) \right] \\ &= A_s^{t,x} - C_s^{t,x}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

By the Skorokhod condition (*iv*):

$$\int_t^T \left( Y_r^{t,x} - (-f_2(r, X_r^{t,x})) \right) dA_r^{t,x} = \int_t^T \left( f_1(r, X_r^{t,x}) - Y_r^{t,x} \right) dC_r^{t,x} = 0,$$

we conclude the following: If  $T_2 < T_1$ , the process  $Y^{t,x}$  reaches the lower boundary  $-f_2(\cdot, X^{t,x})$ , so the minimal push  $A^{t,x}$  is applied to keep the solution inside the two obstacles  $-f_2(\cdot, X^{t,x})$  and  $f_1(\cdot, X^{t,x})$ . Hence,

$$A_s^{t,x} = I_{[T_2, \infty)}(s) \left[ L_{\alpha,\beta}(x)(T-s) - L_{\alpha,\beta}(x)(T) \right]. \quad (4.21)$$

Conversely, when  $T_1 < T_2$ , the process  $Y^{t,x}$  reaches the upper boundary  $f_1(\cdot, X^{t,x})$ , and the minimal push  $C^{t,x}$  is applied. Hence,

$$C_s^{t,x} = -I_{[T_1, \infty)}(s) \left[ H_{\alpha,\beta}(x)(T-s) - H_{\alpha,\beta}(x)(T) \right]. \quad (4.22)$$

The proof is then complete.  $\square$

## 5 Contract for Differences with Exit Options in Energy Markets

With the theoretical model established, we now apply it to the real-world setting of contracts for differences. We analyze how strategic contract exits influence market stability and producer profitability. The interaction between regulatory interventions and producer incentives is explored, with particular attention to how stochastic price movements shape decision-making. The underlying stochastic dynamics of the electricity price are modeled as an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process, reflecting mean-reverting behavior. The exit penalties and payoff functions are explicitly defined, leading to a formulation involving DRBSDE.

CfDs are key instruments in electricity markets, designed to stabilize revenues for electricity producers while ensuring predictable costs for regulatory entities. These contracts establish a fixed strike price, guaranteeing that electricity generators receive a predetermined price for their electricity regardless of market fluctuations. The fundamental mechanism behind CfDs ensures that if the market price falls below the strike price, the generator receives a compensatory payment from the regulatory entity, while if the market price exceeds the strike price, the generator refunds the excess amount.

This structure plays a crucial role in de-risking investments in energy production, particularly in renewable energy projects, by reducing exposure to price volatility [2]. Recent studies emphasize that CfDs enhance financial predictability, providing a mechanism for stabilizing cash flows, which is particularly beneficial for long-term infrastructure planning in the energy sector [4].

### 5.1 Market Price Modeling

Electricity prices exhibit significant fluctuations due to supply-demand imbalances, regulatory policies, and fuel price changes. To capture this behavior, we adopt a well-established stochastic model [15] based on the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process, which describes mean-reverting dynamics:

$$dX_s = \kappa(\mu - X_s)ds + \sigma dB_s, \quad (5.1)$$

where  $\kappa > 0$  represents the speed at which prices revert to the long-term equilibrium  $\mu > 0$ , while  $\sigma > 0$  captures the volatility of the electricity price fluctuations, and  $B_s$  is a standard Brownian motion. The actual electricity price, denoted by  $P_t = e^{X_t}$ , ensures positivity while incorporating the characteristic mean-reverting nature of energy prices.

## 5.2 Exit Options and Strategic Decision-Making

The key idea behind a two-way CfD is that at each time  $s \in [t, T]$ , where the contract is initiated at  $t$  and matures at  $T$ , the amount exchanged between the parties is adjusted according to the difference between the market price  $P_s$  and a fixed strike price  $K > 0$ . This translates into setting a payoff function of the form

$$\varphi(s, P_s) = Q(K - P_s)e^{-\rho(s-t)},$$

where  $Q > 0$  represents the quantity of energy covered by the contract.

To discourage premature termination, penalty clauses for early exits are introduced. Player 1, representing the regulatory entity, incurs a penalty  $f_1(\tau_1, P_{\tau_1})$  upon early termination, while Player 2, the electricity generator, pays a penalty  $f_2(\tau_2, P_{\tau_2})$  if choosing to withdraw before the contract's expiration. If neither party exits early, the contract reaches maturity at  $T$ , at which point the final settlement occurs based on the agreed payoff structure. Since all payments have been accounted for through the payoff function  $\varphi(s, P_s)$  over  $[t, T]$ , no additional terminal adjustment is required.

These competing incentives create a strategic conflict, naturally leading to a two-player Dynkin game, where each party optimally selects a stopping time  $\tau_i, i = 1, 2$ , to maximize their respective payoffs. The expected cost to Player 1, which is equivalent to the gain of Player 2, is given by:

$$J_t(\tau_1, \tau_2) = \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_t^{\tau_1 \wedge \tau_2} \varphi(s, P_s) ds + f_1(\tau_1, P_{\tau_1}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_1 \leq \tau_2, \tau_1 < T\}} - f_2(\tau_2, P_{\tau_2}) \mathbb{1}_{\{\tau_2 < \tau_1\}} \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right], \quad \tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathcal{T}_{t,T}. \quad (5.2)$$

where  $\tau_1 \wedge \tau_2 = \min(\tau_1, \tau_2)$  denotes the first contract termination. Player 1 aims to minimize  $J(\tau_1, \tau_2)$ , while Player 2 seeks to maximize it, leading to a zero-sum game structure. The solution to this problem requires determining optimal stopping times that satisfy the equilibrium conditions.

## 5.3 Solution via DRBSDEs

In this section, we establish the existence of a value for the two-player Dynkin game introduced above. Precisely, we show that this value can be characterized as the first component of the solution to a DRBSDE. Furthermore, we prove the existence of a saddle-point, ensuring that both players have optimal stopping strategies that satisfy equilibrium conditions.

The upper and lower value functions for the game on  $[t, T]$ , are given by:

$$\bar{V}(t) = \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\tau_1 \in \bar{\mathcal{T}}_{t,T}} \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau_2 \in \bar{\mathcal{T}}_{t,T}} J_t(\tau_1, \tau_2), \quad \underline{V}(t) = \operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\tau_2 \in \bar{\mathcal{T}}_{t,T}} \operatorname{ess\,inf}_{\tau_1 \in \bar{\mathcal{T}}_{t,T}} J_t(\tau_1, \tau_2). \quad (5.3)$$

To analyze the value of the game, we use the connection with the doubly reflected BSDEs established in Section 4.

Given that the penalty functions  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  satisfy Assumption 3.2, we consider the unique  $\mathcal{P}$ -measurable solution  $(Y, Z, A, C)$  of the DRBSDE associated with the data of the two-way CfD,

$$\left( Q(K - P_s)e^{-\rho(s-t)}, 0, f_1(\cdot, P), -f_2(\cdot, P) \right),$$

that is,

(i)  $Y \in S^2$ ,  $Z \in \mathcal{H}^{2,k}$ ,  $A \in S_{ci}$ , and  $C \in S_{ci}$ .

(ii) For each  $s \in [t, T]$ ,

$$Y_s = \int_s^T Q(K - P_r)e^{-\rho(r-t)}dr - \int_s^T Z_r dW_r + (A_T - A_s) - (C_T - C_s). \quad (5.4)$$

(iii)  $-f_2(s, P_s) \leq Y_s \leq f_1(s, P_s)$ ,  $\forall s \in [t, T]$ .

(iv)  $\int_t^T (Y_r + f_2(r, P_r))dA_r = \int_t^T (f_1(r, P_r) - Y_r)dC_r = 0$ .

The existence and uniqueness of the solution follow from Theorem 2.3. The Skorokhod conditions (iv) ensure that the processes  $A$  and  $C$  act only when necessary to keep  $Y$  within the barriers  $[-f_2, f_1]$ . The increasing process  $A$  adjusts  $Y$  only when  $Y$  reaches the lower boundary  $-f_2$ , meaning that Player 1 is forced to stop at this level. Similarly, the process  $C$  increases only when  $Y$  reaches the upper boundary  $f_1$ , forcing Player 2 to stop.

Let  $\tau_1^*$  and  $\tau_2^*$  be the stopping times defined by:

$$\tau_1^* = \inf\{s \geq t : Y_s = f_1(s, P_s)\} \wedge T, \quad (5.5)$$

$$\tau_2^* = \inf\{s \geq t : Y_s = -f_2(s, P_s)\} \wedge T. \quad (5.6)$$

These stopping times correspond to the moments when the solution  $Y$  reaches the upper and lower barriers, ensuring that neither player exits prematurely.

We now state the main result, which follows from Theorem 4.1.

**Theorem 5.1.** *The first component of the solution  $Y$  of the DRBSDE (5.4) is the common value function of the Dynkin game (5.2) on  $[t, T]$ , i.e.,*

$$Y_t = \bar{V}(t) = \underline{V}(t). \quad (5.7)$$

Furthermore, the pair of stopping times  $(\tau_1^*, \tau_2^*)$  form a saddle point for the Dynkin game on  $[t, T]$ .

A saddle point  $(\tau_1^*, \tau_2^*)$  represents an equilibrium where neither player benefits from deviating from their optimal stopping strategy. That is, Player 1 cannot reduce their expected cost by choosing a different stopping time when Player 2 follows  $\tau_2^*$ , and Player 2 cannot increase their expected payoff by altering their stopping strategy when Player 1 follows  $\tau_1^*$ . This confirms that  $(\tau_1^*, \tau_2^*)$  forms a Nash equilibrium, ensuring a stable solution.

## 5.4 Application to Exponentially Decaying Penalty Structures

A common real-world penalty model assumes that the cost of terminating the contract diminishes over time, reflecting the increasing reluctance of counterparties to withdraw as maturity approaches. This can be captured through an exponentially decaying penalty function:

$$f_1(s, P_s) = \gamma_1 e^{-\rho(s-t)}, \quad f_2(s, P_s) = \gamma_2 e^{-\rho(s-t)}. \quad (5.8)$$

This choice aligns with practical penalty structures observed in electricity markets, where long-term commitments are encouraged, and early withdrawals are penalized.

To incorporate this structure into the DRBSDE framework, we reformulate the reflected constraints in terms of the exponentially decaying barriers:

$$\begin{cases} Y_s = \int_s^T Q(K - P_r) e^{-\rho(r-t)} ds - \int_s^T Z_r dW_r + (A_T - A_s) - (C_T - C_s), \\ -\gamma_2 e^{-\rho(s-t)} \leq Y_s \leq \gamma_1 e^{-\rho(s-t)}, \\ \int_t^T (Y_r + \gamma_2 e^{-\rho(r-t)}) dA_r = \int_t^T (\gamma_1 e^{-\rho(r-t)} - Y_r) dC_r = 0. \end{cases} \quad (5.9)$$

This formulation ensures that the solution remains within the time-dependent barriers given by the decaying penalty functions. The increasing processes  $A_t$  and  $C_t$  act to keep  $Y_t$  inside the interval determined by the exponentially decaying constraints. The effect of this formulation is that early terminations are discouraged more strongly at the beginning of the contract period, whereas termination becomes more feasible as  $s$  approaches  $T$  due to the vanishing penalty terms.

In this setting, the optimal stopping times  $\tau_1^*$  and  $\tau_2^*$  must be adapted to the time-dependent constraints:

$$\tau_1^* = \inf\{s \geq t : Y_s = \gamma_1 e^{-\rho(s-t)}\}, \quad \tau_2^* = \inf\{s \geq t : Y_s = -\gamma_2 e^{-\rho(s-t)}\}. \quad (5.10)$$

This time-adaptive penalty structure provides a more realistic representation of contract termination dynamics in electricity markets. It captures the trade-off between stability and flexibility by penalizing premature exits while allowing for rational termination as the contract nears its end. Moreover, this formulation allows regulators and market participants to analyze the sensitivity of optimal stopping decisions to penalty decay rates, which can inform policy decisions on contract design and risk mitigation strategies.

## 6 Deep Learning for Doubly Reflected BSDEs

In this section, we extend the deep learning-based algorithm introduced in [13] for solving reflected BSDEs to the case of doubly reflected BSDEs. Our approach employs feedforward neural networks to approximate the unknown functions associated with the DRBSDE. These networks provide an efficient way to learn complex functional relationships through affine transformations and nonlinear activation functions. The methodology leverages the universal approximation capabilities of deep learning to capture the intricate dependencies of the solution.

### 6.1 Neural Network Architecture

The neural network consists of  $L + 1$  layers, where  $L > 1$ , and  $N_\ell$  neurons in each layer, for  $\ell = 0, \dots, L$ . The first layer, known as the input layer, has  $N_0 = d$  neurons, corresponding to the dimension of the state variable  $x$ . The output layer has  $N_L = d_1$  neurons, while the  $L - 1$  hidden layers each contain  $N_\ell = h$  neurons, for  $\ell = 1, \dots, L - 1$ .

A feedforward neural network is a function mapping  $\mathbb{R}^d$  to  $\mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ , expressed as:

$$\mathcal{N}(x; \theta) = (A_L \circ \rho \circ A_{L-1} \circ \rho \circ \dots \circ \rho \circ A_1)(x), \quad (6.1)$$

where each  $A_\ell$  is an affine transformation defined as:

$$A_\ell(x) = W_\ell x + b_\ell, \quad (6.2)$$

where  $W_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{N_\ell \times N_{\ell-1}}$  is the weight matrix and  $b_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{N_\ell}$  is the bias vector for layer  $\ell$ . The activation function  $\rho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is applied component-wise after each affine

transformation. Common choices for activation functions include ReLU, tanh, and sigmoid functions. In the notation  $\mathcal{N}(\theta)$ , the parameter vector  $\theta$  represents all trainable weights and biases in the network.

## 6.2 Training Data and Discretization of the Forward Process

The training data for the neural network is based on the discretized version of the forward process described by the stochastic differential equation (SDE). For a given integer  $N > 0$ , we consider a uniform time grid of step size  $\Delta s = \frac{T}{N}$ , denoted by  $\pi := \{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_N\}$ . The Brownian motion increments are given by  $\Delta B_{n+1} = B_{s_{n+1}} - B_{s_n}$ . We use the Euler-Maruyama discretization scheme for the forward SDE:

$$\begin{cases} X_{n+1} = X_n + b(s_n, X_n)\Delta s + \sigma(s_n, X_n)\Delta B_{n+1}, \\ X_0 = x, \quad n = 0, \dots, N-1. \end{cases} \quad (6.3)$$

## 6.3 Discretization of the Backward Process

Again we consider partition  $\pi := \{s_0, s_1, \dots, s_N\}$  of the time interval  $[0, T]$ . For simplicity of notation, we omit the starting time and starting point of processes in their superscript. If we ignore the terms, including processes  $A$  and  $C$  in Equation (4.1) we obtain the following process

$$\tilde{Y}_{s_n} = Y_{s_{n+1}} + \int_{s_n}^{s_{n+1}} \varphi(r, X_r) dr - \int_{s_n}^{s_{n+1}} Z_r dB_r, \quad (6.4)$$

defined on each subinterval  $[s_n, s_{n+1}]$  for  $n = 0, \dots, N-1$ . This process represents the evolution of the DRBSDE if it does not hit one of the barriers on the selected subinterval. If one enforces that the upper value remains within the barriers and proceeds to update process  $Y$  in a backward manner following the above rule, the obtained process approximates the one in Equation (4.1) as the number of discrete time points  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

The question remains how to approximate the “non-constrained” components  $\tilde{Y}$  and  $Z$  in Equation (6.4). Recall that through the value function  $V$ , defined in (3.3), we have the following representation:

$$Y_s = V(s, X_s), \quad Z_s = \sigma^\top(s, X_s)V_x(s, X_s), \quad t \leq s \leq T. \quad (6.5)$$

A possibility that gained a lot of popularity in recent years is to approximate functions  $V$  and  $V_x$  using neural networks and then use optimizing algorithms such as stochastic gradient descent to improve these approximations. A detailed description of the algorithm can be found in the next section.

## 6.4 Neural Network Approximation of the DRBSDE Solution

To approximate the solution of the DRBSDE, we use a localized algorithm, where at each discrete time step  $s_n$  we employ two independent neural networks:

- $\mathcal{Y}_n(s_n, X_n; \theta_n^1)$  to approximate  $\tilde{Y}_{s_n}$ ,
- $\mathcal{Z}_n(s_n, X_n; \theta_n^2)$  to approximate  $Z_{s_n}$ .

In practice, these two networks are combined into a single larger network, denoted by  $\mathcal{NN}_n(s_n, X_n; \theta)$ , where  $\theta_n = (\theta_n^1, \theta_n^2)$  represents the full set of trainable parameters. The network is trained in a way that ensures the obtained processes follow the dynamics in Equation (6.4). After the training, we set

$$\hat{Y}_n = \min(\max(\tilde{Y}_n, f_1(t_n, X_n)), -f_2(t_n, X_n^j)) \quad (6.6)$$

to ensure that the obtained approximation follows the doubly reflected solution in Equation (4.1).

The steps involved in training the neural networks and solving the DRBSDE are outlined in the following algorithm:

---

**Algorithm 1** Doubly-Reflecting FBSDE Solver
 

---

```

1: for  $n = N - 1$  to 0 do
2:   for each epoch do
3:     for  $j = 0$  to  $B$  do
4:       Initialize state  $X_0$  with initial condition  $x_0$ 
5:       for  $i = 0$  to  $n$  do
6:         Sample Brownian motion increment  $\Delta B_{i+1}^j$ 
7:         Compute  $X_{i+1}^j = X_i^j + b(t_i, X_i^j)\Delta t + \sigma(t_i, X_i^j)\Delta B_{i+1}^j$ 
8:       end for
9:       Compute  $\tilde{Y}_n^j, \hat{Z}_n^j = \mathcal{NN}_n(t_n, X_n^j; \theta_n)$ 
10:      if  $n = N - 1$  then
11:         $\hat{Y}_N^j = g(X_N^j)$ 
12:      else
13:         $\tilde{Y}_{n+1}^j = \mathcal{NN}_{n+1}(t_{n+1}, X_{n+1}^j; \theta_n^1)$ 
14:         $\hat{Y}_{n+1}^j = \min(\max(\tilde{Y}_{n+1}^j, f_1(t_{n+1}, X_{n+1}^j)), -f_2(t_{n+1}, X_{n+1}^j))$ 
15:      end if
16:       $\ell(\theta_n) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{j=1}^B |\hat{Y}_{n+1}^j - (\tilde{Y}_n^j - \varphi(t_n, X_n^j)\Delta t + \hat{Z}_n^j \Delta B_{n+1}^j)|^2$ 
17:      Update parameters  $\theta_n = \theta_n - r \nabla_{\theta_n} \ell(\theta_n)$ 
18:    end for
19:  end for
20: end for
21: return  $(\hat{Y}_n, \hat{Z}_n)$  for  $n = 0, \dots, N$ 

```

---

We have the following convergence result.

**Theorem 6.1.** *Let  $(\hat{Y}_n, \hat{Z}_n)$  for  $n = 0, \dots, N$  be neural network approximations of the doubly reflected BSDE solution  $(Y_t, Z_t)$  for  $t \in [0, T]$ . Then the error*

$$\max_{n=0, \dots, N} \mathbb{E} \left[ |Y_{t_n} - \hat{Y}_n|^2 \right] + \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \int_{t_n}^{t_{n+1}} \mathbb{E} \left[ |Z_t - \hat{Z}_n|^2 \right] dt$$

*converges towards 0 as we increase number of timesteps  $N$  and the number of neural networks' hidden parameters  $\theta_n$  for each  $n = 0, \dots, N$ .*

For the proof of the theorem, we refer to [3], where the authors prove a similar result for a system of reflected BSDEs with jumps. In order to extend the result to doubly reflected BSDE, one only needs to note that we have

$$|\hat{Y}_{t_n} - \hat{Y}_n| \leq |\tilde{Y}_{t_n} - \tilde{Y}_n|$$

due to formulation in Equation (6.6).

## 7 Numerical Implementation

To solve the DRBSDE (4.1), we implemented a feedforward neural network using Pytorch. The network follows the backward-in-time algorithm presented in Algorithm 1, designed to approximate the solution pair  $(Y, Z)$ . It consists of  $L = 3$  hidden layers, each with  $N_\ell = 11$  neurons for  $\ell = 1, 2, 3$ . The input layer has  $N_0 = 2$  neurons representing time and real-valued forward process, while the output layer has  $N_4 = 2$  neurons corresponding to the estimated values of  $Y$  and  $Z$ . We use  $\tanh$  as activation function in all hidden layers and perform the optimization using Adam algorithm, with a learning rate  $lr = 0.001$ .

We train the network for a total of  $N = 50$  time steps, we use 1000 training epochs for the first two optimization steps (corresponding to the last two time steps in the backward-in-time algorithm) and 200 epochs for the remaining steps. The batchsize is set to  $B = 2^{13}$ , and the training set is generated as described in Subsection 6.2. The input data is standardized before being passed to the neural network.

In the following, we report the implementation of two different problems. The first one is designed to be a fair game, constructed symmetrically to serve as a benchmark solution. This allows us to evaluate the performance of the algorithm in a controlled setting. The second is designed to have a greater economic interest by illustrating how CfDs actually works in energy markets.

### 7.1 Benchmark Problem: Symmetric Fair Game

In this implementation, we built a symmetric problem that aims to provide a benchmark solution to evaluate the performance of the algorithm. The forward process governing the state dynamics is modeled as an Ornstein Uhlenbeck process

$$dX_s = \kappa(\mu - X_s)ds + \sigma dB_s,$$

with  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\kappa, \sigma > 0$ . We set the payoff function

$$\varphi(s, x) = -\alpha x$$

with  $\alpha > 0$  scaling parameter. The terminal cost is set to  $g(x) = 0$  and the barriers are taken to be constants and symmetric

$$f_1(s, x) = f_2(s, x) \equiv \gamma > 0.$$


Due to the symmetric nature of the problem, both players are in identical strategic positions. This implies that neither player has any structural advantage and therefore the game is fair. The value of the game at time  $t = 0$  is  $Y_0 = 0$ . Furthermore, since the game dynamics and exit rules are symmetric, the exit times  $\tau_1, \tau_2$  must follow the same probability distribution.

We summarize the model parameters in the Table 1.

Simulation parameter	Value
Time horizon $T$	1.0
Long-term mean price $\mu$	0.0
Mean reversion rate $\kappa$	2.0
Volatility $\sigma$	1.0
Initial value $x_0$	0.0
Scaling factor $\alpha$	10.0
Barrier coefficient $\gamma$	2.0


Table 1: Parameter values for the Symmetric Benchmark Problem

Since the algorithm is local, we have separate loss functions for all the time steps. In Figure 1, we can see how the loss functions for  $n \geq N - 3$  decrease towards zero. The losses for  $n < N - 3$  behave in a similar way, so we omit their presentation.




**Fig. 1** Convergence of loss function at different timesteps  $n$  in the benchmark problem

In Figure 2a, we see one realization of the  $Y_t$  dynamics, while in Figure 2b the distribution of the estimated  $Y_0$  is presented. As we can see, the algorithm is able to capture the fair nature of the game.




(a) Dynamics of  $Y_t$



(b) Distribution of estimated  $Y_0$  compared to true value  $Y_0 = 0$

**Fig. 2** One realisation of the  $Y_t$  dynamics and the distribution of estimated  $Y_0$  over 100 independent training processes in the benchmark problem

Another topic of interest is the distribution of the first exit times  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$ . As we can see in Figure 3, the exit times seem to follow the same distribution as expected due to the fair nature of the game. Furthermore, we can observe that over time the probability of exiting the game decreases due to the dynamics being drawn to the terminal value  $Y_T = 0$ . In approximately 75 % of realisations the barriers are not reached. Conditionally on the event that the player exits the game, the expected exit time is approximately 0.31.



**Fig. 3** Estimated distribution of the first exit times in the benchmark problem

## 7.2 Parameter Calibration for the Underlying Price Process

In this section, we present the calibration of the parameters  $\mu, \sigma$  and  $\kappa$  governing the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process that drives the log-prices of electricity in (5.1). The calibration is based on historical data for France’s 1-year forward baseload power prices<sup>1</sup> for the entire year 2024. This dataset represents the agreed upon price for the continuous delivery of electricity one year into the future, reflecting market expectations for the average electricity price throughout 2025. The choice of the dataset is motivated by the fact that forward prices tends to be less volatile than spot prices, as they are not affected by short-term supply and demand imbalances. Moreover, forward prices are less noisy and exhibit fewer extreme spikes, making them more suitable for parameter estimation with continuous models.

To estimate the parameters, we first compute the logarithm of the observed dataset, then we perform maximum likelihood estimation (MLE). Given the discrete observations of the log-price process  $X_t$  at times  $t_0, t_1, \dots, t_N$ , this method exploits the fact that the conditional distribution of  $X_{t_{i+1}}$  given  $X_{t_i}$  for an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process is

$$X_{t_{i+1}} | X_{t_i} \sim \mathcal{N} \left( X_{t_i} + \kappa(\mu - X_{t_i})\Delta t, \sigma^2\Delta t \right), \quad (7.1)$$

where  $\Delta t$  is the time step. To estimate  $\mu, \sigma$ , and  $\kappa$ , we maximize the log-likelihood function

$$\log \mathcal{L}(\mu, \sigma, \kappa) = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} -\frac{1}{2} \left[ \log(2\pi\sigma^2\Delta t) + \frac{(X_{t_{i+1}} - (X_{t_i} + \kappa(\mu - X_{t_i})\Delta t))^2}{2\sigma^2\Delta t} \right]. \quad (7.2)$$


To perform the optimization we used the L-BFGS-B algorithm, a quasi-Newton optimization method which approximates the inverse Hessian matrix without storing it entirely and thus significantly reducing memory requirements.

For the long-term mean we get a value of  $\mu = 4.33$ , which translates to an average price of approximately 75.74 EUR/MWh. We estimate that the log price fluctuates with a standard deviation of  $\sigma = 0.43$  per time step and we measure a mean-reversion rate  $\kappa = 23.67$ . In this case, the value of  $\kappa$  indicates that the prices return to the long-term mean in approximately 15 days.

---


<sup>1</sup>Historical data on France’s 1-year forward baseload power prices is available at <https://en.macromicro.me/series/24101/france-baseload-power-price-1-year-forward>

To assess the quality of the calibration, in Figure 4a we compare the observed data with a realization of the simulated Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. In Figure 4b we compare the distribution of the observed and estimated prices and observe a close match between the two histograms. To further evaluate the model fit, we analyze the residuals i.e. the deviation between the observed log-prices and the estimated drift component of the process. We performed the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) goodness-of-fit test and obtained a p-value of 0.3116, which suggests that there is no significant evidence to conclude that the residuals deviate from a normal distribution. In Figures 4d and 4c, we report the Q-Q plot of the residual and the autocorrelation function (ACF) of the residual, which shows no spikes out of the confidence bound at any of the lags and suggests that the residuals are uncorrelated.



(a) Observed log-prices (blue) and log-prices generated by the fitted Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process (red, dashed)

(b) Comparison of histograms for observed and simulated log-prices.



(c) Autocorrelation Function (ACF) of the residuals.

(d) Q-Q plot of the residuals.

**Fig. 4** Validation of the calibration for the log-price process.

### 7.3 Implementation of the CfD in Energy Markets


In this second example, we implement the model for the Contract for Differences (CdF) presented in Section 5.

For the process  $X_t$  in (5.1), we use the parameters estimated in the calibration section 7.2 and set today's value of the log price to  $X_0 = 4.35$ . We then address the selection of parameters related to the payoff function (3.1), which includes the strike price and the penalties for early exit. The strike price represents the agreed-upon price at which electricity is exchanged under the CfD. In real-world markets, the strike price of a CfD is typically determined through an auction process, reflecting market conditions and competition at the time. However, for the purposes of modelling and to ensure simplicity, we set this value equal to today's price of electricity, namely  $K = P_0$ . Finally, it remains to set the coefficients  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$  in (5.8), modelling the penalties for early exits. In the context of hedging risks associated with renewable energy investments, we assign a higher penalty to Player 1, reflecting the realistic assumption that the public entity (Player 1) is less likely to exit early from a contract within a typically small-sized energy producer (Player 2). We thus set  $\gamma_1 = 1.56$  and  $\gamma_2 = 0.31$ .


As shown in Figure 5, the loss function for the time steps  $n \geq N - 3$  decreases across iterations, approaching zero. The losses for  $n < N - 3$ , which are omitted, exhibit a similar trend. In Figure 6a, we report a realization for  $Y_t$  in which both players exercise early exit. The estimated distribution of  $Y_0$  across 100 independent simulations is illustrated in Figure 6b. The distribution has mean 1.08 indicating that the game yields an admissible investment for Player 2, ensuring coverage against potential risk. This suggests that the electricity producer can expect to achieve sufficient returns to secure their position. This outcome aligns with expectations, as the strike price of the game is set above the long-term mean of the price process dynamics. Additionally, we observed that the empirical distributions of exit times for both the upper and lower barriers are consistent across the 100 reruns, though these results are omitted. The histogram in Figure 7a shows the distribution of the optimal exit times for both players. For the chosen strike price and the penalties, we get that Player 1 early exits the game 9.5% of the time, and Player 2 18% of the time. We also observe that in cases where these decide to exit, Player 1 does so only in the first part of the time horizon and Player 2 in the second. Finally, the scatterplot in Figure 7b compares the exit times for each player with the electricity prices at the time of exit, which slightly decreases for both players as time progresses.

Simulation parameter	Value
Time horizon $T$	1.0
Discount factor $\rho$	0.04
Long-term mean price $\mu$	4.33
Mean reversion rate $\kappa$	23.67
Volatility $\sigma$	0.43
Initial value $X_0$	4.35
Strike price $K$	4.35
Scaling factor $Q$	1
Upper barrier coeff. $\gamma_1$	1.56
Lower barrier coeff. $\gamma_2$	0.31


Table 2: Parameter values for the CfD example



**Fig. 5** Convergence of loss function at different timesteps  $n$  in the CfD example




(a) Dynamics of  $Y_t$




(b) Distribution of estimated  $Y_0$

**Fig. 6** One realisation of the  $Y_t$  dynamics and the distribution of estimated  $Y_0$  over 100 independent training processes in the CfD example



(a) Estimated distribution of the first exit times



(b) Relationship between first exit times and price dynamics

**Fig. 7** First exit time analysis in the CfD example

**Acknowledgment.** The authors (N. Agram and G. Pucci) would like to express their gratitude to René Aïd for his insightful discussions and valuable feedback during his visit to KTH.

## References

- [1] R. Aïd, L. Campi, N. Langrené, and H. Pham. A probabilistic numerical method for optimal multiple switching problems in high dimension. *SIAM*, 2014.
- [2] A. Ason and J. Dal Poz. Contracts for difference: The instrument of choice for the energy transition. *OIES Paper: ET*, (34), 2024.
- [3] E. Bayraktar, A. Cohen, and A. Nellis. A neural network approach to high-dimensional optimal switching problems with jumps in energy markets. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, 14(4):1028–1061, 2023.
- [4] P. Beiter, J. Guillet, M. Jansen, E. Wilson, and L. Kitzing. The enduring role of contracts for difference in risk management and market creation for renewables. *Nature Energy*, 9(1):20–26, 2024.
- [5] K. Burdzy, W. Kang, and K. Ramanan. The skorokhod problem in a time-dependent interval. *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications*, 119(2):428–452, 2009.
- [6] European Commission. Proposal for a regulation of the european parliament and of the council amending regulations (eu) 2019/943 and (eu) 2019/942 as well as directives (eu) 2018/2001 and (eu) 2019/944 to improve the union’s electricity market design. Official EU Document, 2023. URL <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A52023PC0148>.
- [7] J. Cvitanifá and I. Karatzas. Backward stochastic differential equations with reflection and dynkin games. *The Annals of Probability*, 24(4):2024–2056, 1996.
- [8] E. Ekström and G. Peskir. Optimal stopping games for markov processes. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 47:684–702, 2008.
- [9] S. Hamadene. Mixed zero-sum stochastic differential games and american game options. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 45:496–518, 2006.
- [10] S. Hamadene and M. Hassani. Bsdes with two reflecting barriers: the general result. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 132:237–264, 2005.
- [11] S. Hamadene and M. Hassani. Bsdes with two reflecting barriers driven by a brownian motion and poisson noise and related dynkin game. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 11:121–145, 2006.

- [12] S. Hamadene and J.-P. Lepeltier. Reflected bsdes and mixed game problem. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 85:177–188, 2000.
- [13] C. Hure, H. Pham, and X. Warin. Deep backward schemes for high-dimensional nonlinear pdes. *Mathematics of Computation*, 89:1547–1579, 2019.
- [14] I. Karatzas and S. E. Shreve. *Brownian Motion and Stochastic Calculus*. New York, 1991.
- [15] J. J. Lucia and E. S. Schwartz. Electricity prices and power derivatives: Evidence from the nordic power exchange. *Review of Derivatives Research*, 5:5–50, 2002.
- [16] M. Slaby. An explicit representation of the extended skorohod map with two time-dependent boundaries. *Journal of Probability and Statistics*, 2010:Article ID 846320, 18 pages, 2010. doi: 10.1155/2010/846320.