Modeling Robust Energy Systems Considering Weather Uncertainty and Nuclear Power Failures: A Case Study in Northern Europe

Kamran Forghani^{a,*}, Xiaoming Kan^a, Lina Reichenberg^a, Fredrik Hedenus^a

^aDepartment of Space, Earth and Environment, Chalmers University of Technology, 412 96, Göteborg, Sweden

Abstract

Capacity expansion models used for policy support have increasingly represented both the variability and uncertainty of weatherdependent generation (wind and solar). However, although also uncertain, as demonstrated by the performance of the French nuclear power fleet in 2022, uncertainty arising from nuclear power outages has been largely neglected in the literature. This paper presents the first capacity expansion model that considers uncertainty in nuclear power availability caused by unplanned outages. We propose a mathematical model that combines a scenario-based stochastic optimization approach (to deal with weather-related uncertainties) with a data-driven adjustable robust optimization approach (to deal with nuclear failure-related uncertainties). The robust model represents the bulky behavior of nuclear power plants, with large (1 GW) units that are either on or off, while at the same time letting the model decide on the optimal amount of nuclear capacity. We tested the model in a case for Northern Europe (seven nodes) with a time resolution of 1250 time steps. Our findings show that nuclear power outages do, in fact, impose a vulnerability on the energy system if not considered in the planning phase. Our proposed model performs well and finds solutions that prevent Loss-of-Load (at a price of robustness of 0.6%), even in more extreme weather conditions. Robust solutions are characterized by a higher capacity of gas plants, but, perhaps surprisingly, nuclear power capacity is barely affected.

Keywords: weather uncertainty, nuclear outage, stochastic optimization, robust optimization, electricity systems, capacity expansion

1. Introduction

Renewable energy technologies, such as wind and solar power, along with nuclear power, are potentially key energy sources in low-carbon energy systems. However, debates persist within the scientific community, as well as in public and political spheres, regarding how their variability limits the extent to which energy systems may rely on them, see [1, 2]. While the uncertainty in wind and solar power outputs is often highlighted, the risk of unplanned outages of nuclear power plants receives comparatively little attention. Even less explored is the potential interaction between these two uncertainties. Despite their significance, incorporating uncertainty into large-scale energy system planning is not a common practice, even though its importance has been highlighted by previous studies [3, 4]. In this study, we develop a novel method that combines stochastic and robust optimization to address uncertainties in wind, solar, and nuclear power outputs for robust energy system design.

The need to account for these uncertainties has become increasingly evident. The recent energy crisis in Europe vividly highlights the urgent need for robust energy systems that can reliably meet demand even under unusual circumstances [5, 6]. However, the energy system analyses that inform policymakers' decisions rely heavily on deterministic approaches, which often

*Corresponding author

result in solutions that are not resilient to even regular operational uncertainties (e.g., inter-annual weather variability) and may underestimate the true cost of a robust energy system.

To address uncertainty in energy system planning, several studies have explored the importance of weather year selection [7, 8] and the impact of prolonged periods of low solar and wind output [9, 10]. These studies typically adopt a deterministic approach and rely on scenario or sensitivity analysis [11], which helps assess the effects of different assumptions about uncertain inputs. Similar methods include global sensitivity analysis [12] and Monte Carlo simulations [13]. However, deterministic approaches do not explicitly incorporate uncertainty into the decision-making process [14, 15].

To address decision-making under uncertainty, stochastic and robust optimization methods are increasingly being used to investigate various aspects of the energy system, such as investment costs [16–19], fuel costs [18], discount rates [18], and energy demand [17, 20]. More relevant to our focus, some studies have incorporated wind and solar output uncertainty into the design of future energy systems. Seljom and Tomasgard [21] made early efforts to incorporate wind power output uncertainty in an energy system model for Denmark. Perera et al. [22] developed a stochastic-robust optimization method to account for wind and demand uncertainties in Sweden. Seljom et al. [23] incorporated stochastic wind and solar outputs into Norway's long-term energy model, finding that stochastic optimization leads to 13% less solar and 2% more wind capacity, with a

Email address: kamranf@chalmers.se (Fredrik Hedenus)

¹This work has been submitted to Applied Energy for possible publication.

system cost difference of less than 1%. Verástegui et al. [24] applied adaptive robust optimization to address operational uncertainties in renewable power outputs and electricity demand in Chile, showing that a robust design increases system costs by 8%–20% compared to a deterministic approach. Based on the literature, weather uncertainty's impact on system costs seems to vary significantly across different models and contexts.

Regarding nuclear power outages, Murphy et al. [25] examined the impact of temperature-dependent forced outages of thermal power generators on the operation of a regional electricity market in the US. They found that accounting for temperaturedependent failures increases the required reserve capacity from 16% to 23%. In contrast to temperature-dependent outages in warm climate zones, nuclear power outages caused by technical failures are more prevalent across all countries and far less predictable. These failures can result in full outages lasting several months, significantly affecting the reliability of the electricity system [26]. For instance, in France, a record 26 of its 56 reactors were offline due to pipe corrosion during the energy crisis in Europe in 2022 [27]. However, to the best of our knowledge, no studies have yet incorporated these uncertainties into decision-making for energy system planning.

In this paper, we present an energy system model for capacity expansion that incorporates two types of uncertainties: weatherrelated uncertainty arising from the variability in wind and solar power outputs due to changing weather conditions and failurerelated uncertainty arising from nuclear power plant outages. We use a scenario-based approach to address weather-related uncertainties, while a robust optimization method is applied to deal with failure-related uncertainty. To assess the impact of these uncertainties on energy system planning, we conduct experiments using the developed model for the northern European electricity system.

The aims of the paper are to:

- 1. Develop a methodology to account for both weather uncertainties and unplanned nuclear power outages in energy system planning.
- Quantify the direction and approximate magnitude of impacts on cost and energy system design from incorporating weather uncertainties and unplanned nuclear power outages into long-term energy system planning.
- 3. Assess the *cost* of resilience, as well as the *value* of designing for resilience if something does not go as planned.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we review typical methods used to address uncertainties related to component failure in power systems. Section 3 explains the base energy system model and key assumptions and formulates the problem as a scenario-based two-stage program. We then derive the robust counterpart by incorporating unplanned nuclear failure uncertainty and present the methodology for solving the robust model. Section 4 introduces the case study, weather scenarios, and simulation cases, followed by presenting and discussing the results and comparing system performance across different cases in terms of system cost, capacity mix, and loss of load. Finally, Section 5 provides conclusions and directions for future research.

2. Review of studies on component failure in energy systems

In this paper, we study a capacity expansion problem for electricity generation facing two types of uncertainties: uncertainty in the wind and solar power outputs (weather-related uncertainty) and uncertainty in the availability of nuclear power plants (uncertainty related to component failure in energy systems). Scenario-based stochastic optimization approaches have widely been used in the literature to account for weather-related uncertainties, see, e.g., [28-30]. Since a relatively large and accurate dataset of wind and solar capacity factors is accessible, this approach can effectively represent different weather-year conditions using scenarios. However, limited attention has been paid to component failure, more specifically nuclear power plant failure, in the literature. The main focus of this section is to review the existing studies that utilize stochastic and robust optimization approaches to deal with component failures. For more comprehensive reviews on stochastic and robust optimization applications in electricity systems, readers are referred to [31-33].

In real-world electricity systems, due to unpredictable events, components such as transmission lines, power generation units, and equipment face the risk of failure. Researchers have utilized different approaches to represent the uncertain operating states of these components when failures happen; examples of such studies can be found in [34, 35].

Although scenario-based optimization approaches are straightforward to implement, they have limitations in effectively accounting for component failure in power systems. Section 3.2 discusses these limitations in more detail. Aside from using scenarios, another approach to representing component failures is to model them using box uncertainty. For example, Ratanakuakangwan and Morita [36] assumed that available dispatchable capacity is influenced by the risk of power plant outages and applied Soyster [37]'s robust optimization framework (based on box uncertainty) to ensure the total dispatchable capacity meets the projected peak demand. Despite its simplicity, the conventional box uncertainty approach is highly conservative, resulting in the maximum price of robustness; see [38, 39] for more details.

In many cases, optimization problems are single-period, where decisions are made all at once, and there is no opportunity to adapt. Static Robust Optimization (RO) models are well-suited in those cases. These models focus on minimizing risk based on the worst-case realization of uncertain parameters. In contrast, for multi-period optimization problems, which happens to be more common in electricity systems, Ben-Tal et al. [40] proposed the idea of Adjustable Robust Optimization (ARO), also known as two-stage or adaptive robust optimization. In ARO, decision-making occurs in two stages. The first stage involves *Here-and-Now* variables (e.g., investment decisions on power plants, transmission lines, and storage facilities), which are determined before uncertainty is revealed. The second stage involves *Wait-and-See* variables (e.g., power generation schedule and load shedding), which are decided after the uncertainty is resolved.

Wang et al. [41] proposed an ARO approach to address the contingency-constrained unit commitment problem, considering contingencies in both generators and transmission lines. To obtain a robust unit commitment schedule, the objective was to minimize the total generation cost in a multi-bus power grid under an N-k security criterion. The N-k security criterion specifies that for a system with N elements, there are $\binom{N}{k}$ possible contingencies, and no more than k failures can occur simultaneously. In a similar study conducted by Zhang et al. [42], researchers dealt with this issue by extending the N-k security criterion to also include the probabilities of component failures in the problem. These studies mainly concentrated on the modeling of uncertainty sets considering the simultaneous failure of multiple components in the system. More extensive analysis was made by, for instance, Guo and Zhao [43], where not only singular events were considered but also uncertainties related to the duration of component failures. They investigated energy management in microgrids under uncertainties in both the power outputs of renewable energy sources and the duration of microgrid islanding event periods ¹. They assumed that the islanding time is an uncertain parameter and the microgrid undergoes the islanding mode for k out of N periods. Similarly, Gholami et al. [44] studied microgrid islanding events while considering uncertainties in both the islanding time and duration.

ARO approaches, such as the ones reviewed earlier, offer a more accurate representation of system functionality under uncertain conditions. By employing ARO, it is possible to develop more resilient energy systems, often leading to less conservative solutions compared to static RO. This approach is therefore used in this study to address nuclear power plant outages.

2.1. Research gaps in nuclear outage modeling

In capacity expansion problems for electricity systems, the power outputs of the generation units (such as wind, solar, and nuclear) could vary due to weather conditions and technical failures. Researchers have already used stochastic and robust optimization approaches to deal with uncertainty in wind and solar power outputs. However, to the best of our knowledge, the uncertainty in nuclear power output due to unplanned outages has not been investigated. A summary of the reviewed papers addressing component failures in electricity systems is provided in Table 1. As this table shows, there is only one study, [36], dedicated to component failures in capacity expansion problems where the authors used a conventional robust optimization approach (box uncertainty) to deal with uncertainty in the capacity of dispatchable generating units. Modeling uncertainty in the availability of nuclear power plants requires considering both the failure start time and duration (referred to as temporal uncertainty in the table). Additionally, multiple plants may

fail simultaneously (denoted as spatial uncertainty in the table), and historical data show that failure rates vary across different months. Moreover, the number of nuclear plants in the system is a decision variable that must be determined by solving the capacity expansion model. However, existing models developed to deal with component failure models do not account for these factors simultaneously. To address this research gap, this paper introduces an ARO approach to represent uncertainty in nuclear power outages.

3. Problem description and mathematical model

The capacity expansion model used in this study is a modified version of the model proposed in [46]. The model represents investment in power generation capacities, batteries, and transmission lines. Power generation sources include photovoltaic solar (**P**), wind (**W**), hydropower (**H**), and nuclear (**N**), along with a natural gas turbine (**G**). The power produced using these technologies can be stored in batteries for future use. Each technology is characterized by parameters such as investment cost, operational cost, CO_2 emissions factor, and capacity factor. Transmission lines can also be established to transfer the electricity among a set of regions \mathcal{R} .

Since the electricity load and the inputs for wind, solar, and hydropower technologies are variable in time, in our model, we use annual time series data to capture the variations in those inputs. Having an hourly temporal resolution makes the model computationally heavy to solve. Therefore, we use a parameter called the time step, ts, to adjust the model's temporal resolution. The objective of the models is to find a capacity mix that minimizes the levelized total cost of the system. Load shedding is allowed in our model, and the shed load is penalized in the objective function by a parameter called the load shedding cost, c^S. The amount of shed load at each time step, however, must not exceed a certain fraction, sr, of the electricity load. There is no constraint on CO₂ emission levels, and a carbon tax approach is applied in the objective function to penalize emissions. The electricity system and the interactions among its components are depicted in Figure 1.

In real-world power systems, nuclear power plants may become unavailable due to technical failures and maintenance requirements. To model nuclear plant availability, we categorize nuclear power outages into two types: *planned outages*, resulting from scheduled maintenance, and *unplanned outages*, mainly caused by unexpected technical failures. Since planned outages can be scheduled in advance, we introduce the parameter β , which represents the fraction of time that needs to be allocated for scheduled nuclear plant maintenance. This parameter is directly incorporated into the stochastic model discussed in Section 3.1. In contrast, unplanned outages are unpredictable and beyond operational control. The consequences of such outages may become significantly problematic, especially if a substantial portion of nuclear capacity becomes unavailable during periods of low wind and solar generation. To address this, Section 3.2

¹events where the microgrid is disconnected from the network due to interruption in transmission lines

			Uncer	tainty related	to component f	failures	Other u		
Paper	Problem scope	Investment decisions	Uncertain parameters	Spatial uncertainty	Temporal uncertainty	Uncertainty modeling method	Uncertain Parameters	Uncertainty modeling method	Solution approach
[34]	Power supply chain	\checkmark	Generator and transmission line outages	\checkmark		Scenario-based RO ^b	-	-	MIP solver
[35]	Unit commitment with natural gas network		Generator and transmission line outages	\checkmark	\checkmark	Scenario-based SO	Load	Scenario-based SO	MIP solver
[36]	Capacity expansion	\checkmark	Reliable capacity			RO ^c	Capacity factors Load Capital and fixed O&M cost	Scenario-based RO ^b	MIP solver
[41]	Unit commitment		Generator and transmission line outages	\checkmark		ARO with <i>N</i> – <i>k</i> security criterion	-	-	Bender's decompositions
[42]	Unit commitment		Generator outages	\checkmark	\checkmark	ARO with $N-k$ and α -cut security criterion	Capacity factors Load	ARO with box-type uncertainty set	Bender's decomposition
[43]	Microgrid scheduling		Micro grid islanding time		\checkmark	ARO ^a	Capacity factors	ARO ^a	Column and constraint constraint generation
[44]	Microgrid scheduling		Micro grid islanding time and duration		√	ARO ^a	Capacity factors Load Market prices	ARO ^a	Column and constraint constraint generation
This paper	Capacity expansion	\checkmark	Nuclear power outages	\checkmark	\checkmark	Data-driven ARO with <i>N–k</i> security criterion	Capacity factors	Scenario-based SO	Heuristic decomposition

Table 1: Overview of studies addressing uncertainties related to component failures in power systems.

a,b,c Bertsimas and Sim [38] approach [a]; Mulvey et al. [45] approach [b]; Soyster [37] approach [c]

extends the stochastic model by integrating unplanned nuclear outages through a data-driven ARO approach.

It should be mentioned that the notation list provided in Appendix A is used throughout the paper in the development of the mathematical models.



Figure 1: Schematic of interactions in the proposed energy systems.

3.1. Weather Uncertainty model

We use a scenario-based stochastic optimization approach to capture the uncertainty in wind and solar power outputs (i.e., weather-related uncertainties), a method widely used in the literature (see, for example, [28–30]). Since a relatively large and accurate dataset of wind and solar capacity factors is available, we can select several weather years as scenarios representing different weather-year conditions. Some of these scenarios can be chosen in a way that realistically captures extreme weather events based on historical data. The mathematical model for the proposed capacity expansion problem, which incorporates uncertainty in wind and solar capacity factors using scenarios, is given in Appendix B. This model is referred to as the *Weather Uncertainty* (WU) model, and later, in Section 3.2, it is extended to incorporate the uncertainty in nuclear power availability. It should be noted that, in Section 4.1, the term *Deterministic* (D) model is used to refer to a specific case of the WU model. In this case, a single weather year close to the average weather conditions is used as a scenario in the WU model for making comparisons between stochastic and deterministic approaches.

3.2. Weather and Nuclear Uncertainty model

In this section, the WU model described in Section 3.1 is extended to address unplanned nuclear power outages. Scenariobased approaches, such as those presented in [34, 35], have limitations in representing the uncertainty associated with component failures due to the following reasons:

• **Complexity of the scenario tree**: Since the number and layout of components (e.g., nuclear power plants) are decision variables, an upper bound must be set, and distinct scenarios must be created to represent their state over time (since nuclear power plants are treated as discrete units¹).

¹Unlike the simultaneous reduction in wind and solar power output, nuclear failures typically do not occur at the same time, which adds complexity in scenario generation for nuclear plants.

This approach is impractical, as the number of scenarios grows exponentially, making stochastic optimization computationally intractable.

• Underestimation of consequences: Stochastic optimization may underestimate the risks of rare but extreme events, such as simultaneous failures of multiple components during periods of low wind and solar output, which could lead to a loss of load. In contrast, robust optimization can provide preparedness against worst-case scenarios, thus mitigating the risks of loss of load.

Additionally, approaches such as those proposed in [41, 42] (which employ the *N*–*k* security criterion) and [43, 44] (focused on the time and duration of outages) are not directly applicable for modeling nuclear power outages. The reason is that, firstly, in a capacity expansion problem, the number and layout of nuclear plants are decision variables rather than predefined inputs. Secondly, when modeling nuclear power outage uncertainty, factors such as outage start time, duration, the number of simultaneous outages, and their time correlation must be considered¹. These factors make existing uncertainty modeling methods (see Table 1) less effective for representing nuclear power outages.

Therefore, we employ an ARO approach to address nuclear power outage uncertainty. In this respect, a data-driven uncertainty set is combined with a discrete-state uncertainty set to define the uncertainty in the ARO model. A data-driven uncertainty set uses empirical data to construct a polyhedron that models uncertainty in parameters. These sets are used to obtain robust solutions to optimization problems by capturing possible variations in uncertain parameters while relying on observed historical data. This helps reduce the conservativeness of robust solutions; see [47–50].

We utilize historical nuclear power outage data [26] to simulate unplanned nuclear power outages throughout the year. Let NM denote the number of outage samples available in the historical data, and let $os_{i,m}^{M}$ denote the unplanned outage time (in hours) for the *i*-th sample in month *m*. We can use these samples to simulate unplanned nuclear power outages on an hourly basis, denoted by $os_{i,t}$. To do so, we apply Algorithm GenerateOutageSamples(N) to generate N samples, representing whether a nuclear plant is offline (represented by 1) or active (represented by 0) at each hour of the year. It should be noted that to convert monthly outages, $os_{i,m}^{M}$, to hourly samples, Algorithm GenerateOutageSamples(N) assumes that each monthly unplanned outage involves one incident that starts randomly within $[h^{s}, h^{s} + h_{j}^{M} - os_{i,j}^{M}]$, where h^{s} and h_{j}^{M} represent the starting hour and the total hours in the corresponding month, respectively.

The amount of unplanned nuclear power outages depends on the number of nuclear plants in the system. Let's assume that the number of nuclear plants in the system, i.e., $\sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \operatorname{Cap}_{r,N}$, is Function GenerateOutageSamples(N)

```
os<sub>i,t</sub> \leftarrow 0, \forall i \in \{1, 2, ..., N\}, t \in \mathcal{T}

for i \leftarrow 1 to N do

\begin{vmatrix}
h^s \leftarrow 1 \\
id \leftarrow \mathbf{Rand}(1, NM) \\
for <math>j \in \mathcal{M} do

ot \leftarrow os_{id,j}^M \\
if ot > 0 then

\begin{vmatrix}
\bar{h}^s \leftarrow h^s + \mathbf{Rand}(0, h_j^M - ot) \\
for <math>h \leftarrow \bar{h}^s to \bar{h}^s + ot - 1 do

\begin{vmatrix}
os_{i,t} \leftarrow 1 \\
end \\
h^s \leftarrow h_j^M + h^s \\
end \\
return os
\end{vmatrix}
```

equal to $n \in N$, where N defines the set of possible numbers of nuclear plants in the system. To adjust the conservativeness of the model, we introduce a parameter called the confidence level, α , and impose two sets of constraints as uncertainty budgets in the uncertainty set. One constraint ensures that the annual unplanned nuclear power outages remain below a threshold, denoted by AOP. The other constraint ensures that no more than MOP outages occur simultaneously at any hour. For any given number of nuclear plants, n, and confidence level $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, we use Algorithm Percentiles(n, α , N^P) to perform simulations and determine AOP and MOP. In this algorithm, the parameter N^P represents the number of outage samples generated to estimate AOP and MOP. With these explanations, we define the following data-driven discrete-state uncertainty set, denoted by $\mathcal{U}(n, \alpha, N^P)$, for the ARO model.

$$\mathcal{U}(\mathbf{n}, \alpha, \mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{P}}) := \begin{cases} z_{i,s} \in \{0, 1\} : \\ (\text{AOP}, \text{MOP}) = \text{Percentiles}(\mathbf{n}, \alpha, \mathbf{N}^{\mathrm{P}}), \end{cases}$$
(1)

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N^{\kappa}} z_{i,s} = \mathbf{n},\tag{2}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N^{\mathsf{R}}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{H}} \operatorname{os}_{i,t} \cdot z_{i,s} \le \operatorname{AOP},$$
(3)

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} \operatorname{os}_{i,t} \cdot \mathbf{z}_{i,s} \le \operatorname{MOP}, \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, \mathbf{N}^{\mathsf{R}}\}, \ s \in \mathcal{S}, \ t \in \mathcal{H} \}$$

$$(4)$$

The so-called uncertainty set comprises three sets of constraints. Constraint (1) sets the annual and maximum number of unplanned nuclear power outages by performing N^P simulations

¹Historical data shows that outages are influenced by weather conditions, e.g., higher failure rates during hot seasons due to cooling requirements.

via Algorithm Percentiles(.)¹. Constraint (2) ensures that, out of N^R outage samples, one is selected for each nuclear plant in every scenario. Essentially, this constraint is inspired by the datadriven uncertainty set and determines both the outage time and duration for each nuclear plant². Constraints (3) and (4) serve as two uncertainty budgets that respectively limit the annual and hourly outages.

Function Percentiles(n, α , N) $\mathbf{O}^{\max} \leftarrow \emptyset$ and $\mathbf{O}^{\mathrm{T}} \leftarrow \emptyset$ for $i \leftarrow 1$ to N doos \leftarrow GenerateOutageSamples(n) $\mathbf{O}^{\max} \leftarrow \mathbf{O}^{\max} \cup \{\max_{t \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \operatorname{os}_{j,t}\}$ $\mathbf{O}^{\mathrm{T}} \leftarrow \mathbf{O}^{\mathrm{T}} \cup \{\sum_{t \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{j=1}^{n} \operatorname{os}_{j,t}\}$ endMOP \leftarrow Quantile($\mathbf{O}^{\mathrm{T}}, \alpha$)AOP \leftarrow Quantile($\mathbf{O}^{\mathrm{T}}, \alpha$)return MOP, AOP

Now, assuming that the number of nuclear plants in the system, n, belongs to the set N, the Min-Max-Min robust model of the problem, under the uncertainty set $\mathcal{U}(n, \alpha, N^P)$, can be expressed as follows. Henceforth, this model will be referred to as the *Weather and Nuclear Uncertainty* (WNU) model.

WNU model:

$$SC(\alpha, N^{P}, N^{R}) = \min_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \max_{z \in \mathcal{U}(n, \alpha, N^{P})} \min \left\{ IC + FC + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \pi_{s} \left(OC_{s} + c^{tax} \cdot TE_{s} + c^{S} \cdot TS_{s} \right) \right\}$$
(5)

Subject to: (B.2)–(B.7), (B.9)–(B.24)

 $\mathbf{E}_{s,r,\mathbf{N},t} \le \operatorname{Cap}_{r,\mathbf{N}} \cdot \operatorname{ts} - \operatorname{PO}_{s,r,t} - \operatorname{UO}_{s,r,t}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \ r \in \mathcal{R}, \ t \in \mathcal{T}$ (6)

$$\sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \operatorname{Cap}_{r,\mathbf{N}} = \mathbf{m} \cdot \mathbf{n} \tag{7}$$

$$\sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \mathrm{UO}_{s,r,t} = \mathrm{m} \cdot \mathrm{ts} \sum_{i=1}^{\mathrm{N}^{\mathrm{R}}} \mathrm{os}_{i,t} \cdot \mathrm{z}_{i,s}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \ t \in \mathcal{T}$$
(8)

$$\mathrm{UO}_{s,r,t} \ge 0, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \ r \in \mathcal{R}, \ t \in \mathcal{T}$$

$$\tag{9}$$

In the WNU model, the objective function in Equation (5) minimizes the worst-case cost of the system under the uncertainty set $\mathcal{U}(n, \alpha, N^P)$ and confidence level α . The innermost optimization problem in Equation (5) minimizes the SC, given that the number of nuclear plants in the system is n, and z are the selected samples. All of the constraints in the innermost optimization problem are the same as those in the stochastic model presented in Section 3.1, except for Constraint (B.8), which needs to be replaced with Constraint (6) to account for unplanned nuclear power outages as well. Three additional constraints must be considered. Constraint (7) ensures that the total capacity of the nuclear plants in the system equals the number of nuclear plants multiplied by the unit capacity of a nuclear plant, m, in GW. Constraint (8) ensures that the total unplanned nuclear power loss (in MWh) in each time step is determined according to the selected outage samples. Finally, constraint (9) states that the decision variable corresponding to the unplanned nuclear power outages is non-negative.

3.3. Simulation model

We perform simulations to evaluate the quality of solutions derived from solving the models. This allows us to assess the solutions more accurately using a relatively large historical dataset. For a given solution, Cap (representing the capacity mix of various technologies) and n (the number of nuclear plants in the corresponding capacity mix), the simulation involves independently solving the Simulation problem (given in Appendix C) for each year $s \in S'$, where S' is the set of simulation years. Since some solutions may fail to meet the demand constraint in certain simulation years, we introduce the decision variable $EL_{s,r,t}$ to quantify the load loss in simulation year s, at region r, in time step t. This load loss is then penalized using a sufficiently large cost, BM, in the objective function. After solving the optimization problem for each $s \in S'$, the average values of the system costs and loss-of-loads are calculated to represent the simulation outcome.

3.4. Solution method

Solving the WNU model presented in Section 3.2 to optimality is computationally challenging. This is because the proposed mathematical model is a nonlinear optimization (due to the trilevel Min-Max-Min structure of the objective function in (5)), making it difficult for current solvers to solve the problem effectively. Although this model can be linearized using duality theory³, see also [32, 51], solving the reformulated model still remains challenging, even when the capacity mix, $Cap_{r,p}$, is predetermined. One could argue that to reduce the number of binary variables, we can reduce the number of samples in the WNU model, i.e., N^R, or increase the time step parameter, i.e., ts, as it significantly affects the number of variables and constraints in the problem. This, however, makes the model unrealistic to the extent that the resulting solutions become far from reality.

 $^{{}^{1}}N^{P}$ needs to be sufficiently large to ensure the accurate calculation of AOP and MOP. For our experiments in Section 4, we set $N^{P} = 100,000$.

 $^{^{2}}N^{R}$ also needs to be sufficiently large to ensure that the uncertainty set adequately covers all potential outage scenarios. This parameter, however, affects the computational complexity of the model. For our experiments in Section 4, we set $N^{R} = 5,000$.

³The model can be converted into a mixed-integer program by writing the dual of the innermost problem as a maximization problem. Let $\lambda_{s,h}$ denote the dual variable associated with Constraint (8). From duality theory, we would have $m \cdot ts \sum_{s \in S} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} os_{i,t} \cdot z_{i,s} \cdot \lambda_{s,h}$ in the objective function. The bi-linear term $os_{i,t} \cdot z_{i,s}$ can be linearized using an auxiliary variable and additional constraints.

Thus, to solve the WNU model more effectively, we propose a heuristic approach that mitigates these complications by solving it iteratively through a master problem and a sub-problem. When the number of nuclear plants, n, and the binary variable, \mathbf{z} , in the WNU model are fixed and denoted as $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$, the model simplifies to a linear program (LP), referred to as the Master problem(n, $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$).

Master problem(n, \bar{z}): min SC (10) subject to: (B.2)–(B.7), (B.9)–(B.24), (6), (7), (9)

$$\sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \mathrm{UO}_{s,r,t} = \mathrm{m} \cdot \mathrm{ts} \sum_{i=1}^{\mathrm{N}^{\kappa}} \mathrm{os}_{i,t} \cdot \bar{\mathrm{z}}_{i,s}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \ t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (11)$$

Assume a known capacity mix, denoted by \overline{Cap} , consisting of n nuclear plants. For this partial solution, to identify the extreme periods when nuclear power outages maximize the system cost, we can formulate a Max-Min optimization problem for each scenario s. However, this results in the same computational complexity issue discussed earlier due to the nonlinearity of the model. Our heuristic simplifies this process by avoiding the direct solution of the Max-Min problem. Instead, a simplified problem is solved to identify potential periods when nuclear power outages are more likely to result in loss of load. Given a known capacity mix Cap, we substitute the Max-Min objective function with another function that correlates with the highest system cost. A suitable alternative is assigning nuclear power outages to those time steps when the net electricity load, γ_t , as given by Equation (12), is at its maximum. Our preliminary tests revealed that a normalized version of this parameter, shown in Equation (13), yields better results (i.e., generally resulting in a higher system cost).

$$\gamma_{t} = \max\left\{0, \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \operatorname{load}_{r,t} - \sum_{p \in \{\mathbf{H},\mathbf{G}\}} \overline{\operatorname{Cap}}_{r,p} - \sum_{p \in \{\mathbf{W},\mathbf{P}\}} \operatorname{crf}_{p} \cdot \overline{\operatorname{Cap}}_{r,p} - \mathbf{m} \cdot (\mathbf{n} - \operatorname{MOP})\right\}, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{H}$$
(12)

$$\bar{\gamma}_t = \frac{\gamma_t}{\max_{t \in \mathcal{H}} \{1, \gamma_t\}}, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{H}$$
(13)

After calculating the parameter $\bar{\gamma}_t$ using Equation (13), for each scenario *s* from the WNU model, we derive a MIP model given by Sub-problem(.) to identify the potential problematic periods. The objective function of this model maximizes a weighted outage time, where the weights correspond to the net load. In other words, this model prioritizes assigning nuclear power outages to the time steps with the highest net load.

Sub-problem(n, AOP, MOP, N^R, Cap, s):

$$\max \sum_{i=1}^{N^{R}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \gamma_{t} \cdot \operatorname{os}_{i,t} \cdot z_{i}$$
(14)

subject to:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N^R} z_i = n \tag{15}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N^{R}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \operatorname{os}_{i,t} \cdot z_{i} \le AOP,$$
(16)

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N^{R}} \operatorname{os}_{i,t} \cdot z_{i} \le \text{MOP}, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{H}$$
(17)

$$z_i \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N^R\}$$
 (18)

The suggested heuristic method begins by solving the Master problem (n, \bar{z}) for $n \in \mathcal{N}$, where \mathcal{N} is the set of possible numbers of nuclear plants in the system. Since the optimal number of nuclear plants obtained from solving the WNU model is unlikely to deviate significantly from that of the WU model, we can restrict N by solving the WU model presented in Section 3.1. To find a starting solution, for each $n \in N$, we set $\bar{z} = 0$ and solve the master problem to find a capacity mix, Cap. Then, for each scenario s, we calculate $\bar{\gamma}_t$ via Equation (13) and solve the Sub-problem to obtain \bar{z} . Afterward, we solve the Master problem again to obtain an approximated solution for the WNU model. Distributing the search over the set N also allows us to incorporate simulation into the heuristic. Therefore, for the resulting capacity mix, we solve the Simulation problem to evaluate the resulting solutions more accurately in terms of cost and loss of load. We can also examine different confidence levels, α , to find a set of Pareto solutions. These processes are carried out for every *n* in \mathcal{N} and $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$, where \mathcal{A} is the set of desired confidence levels. The flowchart of the heuristic method is presented in Figure 2.

The proposed method for solving the WNU model, along with the associated mathematical models, was implemented using the Julia programming language. The pseudo-code of the heuristic, including its detailed steps, can also be found in Appendix F. It should be noted that the optimization problems in this study are solved using the Gurobi® Optimizer [52], with the barrier solver selected as the default.

4. Experimental design

The models presented in this study are tested in a case study for countries located in northern Europe. The case study includes seven regions: Northern Sweden (SE^N), Southern Sweden (SE^S), Northern Germany (DE^N), Southern Germany (DE^S), Poland (PL), Denmark (DK), and Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg (BNL), grouped as one region. The data includes the time series of wind and solar capacity factors for 41 years, from 1979 to 2019. For the electricity load, projected time series data for the year 2050 is used. The potential links connecting the regions through transmission lines, along with the distances between the regions, dist_{r,r'}, are shown in Figure 3. Through preliminary experiments, we found that a time step of seven hours, ts = 7 h, provides a suitable trade-off between accuracy and



Figure 2: Flowchart of the heuristic method used to solve the Weather and Nuclear Uncertainty (WNU) model; F, A, and U represent Favorable, Average, and Unfavorable weather scenarios, respectively.

computational time. A description of the additional parameters in the case study can be found in Appendix D.

To select weather scenarios, we conducted a preliminary test by solving 41 deterministic optimization problems (excluding unplanned nuclear power outages) based on data from 1979 to 2019. The objective function values from these tests, i.e., the SC, serve as the basis for our scenario selection method. Figure 5 presents the years ranked according to their SC values. From this, three scenarios were chosen for the *Weather Uncertainty* and *Weather and Nuclear Uncertainty* models: The *Favorable* weather year scenario (F), based on the 1983 data (which results in the lowest SCvalue); the *Average* weather year scenario (A), based on the 1993 data (which has an SCvalue closest to the average of the 41 SCs); and the *Unfavorable* weather year scenario (U), based on the 1996 data (which produces the highest SC value). It is assumed that scenario F has a probability of 0.2, whereas both scenarios A and U have probabilities of 0.4 each¹.

We have considered three models, presented in Table 2, for comparison. For the *Deterministic* (D) model, only the normal scenario data is used (thus no weather uncertainty), and unplanned nuclear power outages are disregarded. In this case, we solve the WU model, presented in Section 3.1, with only the given scenario A. For the *Weather Uncertainty* (WU) model, the three scenarios, {F, A, U}, highlighted in Figure 5, are used to account for uncertainty in weather conditions. Finally, the *Weather and Nuclear Uncertainty* (WNU) model is solved using the heuristic method presented in Section 3.4 under three scenarios.





Figure 3: Selected regions in the case study, as well as the potential transmission lines among the regions.

narios to account for uncertainties in unplanned nuclear power outages and weather conditions. In this respect, the heuristic method is employed with ten confidence levels, $\alpha \in \mathcal{A} =$ $0.1, 0.2, \ldots, 0.9 \cup 0.99$, and 13 possible sizes for the number of nuclear plants in the system, $n \in \mathcal{N} = \{36, 38, \ldots, 62\}$. In the experiments, each nuclear plant is assumed to have a capacity of 1 GWh (m = 1000). Additionally, we set N^R = 50000 and N^P = 100000 (see Sections 3.2 and 3.4, for further details about these two parameters). Historical monthly outage data from six nuclear power plants in Sweden are used in this study (see Figure 4).

The capacity layouts resulting from the models are evaluated using simulations. The following are the four simulation cases used for this purpose:

- No-outage simulation: 41 historical weather years, neglecting the risk of unplanned nuclear power outages.
- *Normal* simulation: 41 historical weather years, including the risk of unplanned nuclear power outages.
- Unfavorable Weather simulation: 41 extreme weather years (with historical data from the year 1996 used for all 41 weather years), combined with the risk of nuclear power outages. This simulation increases the likelihood of nuclear unavailability coinciding with unfavorable weather and demand situations.
- *Dunkelflaute* simulation: Similar to the normal simulation, but with an additional *Dunkelflaute* event starting on February 1st (day 32 of the 365-day year) and lasting for 14 days. ¹.

The solutions of the D and WU models are evaluated using the *No-outage* and *Normal* simulation cases (see Section 4.1.1), while the last three simulation cases are used to evaluate the solutions of the WNU model (see Section 4.1.2).



Figure 4: Unplanned nuclear power outages based on 60 separate 12-month samples from six nuclear plants in Sweden. Data source: [26].

Table 2: Models considered for making comparisons in this paper.

Model	Description	Unplanned nuclear power outages	Scenarios ^a		
D ^b	Deterministic (no uncertainty)			А	
WU ^c	Uncertainty in weather conditions		F	А	U
WNU ^c	Uncertainty in weather conditions and nuclear power availability	\checkmark	F	Α	U

^a Scenario are as follows: F: Favorable weather year, A: Average weather year, and U: Unfavorable weather year.

^b In this case, the probability of Scenario A is 1.

 b In this case, the probabilities of the scenarios are as follows: $\pi_F=0.2$ and $\pi_A=\pi_U=0.4.$

4.1. Results

In Section 4.1.1, we begin by comparing the solutions obtained from the D and WU models, which are similar to models already published in the literature, in order to investigate the effect of uncertainty in weather conditions and evaluate how the system performs when unplanned nuclear power outages are disregarded. Then, in Section 4.1.2, we proceed to investigate the performance of our proposed WNU model, which takes into account uncertainty regarding nuclear availability in the planning phase.

The energy systems resulting from the optimization in the D and WU models are depicted in Appendix H, Figure H.1. The system is primarily characterized by generation from wind and solar power, with nuclear energy closely following. The transmission capacity is significantly higher than current levels, and gas serves as the primary backup capacity. Additionally, the battery capacity is designed to cover approximately two hours of average demand.

4.1.1. The Effect of Considering Weather Uncertainty: Comparing the Performance of the D and WU Models

The main purpose of this section is to demonstrate that failing to consider unplanned nuclear power failures during the planning stage is consequential if the goal is to design a robust energy system with minimal loss of load. To this end, we begin by examining the performance (total cost and Loss of Load (LoL)) of the D model, which has no uncertainty, and the WU model, which incorporates uncertainty in weather conditions. We achieve this by exposing the respective solutions to the Nooutage and Normal simulation environments. The difference in system cost between the performance of the solution from the WU model and that from the D model when exposed to these simulation environments is termed the value of stochastic solution (VSS) [28, 53]. The simulation results indicate that exposing the solutions only to varying weather conditions (Nooutage simulation) yields a VSS of $(51309 - 51254) = 55 \text{ M} \in$, which is equivalent to annual savings of 0.11%.

Regarding Loss-of-Load (LoL), the solution of the D model exhibits a LoL that is twice as high as the solution of the WU model in the *No-outage* simulation. When there is uncertainty in both nuclear power outages and weather conditions (*Normal* simulation), the value of stochastic solution (VSS) is calculated

¹This was done by modifying the wind and solar capacity factors within a specific period. During this period, the original wind and solar capacity factors of the regions in each simulation year were multiplied by a constant, referred to as Dunkelflaute intensity, which was assumed to be 0.4.



Figure 5: Optimal SC for each year, sorted in ascending order, with the three selected years highlighted to represent the weather scenarios.

Table 3: Summary of the computational results for the Deterministic (D) and Weather Uncertainty (WU) models.

	Resu the models	alts of solving without simulation	Simulation unplanned nuc (<i>No-outa</i>	results excluding clear power outages ge simulation)	Simulation results with unplanned nuclear power outages (Normal simulation)		
	D	WU	D	WU	D WU		
SC (M€)	50777	51534	51309	51254	52301	52205	
LoL (GWh)	0	0	13	7	34	18	
LoL frequency	0/41	0/41	7/41	7/41	14/41	14/41	
LoL percentage (%)	0	0	1.3×10^{-3}	6.6×10^{-4}	3.3×10^{-3}	1.7×10^{-3}	
Investment cost (M€)	29539	30245	29539	30245	29539	30245	
Fixed cost (M€)	12064	12292	12064	12292	12064	12292	
Operational cost (M€)	6262	6331	6636	6239	7092	6689	
Emissions cost (M€)	2702	2514	2978	2440	3449	2905	
Load shedding cost (M€)	210	152	92	38	157	74	

as $52301 - 52205 = 96M \in$, or 0.18%. In this case, the LoL remains approximately twice as high in the D model's solution compared to the WU model's solution (34 vs. 18 GWh). These results demonstrate that, although the WU model performs better than the D model, the solution is not sufficiently robust, as LoL increases significantly when nuclear power outages are considered. As seen in Table 3, LoL also becomes more frequent with unplanned nuclear power outages, rising from 7 to 14 events over the 41 years. Detailed simulation results for the solutions under the *Normal* simulation case can be found in Table G.4.

To assess how the vulnerability of the energy system varies with nuclear capacity, we conducted a sensitivity analysis on the number of nuclear plants. The results revealed that as nuclear power penetration increases, the system becomes more susceptible to loss of load (LoL), as shown in Figure H.3 in Appendix H. Furthermore, the Pareto front analysis (Figure H.4 in Appendix H) indicates that the WU model outperforms the D model in terms of system cost and LoL. Based on these findings, the following section will use the Pareto front derived from the WU model to evaluate the solutions of the WNU model.

4.1.2. Considering nuclear uncertainty in the planning phase: Simulation results for the WNU) model

The Weather and Nuclear Uncertainty (WNU) model incorporates uncertainty in both weather conditions and nuclear power outages during the planning phase. Its performance was evaluated under three simulation conditions: Normal, Unfavorable Weather, and Dunkelflaute, with the latter two scenarios increasing the likelihood of unfavorable weather conditions coinciding with unplanned nuclear power outages. The corresponding Pareto fronts for the WU and WNU models under each simulation case are shown in Figure 6¹. The figure demonstrates that the WNU model consistently outperforms the WU model in both loss-of-load (LoL) and system cost (SC) across all simulation cases. Notably, in all three simulation conditions, the WNU model produces solutions with zero LoL, underscoring its suitability for designing a more robust energy system.

Focusing on the *Normal* simulation case in Figure 6, the results for the WNU model reveal a distinct Pareto front with 29 solutions, showing increasing cost to achieve zero LoL. The total capacity mix, costs, and LoL for all 29 solutions are detailed in Table G.3 in the appendix. The two endpoints of the Pareto front, representing the most and least conservative solutions, are highlighted with stars in Figure 6^2 .

The simulation results indicate a substantial difference in LoL across different years, see G.4 in Appendix G, but here we show the average results. Based on the two solutions obtained by the WNU model (solutions #1 and #29), the additional cost that we may be willing to pay to further protect the energy

system against LoL, the *price of robustness* [38], is calculated as $52490 - 52186 = 304 \text{ M} \in$, which is equivalent to a 0.6% increase in the system cost.

In the simulation cases *Unfavorable Weather* and *Dunkelflaute* shown in Figure 6, the solutions of the WNU and WU models are exposed to a more harsh environment, both because the weather situation is less favorable, but also because there is a greater risk of unfavorable weather and demand coinciding with nuclear plants being unavailable. These conditions give rise to a higher system cost, by about 4%, and a higher value for LoL, than in the *Normal* case, see Figure 6. Yet, there is one solution, namely the solution that produced zero LoL in the simulation cases *Unfavorable Weather* and *Dunkelflaute*. We may thus infer that the WNU model is capable of finding solutions that are resilient not only to the conditions under which it was optimized but also, more generally, to unfavorable combinations of weather, demand, and nuclear power outages.

Figure 7 shows the change in capacity mix (LHS) and performance measures (RHS) between the WU solution, the most conservative solution of the WNU model (solution #29), and the D solution. As seen in the figure, compared to the solution of the D model, the WNU solution is mainly characterized by i) an increase in gas, nuclear, and wind capacity (by 17%, 9%, and 6%, respectively), and ii) a decrease in battery capacity (by 15%). Figure 7 also shows that both LoL and load shedding decrease compared to the D model. Thus, the change in capacity mix dominated by added gas capacity provides a greater ability to avoid both load-shedding and LoL. Yet, there is less total generation by gas, which is also evident from the lower (28%) CO₂ emissions in the WNU model's solution. Note that nuclear capacity increases by around 10% in the solutions of the WU and WNU models compared to the D model's solution, see Figure 7. In other words, robustness is provided not only with gas, but also with added nuclear capacity, even when, as is the case in the WNU formulation, nuclear has the disadvantage of unplanned outages.

For each $n \in N$, we can subtract the capacities and LoL in the WNU model's solutions from those in the corresponding WU model's solutions. Since each solution pair has the same nuclear power capacity, this adjustment isolates the impact of other technologies. We then fit a linear regression model to the adjusted data to evaluate how other power generation sources contribute to LoL reduction³. The regression coefficients for each technology are plotted in Figure 8, in decreasing order. This result demonstrates approximately how much an increase in the capacity of each technology contributes to LoL reduction. As expected, gas technology, with a regression coefficient of almost two, plays a major role in improving the robustness of energy

¹In this figure, the Pareto front for the WU model is derived from sensitivity analysis on the number of nuclear power plants, as discussed in Appendix E and illustrated in Figure H.3.

 $^{^{2}}$ For these solutions, the simulation results for each individual year, along with the capacity layout, are available in Table G.4 and Figure H.2.

³The regression analysis yielded a multiple *R* of 0.983 ($R^2 = 0.966$), indicating a strong positive correlation between the adjusted capacity values (predictors) and the adjusted LoL (response variable). This suggests that 96.6% of the variance in LoL reduction is explained by the capacity differences of the non-nuclear technologies. The statistical significance of the regression model is further supported by a near-zero *p*-value (the *F*-statistic of the regression model was about 770).



Figure 6: Pareto front comparing the solutions of robust and stochastic models across three simulation cases; for the WU model, the Pareto front has been obtained through a sensitivity analysis on the number of nuclear plants in the systems.



Figure 7: Relative differences in capacity and costs, comparing the solutions of the *Weather Uncertainty* (WU) and *Weather and Nuclear Uncertainty* (WNU) models against the solution of the *Deterministic* (D) model; the cost comparison is based on the *Normal* simulation case.

systems; in other words, an additional 1 GW of gas capacity reduces LoL by 2 GWh. Following gas, wind, transmission, battery, and solar technologies contribute to LoL reduction in decreasing order of impact.

As explained earlier, the WNU model was solved for ten different confidence levels (α ranging from 0.1 to 0.99) and 13 possible sizes for the number of nuclear plants in the system (n ranging from 36 to 62 nuclear plants), the results consisting of 29 Pareto solutions, are provided in Table G.3). Figure 9 shows the effect of the two parameters (confidence level and number of nuclear plants) on the cost and LoL. In this figure, the red lines represent the mean values and the blue lines represent the minimum values across the number of nuclear plants (left panels in Figure 9) and the confidence level (right panels in Figure 9). The result in the lower left panel in Figure 9 indicates that the impact of the number of nuclear plants (n) on the minimum LoL is minimal. This suggests that regardless of the number of nuclear plants, the WNU model consistently identifies solutions that are resilient to LoL. On the other hand, as shown in the



Figure 8: Impact of a one-unit change in capacities on the reduction of LoL.

top left panel of Figure 9, both the mean and minimum SC increase as n grows; this is due to the higher costs associated with expanding nuclear power capacity. In the WNU model, the confidence level, α , is the main parameter that adjusts the conservatism of the WNU model. As expected, increasing α leads to a higher SC and a lower LoL for both the mean and minimum values, see the two right panels in Figure 9.

4.2. Discussion

This paper presents the first proof of concept for a novel model, named *Weather and Nuclear Uncertainty* (WNU) model, to account for uncertainties in both weather conditions and nuclear power availability in an electricity system. While numerous studies have investigated the importance of weather uncertainty, either through stochastic programming or by comparing solutions based on different weather years [7, 8, 21, 54], the uncertainty of nuclear power output has not been well investigated in



Figure 9: Effect of confidence level and number of nuclear plants on the *Weather* and *Nuclear Uncertainty* (WNU) model's solutions.

the energy system literature. We show that failing to account for the uncertainty arising from nuclear power plant outages is consequential.

4.2.1. Method contribution and comparison

The proposed WNU model utilizes a data-driven robust optimization approach to identify optimal investment decisions under the uncertainties as mentioned earlier. The results of our model were evaluated using two metrics: system cost and Loss-of-Load (LoL). We introduced LoL as a measure to represent situations where the system cannot meet demand through load shedding or other standard measures, resulting in a risk of brownouts or blackouts. The choice to show LoL as a separate quantity, and not just as an added cost, also underscores the trade-off between, on the one hand, system cost and, on the other, system resilience or robustness. As our model does not detail the power system, we are unable to analyze the precise consequences or the economic impact of instances of load deficiency. Instead, LoL is used as an indicator to reflect the risk of high-cost events caused by electricity supply shortages. The model can lead to solutions that are robust in relation to power shortages while at the same time being cost-effective, as shown in Figure 6.

The designated heuristic to solve the *Weather and Nuclear Uncertainty* model is computationally efficient enough to be incorporated into an energy system investment model with seven nodes, approximately 1,250 time steps, and eight generation technologies, in addition to storage and transmission. In terms of performance, it has the ability to decrease LoL to zero or near zero even for a high penetration level of nuclear power, while at the same time minimizing total costs.

4.2.2. The value and cost of robust design, and comparison to literature

Energy system models, including those used in papers that focus on the role of nuclear power [1, 2, 55-59], represent it

as a stable, dispatchable power source, without accounting for the risk of unplanned outages. Here, we show that representing uncertainty in nuclear power availability is important in the investment phase to increase energy system resilience by avoiding LoL: When nuclear uncertainty was considered, i.e. when comparing the results from the solution of the *Weather* and Nuclear Uncertainty model with those of the solution of the Weather Uncertainty model, LoL decreased from 6 GWh to zero under normal conditions (Normal simulation), see Figure 6. Furthermore, when the weather conditions were worse (Unfavorable Weather and Dunkelflaute simulation), our proposed model still managed to find solutions with near-zero LoL, whereas the Weather Uncertainty model was unable to achieve this cost-effectively.

Our results, as well as those in other papers, such as Seljom and Tomasgard [21], Seljom et al. [23], thus highlight the value (in terms of lower cost, lower LoL or both) of designing systems that are robust to varying weather conditions and, in our case, nuclear power outage conditions. However, building for robustness comes with an initially higher cost, because the investment part of the system cost is higher than that estimated by the corresponding deterministic model. We find that this additional projected cost, i.e., the total system cost projected by the investment model, that is resilient under both weather and nuclear uncertainty (solution produced by the Weather and Nuclear Uncertainty model), is 6% higher compared to the estimate of the Deterministic model. The additional cost to build a system that considers only weather uncertainty (solution from Weather Uncertainty model) is 2% higher in this study, while previous studies reported a 1% higher cost [23] and up to 20% higher [54].

Our results also indicate that the main impact on the capacity mix from incorporating weather and nuclear uncertainties is an increased capacity of gas turbines. A previous paper that investigated weather variations [7] *assumed* that adding gas turbines was the technology that would provide increased resilience to the energy system, but here we show that this is indeed the case. This result is also consistent with the findings of Seljom and Tomasgard [21], Seljom et al. [23], which demonstrate that accounting for weather uncertainty leads to an increase in the dispatchable thermal generation capacity. Interestingly, the effect on nuclear investments from accounting for nuclear uncertainty is not, as one might expect, a reduction in nuclear power investments but rather a small increase, see Figure 7. Further investigations are needed in order to determine whether this result is stable also under varying surrounding assumptions.

4.2.3. Limitations: data and generalization to larger models

The exact effect of nuclear outage risks is challenging to estimate at this stage, as we used Swedish data as a proxy. Whether this data accurately reflects the performance of *future* nuclear power plants remains to be assessed: it may be the case that the reasons behind the outage statistics are associated with an aging power plant fleet. Moreover, the impact of nuclear power availability likely varies depending on the overall energy system configuration. Nevertheless, our findings highlight that unplanned outages should be considered when evaluating the resilience of energy systems with nuclear power — a perspective that is largely absent in the existing literature.

The test case for our model is an overnight investment capacity expansion model with seven nodes, 1250 time steps, and eight technology options. The size and design of this model are simpler than the current state-of-the-art models, such as PyPSA [60] or GenX [61], which, apart from being larger in size, also incorporates more technology options, and includes sectors with demands for hydrogen. We believe that our formulation would be feasible to incorporate also in these larger models, but we will leave it for future work to investigate the effect of nuclear power outages in such settings.

4.2.4. Implications for modeling and future work

Our results indicate that the solutions generated by the proposed WNU model, which accounts for both nuclear and weather uncertainties, outperform those that consider only weather uncertainty, particularly during extreme weather events such as Dunkelflaute. This finding indicates that the robust measures implemented to address unplanned nuclear power outages also enhance the system's ability to handle other stresses effectively. The future energy system faces numerous uncertainties (generation, transmission, demand, etc.), and representing and modeling all of them is a challenging task, as stochastic models can become computationally intensive. Our results show that addressing two key uncertainties enhances the robustness of the system. However, identifying other important uncertainties to further increase the system's robustness remains a crucial area for future research.

In this study, we focus mainly on uncertainty within *normal* conditions and do not account for extreme events such as storms that damage infrastructure, terrorist attacks, war, or similar risks. Addressing such extreme events may require a different set of measures to achieve robustness. Designing a robust energy system that accounts for these risks, as well as identifying the parameters that are most crucial for added robustness, remains an important area for future research.

5. Conclusion

This paper investigated a capacity expansion problem for electricity with uncertain weather conditions and nuclear power availability. A scenario-based stochastic optimization approach was employed to represent varying weather conditions. The stochastic model was then extended to incorporate unplanned nuclear power outages using a data-driven adjustable robust optimization approach. Given the computational complexity of the robust problem, a heuristic method was proposed to efficiently solve the model. Since the stochastic and robust models were based on a limited set of scenarios chosen from historical weather data, simulations were carried out using a larger set of historical data to evaluate the performance of the models more accurately under different conditions. We tested the models in a case study for Northern Europe, consisting of seven nodes, with a time resolution of 1250 time steps. Our findings show that:

- The current standard energy system model formulations, both deterministic and those that incorporate uncertainty in weather, are vulnerable to Loss-of-Load (LoL) when exposed to nuclear power uncertainty. This effect is exacerbated at high penetration levels of nuclear power.
- The robust model that incorporates uncertainty in nuclear power availability yielded solutions with no or very low levels of loss of load (LoL), even at high levels of nuclear penetration. These solutions also performed well when tested against new and more extreme combinations of weather events (e.g., Dunkelflaute) and nuclear power outages.
- The price of robustness (the cost to build a system that suffers from less LoL) in our test case was 304 € MWh⁻¹, which corresponds to a 0.6% increase in the system costs.
- Investment strategies that provide added robustness are dominated by greater gas capacity. In addition, and perhaps counterintuitive, the introduction of variability and uncertainty of nuclear operation did not significantly change the optimal amount of nuclear power. Rather, robust solutions showed a slightly higher optimal capacity of nuclear power, compared to the deterministic solution.

Based on the findings of this paper, we conclude that the uncertainty in nuclear power availability in European countries may justify its inclusion in energy system models that inform policies on energy system resilience. Future research should aim to offer more concrete guidance on resilient strategies for countries seeking to incorporate nuclear power into their CO_2 -neutral energy mix.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank legor Riepin for valuable discussions during the initial stage of this project. This work was funded by the Swedish Energy Agency under grant numbers P2023–01323 and P2022–00768.

References

- X. Kan, F. Hedenus, L. Reichenberg, The cost of a future low-carbon electricity system without nuclear power-the case of sweden, Energy 195 (2020) 117015. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2020.117015.
- [2] N. A. Sepulveda, J. D. Jenkins, F. J. De Sisternes, R. K. Lester, The role of firm low-carbon electricity resources in deep decarbonization of power generation, Joule 2 (2018) 2403–2420. doi:10.1016/j.joule.2018.0 8.006.
- [3] T. Larsson, C.-O. Wene, Developing strategies for robust energy systems.
 i: Methodology, International Journal of Energy Research 17 (1993) 503–513. doi:10.1002/er.4440170606.

- [4] J. DeCarolis, H. Daly, P. Dodds, I. Keppo, F. Li, W. McDowall, S. Pye, N. Strachan, E. Trutnevyte, W. Usher, et al., Formalizing best practice for energy system optimization modelling, Applied Energy 194 (2017) 184–198. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.03.001.
- [5] M. Mišík, The eu needs to improve its external energy security, Energy Policy 165 (2022) 112930. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2022.112930.
- [6] J. Brodny, M. Tutak, Assessing the energy security of european union countries from two perspectives-a new integrated approach based on mcdm methods, Applied Energy 347 (2023) 121443. doi:10.1016/j.apener gy.2023.121443.
- [7] E. K. Gøtske, G. B. Andresen, F. Neumann, M. Victoria, Designing a sector-coupled european energy system robust to 60 years of historical weather data, Nature Communications 15 (2024) 1–12. doi:10.1038/s4 1467-024-54853-3.
- [8] S. Collins, P. Deane, B. Ó. Gallachóir, S. Pfenninger, I. Staffell, Impacts of inter-annual wind and solar variations on the european power system, Joule 2 (2018) 2076–2090. doi:10.1016/j.joule.2018.06.020.
- [9] O. Ruhnau, S. Qvist, Storage requirements in a 100% renewable electricity system: extreme events and inter-annual variability, Environmental Research Letters 17 (2022) 044018. doi:10.1088/1748-9326/ac4dc8.
- [10] S. Höltinger, C. Mikovits, J. Schmidt, J. Baumgartner, B. Arheimer, G. Lindström, E. Wetterlund, The impact of climatic extreme events on the feasibility of fully renewable power systems: A case study for sweden, Energy 178 (2019) 695–713. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2019.04.128.
- [11] P. Hsia, J. Samuel, J. Gao, D. Kung, Y. Toyoshima, C. Chen, Formal approach to scenario analysis, IEEE Software 11 (1994) 33–41. doi:10.1 109/52.268953.
- [12] B. Iooss, P. Lemaître, A Review on Global Sensitivity Analysis Methods, Springer US, Boston, MA, 2015, pp. 101–122. doi:10.1007/978-1-489 9-7547-8_5.
- [13] S. Raychaudhuri, Introduction to monte carlo simulation, in: 2008 Winter Simulation Conference, 2008, pp. 91–100. doi:10.1109/WSC.2008.473 6059.
- [14] S. W. Wallace, Decision making under uncertainty: Is sensitivity analysis of any use?, Operations Research 48 (2000) 20–25. doi:10.1287/opre .48.1.20.12441.
- [15] X. Yue, S. Pye, J. DeCarolis, F. G. Li, F. Rogan, B. Ó. Gallachóir, A review of approaches to uncertainty assessment in energy system optimization models, Energy strategy reviews 21 (2018) 204–217. doi:10.1016/j.es r.2018.06.003.
- [16] Y. Fu, H. Lin, C. Ma, B. Sun, H. Li, Q. Sun, R. Wennersten, Effects of uncertainties on the capacity and operation of an integrated energy system, Sustainable Energy Technologies and Assessments 48 (2021) 101625. doi:10.1016/j.seta.2021.101625.
- [17] R. Dominguez, M. Carrión, G. Oggioni, Planning and operating a renewable-dominated european power system under uncertainty, Applied Energy 258 (2020) 113989. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.113989.
- [18] S. Moret, F. Babonneau, M. Bierlaire, F. Maréchal, Decision support for strategic energy planning: A robust optimization framework, European Journal of Operational Research 280 (2020) 539–554. doi:10.1016/j.ej or.2019.06.015.
- [19] J. E. Bistline, J. P. Weyant, Electric sector investments under technological and policy-related uncertainties: a stochastic programming approach, Climatic Change 121 (2013) 143–160. doi:10.1007/s10584-013-0859-4.
- [20] E. Dimanchev, S. A. Gabriel, L. Reichenberg, M. Korpaas, Consequences of the missing risk market problem for power system emissions, Energy Economics (2024) 107639. doi:10.1016/j.eneco.2024.107639.
- [21] P. Seljom, A. Tomasgard, Short-term uncertainty in long-term energy system models—a case study of wind power in denmark, Energy Economics 49 (2015) 157–167. doi:10.1016/j.eneco.2015.02.004.
- [22] A. Perera, V. M. Nik, D. Chen, J.-L. Scartezzini, T. Hong, Quantifying the impacts of climate change and extreme climate events on energy systems, Nature Energy 5 (2020) 150–159. doi:10.1038/s41560-020-0558-0.
- [23] P. Seljom, L. Kvalbein, L. Hellemo, M. Kaut, M. M. Ortiz, Stochastic modelling of variable renewables in long-term energy models: Dataset, scenario generation & quality of results, Energy 236 (2021) 121415. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2021.121415.
- [24] F. Verástegui, A. Lorca, D. E. Olivares, M. Negrete-Pincetic, P. Gazmuri, An adaptive robust optimization model for power systems planning with operational uncertainty, IEEE Transactions on Power Systems 34 (2019) 4606–4616. doi:10.1109/TPWRS.2019.2917854.

- [25] S. Murphy, L. Lavin, J. Apt, Resource adequacy implications of temperature-dependent electric generator availability, Applied Energy 262 (2020) 114424. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.114424.
- [26] IAEA, Operating experience with nuclear power stations in member states in 2023, 2024. URL: https://www.iaea.org/publications/1548 4/operating-experience-with-nuclear-power-stations-i n-member-states-2023-edition.
- [27] L. Alderman, As europe quits russian gas, half of france's nuclear plants are off-line, The New York Times (2022). URL: https://www.nytime s.com/2022/11/15/business/nuclear-power-france.html.
- [28] S. Backe, M. Ahang, A. Tomasgard, Stable stochastic capacity expansion with variable renewables: Comparing moment matching and stratified scenario generation sampling, Applied Energy 302 (2021) 117538. doi:10 .1016/j.apenergy.2021.117538.
- [29] F. Bagheri, H. Dagdougui, M. Gendreau, Stochastic optimization and scenario generation for peak load shaving in smart district microgrid: sizing and operation, Energy and Buildings 275 (2022) 112426. doi:10.1 016/j.enbuild.2022.112426.
- [30] X. Ma, M. Deveci, J. Yan, Y. Liu, Optimal capacity configuration of windphotovoltaic-storage hybrid system: A study based on multi-objective optimization and sparrow search algorithm, Journal of Energy Storage 85 (2024) 110983. doi:10.1016/j.est.2024.110983.
- [31] A. Zakaria, F. B. Ismail, M. H. Lipu, M. Hannan, Uncertainty models for stochastic optimization in renewable energy applications, Renewable Energy 145 (2020) 1543–1571. doi:10.1016/j.renene.2019.07.081.
- [32] H. Qiu, W. Gu, P. Liu, Q. Sun, Z. Wu, X. Lu, Application of two-stage robust optimization theory in power system scheduling under uncertainties: A review and perspective, Energy 251 (2022) 123942. doi:10.1016/j. energy.2022.123942.
- [33] S. Rahim, Z. Wang, P. Ju, Overview and applications of robust optimization in the avant-garde energy grid infrastructure: A systematic review, Applied Energy 319 (2022) 119140. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2022.119140.
- [34] A. Khosrojerdi, S. H. Zegordi, J. K. Allen, F. Mistree, A method for designing power supply chain networks accounting for failure scenarios and preventive maintenance, Engineering Optimization 48 (2016) 154–172. doi:10.1080/0305215X.2014.998662.
- [35] A. Alabdulwahab, A. Abusorrah, X. Zhang, M. Shahidehpour, Stochastic security-constrained scheduling of coordinated electricity and natural gas infrastructures, IEEE Systems Journal 11 (2017) 1674–1683. doi:10.110 9/JSYST.2015.2423498.
- [36] S. Ratanakuakangwan, H. Morita, Hybrid stochastic robust optimization and robust optimization for energy planning – a social impact-constrained case study, Applied Energy 298 (2021) 117258. doi:10.1016/j.apener gy.2021.117258.
- [37] A. L. Soyster, Convex programming with set-inclusive constraints and applications to inexact linear programming, Operations research 21 (1973) 1154–1157. doi:10.1287/opre.21.5.1154.
- [38] D. Bertsimas, M. Sim, The price of robustness, Operations research 52 (2004) 35–53. doi:10.1287/opre.1030.0065.
- [39] S. D. Asgari, E. Mohammadi, A. Makui, M. Jafari, Data-driven robust optimization based on position-regulated support vector clustering, Journal of Computational Science 76 (2024) 102210. doi:10.1016/j.jocs.202 4.102210.
- [40] A. Ben-Tal, A. Goryashko, E. Guslitzer, A. Nemirovski, Adjustable robust solutions of uncertain linear programs, Mathematical programming 99 (2004) 351–376. doi:10.1007/s10107-003-0454-y.
- [41] Q. Wang, J.-P. Watson, Y. Guan, Two-stage robust optimization for n-k contingency-constrained unit commitment, IEEE Transactions on Power Systems 28 (2013) 2366–2375. doi:10.1109/TPWRS.2013.2244619.
- [42] Z. Zhang, Y. Chen, X. Liu, W. Wang, Two-stage robust securityconstrained unit commitment model considering time autocorrelation of wind/load prediction error and outage contingency probability of units, IEEE Access 7 (2019) 25398–25408. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2900 254.
- [43] Y. Guo, C. Zhao, Islanding-aware robust energy management for microgrids, IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid 9 (2018) 1301–1309. doi:10.1109/TSG.2016.2585092.
- [44] A. Gholami, T. Shekari, S. Grijalva, Proactive management of microgrids for resiliency enhancement: An adaptive robust approach, IEEE Transactions on Sustainable Energy 10 (2019) 470–480. doi:10.1109/TSTE.201 7.2740433.

- [45] J. M. Mulvey, R. J. Vanderbei, S. A. Zenios, Robust optimization of large-scale systems, Operations Research 43 (1995) 264–281. doi:10.1 287/opre.43.2.264.
- [46] X. Kan, L. Reichenberg, F. Hedenus, The impacts of the electricity demand pattern on electricity system cost and the electricity supply mix: A comprehensive modeling analysis for europe, Energy 235 (2021) 121329. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2021.121329.
- [47] Y. Zhang, Y. Liu, S. Shu, F. Zheng, Z. Huang, A data-driven distributionally robust optimization model for multi-energy coupled system considering the temporal-spatial correlation and distribution uncertainty of renewable energy sources, Energy 216 (2021) 119171. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2 020.119171.
- [48] C. Ordoudis, V. A. Nguyen, D. Kuhn, P. Pinson, Energy and reserve dispatch with distributionally robust joint chance constraints, Operations Research Letters 49 (2021) 291–299. doi:10.1016/j.orl.2021.01.01
- [49] F. Shen, L. Zhao, M. Wang, W. Du, F. Qian, Data-driven adaptive robust optimization for energy systems in ethylene plant under demand uncertainty, Applied Energy 307 (2022) 118148. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy .2021.118148.
- [50] X. Lu, K. Zhou, A distributionally robust optimization approach for optimal load dispatch of energy hub considering multiple energy storage units and demand response programs, Journal of Energy Storage 78 (2024) 110085. doi:10.1016/j.est.2023.110085.
- [51] Z. Wang, B. Chen, J. Wang, J. Kim, M. M. Begovic, Robust optimization based optimal dg placement in microgrids, IEEE Transactions on Smart Grid 5 (2014) 2173–2182. doi:10.1109/TSG.2014.2321748.
- [52] Gurobi Optimization, LLC, Gurobi optimizer reference manual, 2024. URL: https://www.gurobi.com.
- [53] J. R. Birge, F. Louveaux, Introduction to Stochastic Programming, Springer Series in Operations Research and Financial Engineering, 2nd ed., Springer, New York, 2011. doi:10.1007/978-1-4614-0237-4.
- [54] H.-K. Ringkjøb, P. M. Haugan, P. Seljom, A. Lind, F. Wagner, S. Mesfun, Short-term solar and wind variability in long-term energy system models-a european case study, Energy 209 (2020) 118377. doi:10.1016/j.ener gy.2020.118377.
- [55] M. Hjelmeland, J. K. Nøland, S. Backe, M. Korpås, The role of nuclear energy and baseload demand in capacity expansion planning for lowcarbon power systems, Applied Energy 377 (2025) 124366. doi:10.101 6/j.apenergy.2024.124366.
- [56] L. Duan, R. Petroski, L. Wood, K. Caldeira, Stylized least-cost analysis of flexible nuclear power in deeply decarbonized electricity systems considering wind and solar resources worldwide, Nature Energy 7 (2022) 260–269. doi:10.1038/s41560-022-00979-x.
- [57] J. Z. Thellufsen, H. Lund, B. V. Mathiesen, P. A. Østergaard, P. Sorknæs, S. Nielsen, P. T. Madsen, G. B. Andresen, Cost and system effects of nuclear power in carbon-neutral energy systems, Applied Energy 371 (2024) 123705. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2024.123705.
- [58] J. Price, I. Keppo, P. E. Dodds, The role of new nuclear power in the uk's net-zero emissions energy system, Energy 262 (2023) 125450. doi:10.1 016/j.energy.2022.125450.
- [59] A. Fattahi, J. Sijm, M. Van den Broek, R. M. Gordón, M. S. Dieguez, A. Faaij, Analyzing the techno-economic role of nuclear power in the dutch net-zero energy system transition, Advances in Applied Energy 7 (2022) 100103. doi:10.1016/j.adapen.2022.100103.
- [60] J. Hörsch, F. Hofmann, D. Schlachtberger, T. Brown, Pypsa-eur: An open optimisation model of the european transmission system, Energy strategy reviews 22 (2018) 207–215. doi:10.1016/j.esr.2018.08.012.
- [61] J. D. Jenkins, N. A. Sepulveda, Enhanced decision support for a changing electricity landscape: The genx configurable electricity resource capacity expansion model, 2017. URL: https://dspace.mit.edu/handle/17 21.1/130589, accessed: 2025-04-06.
- [62] Danish Energy Agency, Technology data for generation of electricity and district heating, https://ens.dk/en/analyses-and-statistics/ technology-data-generation-electricity-and-district-h eating, 2024. Accessed: 2024-07-20.
- [63] S. Hagspiel, C. Jägemann, D. Lindenberger, T. Brown, S. Cherevatskiy, E. Tröster, Cost-optimal power system extension under flow-based market coupling, Energy 66 (2014) 654–666. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2014. 01.025.
- [64] W. J. Cole, A. Frazier, Cost projections for utility-scale battery stor-

age, Technical Report, National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), Golden, CO (United States), 2019.

- [65] B. van Zuijlen, W. Zappa, W. Turkenburg, G. van der Schrier, M. van den Broek, Cost-optimal reliable power generation in a deep decarbonisation future, Applied Energy 253 (2019) 113587. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy .2019.113587.
- [66] N. Mattsson, V. Verendel, F. Hedenus, L. Reichenberg, An autopilot for energy models–automatic generation of renewable supply curves, hourly capacity factors and hourly synthetic electricity demand for arbitrary world regions, Energy Strategy Reviews 33 (2021) 100606. doi:10.1016/j.es r.2020.100606.
- [67] ENTSO-E, Installed generation capacity aggregation, https://transp arency.entsoe.eu/generation/r2/installedGenerationCapa cityAggregation/show, 2020. Accessed: 2020-02-01.

Appendix A. Notation

Sets

- \mathcal{H} Set of hours in a year ($\mathcal{H} = \{1, 2, \dots, 8760\}$)
- \mathcal{T} Set of all time steps ($\mathcal{T} = \{t \in \mathcal{H} \mid h = 1 + k \cdot ts, k \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$)
- *S* Set of scenarios used in the robust and stochastic models
- S' Set of scenarios used for simulations
- \mathcal{R} Set of regions
- \mathcal{P}' Set of power generation plants ($\mathcal{P}' = \{\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{H}, \mathbf{N}\}$)
- \mathcal{P} Set of technologies ($\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}' \cup \{\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{I}\}$)
- \mathcal{L} Set of valid transmission power lines that connect regions

Indices

- $s \in S$ Index for scenarios
- $p \in \mathcal{P}$ Index for technologies
- $t \in \mathcal{T}$ Index for hours and time steps
- $r, r' \in \mathcal{R}$ Index for regions

Parameters

ts	Duration of each time period	h
$\mathrm{cf}_{s,r,p,t}$	Capacity factor of plant p in region r un at time step t	der scenario s
β	Planned outage rate for nuclear plants	
rl_r^{max}	Maximum hydro reservoir level in region	n <i>r</i> MWh
ri _{r,t}	Water inflow to reservoir in region r at tim	ne step <i>t</i> MWh
dist _{r,r'}	Distance between regions r and r'	km
$load_{r,t}$	Electricity demand in region r at time ste	ep t MW
$\eta_{r,r'}^{\mathrm{T}}$	Transmission efficiency of electricity bet	ween r and r'
sr	Maximum fraction of electricity demar shed per each time step	nd that can be
ef_p	Emission factor of plant p	$t_{\rm CO_2}\rm MWh^{-1}$
η_p	Efficiency of technology p	
c_p^{FL}	Fuel cost of technology p	\in MWh ⁻¹
c_p^V	Variable cost of technology p	\in MWh ⁻¹
6		

c_p^F	Fixed cost of technology p	\in MW ⁻¹ y ⁻¹
c_p^I	Investment cost of technology p	\in MWh ⁻¹
c ^T	Investment cost for constructing transit tween regions	mission lines be- € MWh ⁻¹ km ⁻¹
c ^S	Load shedding cost	\in MWh ⁻¹
crf _p	Capital recovery factor for technology	р
crf ^T	Capital recovery factor of transmission	n lines <i>p</i>
dt	Battery full discharge time	h
c ^{tax}	Carbon tax	$\in t_{CO_2}^{-1}$
π_s	Probability of scenario s	
OC_s	Operational cost under scenario s	\in y ⁻¹
TE_s	Annual CO ₂ emissions under scenario	s $t_{CO_2} y^{-1}$
TS_s	Annual shed load under scenario s	MWh
FC	Annual fixed cost	\in y ⁻¹
IC	Levelized investment on technologies	\in y ⁻¹
SC	Levelized total costs	\in y ⁻¹

Decision Variables

$\mathbf{E}_{s,r,p,t}$	Electricity generated by technology p in region i	r under
	scenario s at time step t	MWh
Cap _{r,p}	Capacity of technology p in region r	MW
$\operatorname{Cap}_{r,r'}^{\mathrm{T}}$	Transmission capacity between regions r and r'	MW
$PO_{s,r,t}$	Planned outage for nuclear plants in region r	under
	scenario s at time step t	MWh

- RL_{s.r.t} Hydro reservoir level in region r for scenario s and time step t MWh
- $T_{s,r,r',t}$ Electricity transmitted from region r to region r' under MWh scenario s at time step t
- $\text{ES}_{s,r,t}$ Shed load in region r under scenario s at time step tMWh
- Charge stored in the battery in region r under scenario $BL_{s,r,t}$ s at time step t MWh

Appendix B. Weather Uncertainty mathematical model

The mathematical model of the proposed capacity expansion problem with uncertainty in wind and solar power outputs (Weather Uncertainty model) is as follows.

WU model:

$$\min SC = IC + FC + \sum_{s \in S} \pi_s \left(OC_s + c^{tax} \cdot TE_s + c^S \cdot TS_s \right)$$
(B.1)

Subject to:

$$\operatorname{Cap}_{r,p} \le \operatorname{cap}_{r,p}^{\max}, \quad \forall r \in \mathcal{R}, \ p \in \mathcal{P}$$
(B.2)

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}' \cup \{\mathbf{I}\}} \mathbf{E}_{s,r,p,t} - \mathbf{E}_{s,r,\mathbf{B},t} + \sum_{\substack{r' \in \mathcal{R} \\ (r,r') \in \mathcal{L}}} \left(\eta_{r',r}^{\mathsf{T}} \cdot \mathbf{T}_{s,r',r,t} - \mathbf{T}_{s,r,r',t} \right)$$

 \geq ts · load_{r,t} – ES_{s,r,t}, $\forall s \in S, r \in \mathcal{R}, t \in \mathcal{T}$ (B.3) $\text{ES}_{s,r,t} \leq \text{sr} \cdot \text{ts} \cdot \text{load}_{r,t}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \ r \in \mathcal{R}, \ t \in \mathcal{T}$ (B.4)

 $\sum PO = R |\mathcal{T}| \text{ to } Con$ $\forall s \in S, r \in \mathcal{P}$ (D 5)

$$\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} PO_{s,r,t} = \beta \cdot |\mathcal{T}| \cdot \text{ts} \cdot \text{cap}_{r,N}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \ r \in \mathcal{K}$$
(B.3)
REsurves $\leq \{\text{REscattor}\} \text{ if } h = 1: \text{REscattor} \text{ otherwise} \}$

$$\mathsf{KL}_{s,r,t} \leq \{\mathsf{KL}_{s,r,ts}|\mathcal{T}|, \text{ if } n = 1, \mathsf{KL}_{s,r,h-ts}, \text{ otherwise}\}$$

+ ts $\cdot \operatorname{ri}_{r,t} - \mathsf{E}_{s,r,\mathbf{H},t}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \ r \in \mathcal{R}, \ t \in \mathcal{T}$ (B.6)

$$BL_{s,r,t} \le \{BL_{s,r,ts:|\mathcal{T}|}, \text{ if } h = 1; BL_{s,r,h-ts}, \text{ otherwise}\}$$

$$+ \eta_{\mathbf{I}} \cdot \mathbf{E}_{s,r,\mathbf{B},t} - \frac{\mathbf{E}_{s,r,\mathbf{I},t}}{\eta_{\mathbf{I}}}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \ r \in \mathcal{R}, \ t \in \mathcal{T}$$
(B.7)

$$\begin{split} & \mathrm{E}_{s,r,\mathbf{N},t} \leq \mathrm{ts} \cdot \mathrm{Cap}_{r,\mathbf{N}} - \mathrm{PO}_{s,r,t}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \ r \in \mathcal{R}, \ t \in \mathcal{T} \qquad (\mathrm{B.8}) \\ & \mathrm{E}_{s,r,p,t} \leq \mathrm{ts} \cdot \mathrm{cf}_{s,r,p,t} \cdot \mathrm{Cap}_{r,p}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \ r \in \mathcal{R}, \end{split}$$

$$p \in \{\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{P}\}, \ t \in \mathcal{T}$$
(B.9)

$$\mathbf{E}_{s,r,p,t} \le \mathsf{ts} \cdot \mathbf{Cap}_{r,p}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \ r \in \mathcal{R}, \ p \in \{\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}\}, \ t \in \mathcal{T}$$
(B.10)

$$\begin{split} & \mathbf{E}_{s,r,\mathbf{I},t} + \mathbf{E}_{s,r,\mathbf{B},t} \leq \mathrm{ts} \cdot \mathrm{Cap}_{r,\mathbf{I}}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \ r \in \mathcal{R}, \ t \in \mathcal{T} \\ & \mathrm{dt} \cdot \mathrm{Cap}_{r,\mathbf{I}} \leq \mathrm{Cap}_{r,\mathbf{B}}, \quad \forall r \in \mathcal{R}, \ t \in \mathcal{T} \end{split}$$

$$\mathcal{T}$$
 (B.12)

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{s,r,r',t} + \Gamma_{s,r',r,t} &\leq \text{ts} \cdot \text{Cap}_{r,r'}^{\text{T}}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \ r, r' \in \mathcal{R}, \\ r' > r, \ (r,r') \in \mathcal{L}, \ t \in \mathcal{T} \end{aligned} \tag{B.13}$$

$$\operatorname{RL}_{s,r,t} \leq \operatorname{rl}_{r}^{\max}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \ r \in \mathcal{R}, \ t \in \mathcal{T}$$
 (B.14)

$$BL_{s,r,t} \leq Cap_{r,\mathbf{B}}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \ r \in \mathcal{R}, \ t \in \mathcal{T}$$
(B.15)

$$TS_{s} = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} ES_{s,r,t}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}$$
(B.16)

$$TE_{s} = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{\mathbf{B}\}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} ef_{p} \cdot \frac{E_{s,r,p,t}}{\eta_{p}}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}$$
(B.17)

$$OC_{s} = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{\mathbf{B}\}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \left(\frac{c_{p}^{rL}}{\eta_{p}} + c_{p}^{V} \right) E_{s,r,p,t}, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}$$
(B.18)

$$FC = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} c_p^F \cdot Cap_{r,p}$$
(B.19)

$$IC = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} c_p^{\mathrm{I}} \cdot \mathrm{crf}_p \cdot \mathrm{Cap}_{r,p} + \sum_{\substack{r,r' \in \mathcal{R} \\ r' > r}} c^{\mathrm{T}} \cdot \mathrm{crf}^{\mathrm{T}} \cdot \mathrm{dist}_{r,r'} \cdot \mathrm{Cap}_{r,r'}^{\mathrm{T}}$$
(B.20)

$$PO_{s,r,t}, RL_{s,r,t}, T_{s,r,r',t}, BL_{s,r,t} \ge 0, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \ r, r' \in \mathcal{R},$$
$$(r, r') \in \mathcal{L}, \ t \in \mathcal{T}$$
(B.21)

$$\operatorname{Cap}_{r,r'}^{\mathrm{T}} \ge 0, \quad \forall r, r' \in \mathcal{R}, \ r' > r, \ (r,r') \in \mathcal{L}$$
(B.22)

$$\operatorname{Cap}_{r,p} \ge 0, \quad \forall r \in \mathcal{R}, \ p \in \mathcal{P}$$
 (B.23)

$$\mathbf{E}_{s,r,p,t} \ge 0, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}, \ r \in \mathcal{R}, \ p \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \{\mathbf{B}\}, \ t \in \mathcal{T}$$
(B.24)

The objective function (B.1) minimizes the levelized total cost, which includes the levelized investment cost along with the average operational, fixed, CO₂ emission, and load shedding costs across different scenarios. Constraint (B.2) limits the capacity of each technology in a region so that it does not exceed the maximum potential capacity of that region. Constraint (B.3) ensures that the total electricity supply from generation, storage, and transmission meets the demand after accounting for

any shed load. Constraint (B.4) prevents the shed load from exceeding a certain fraction of the electricity demand. Constraint (B.5) enforces that the planned outage duration equals a certain fraction of the time in one year. Constraint (B.6) states that the electrical energy stored in hydro reservoirs at the end of each time step is equal to that of the previous time step plus the water inflow (in energy terms) minus the electrical energy withdrawn from the reservoir. Similarly, constraint (B.7) ensures that the amount of electrical energy stored in batteries at the end of each time step equals that of the previous time step plus the added charge minus the discharged amount. Note that both constraints (B.6) and (B.7) form a closed loop in the storage balance constraints by linking the last time step to the first time step. Constraint (B.8) restricts the electricity produced by nuclear plants to be less than or equal to their capacity minus planned outages. Constraint (B.9) ensures that the wind and solar generation does not exceed their capacity, adjusted by the corresponding capacity factor for each time step. Constraint (B.10)–(B.12) ensures that the electricity generated by gas turbines, hydropower plants, the electricity used for battery charging, and the electricity discharged from batteries do not exceed their respective capacities. Constraint (B.13) states that the electricity transmitted between regions does not exceed the transmission line capacity. Constraint (B.14) restricts the stored electricity in the hydro reservoir to its maximum storage capacity in each region and constraint (B.15) ensures that the electricity stored in the batteries does not exceed their storage capacity. Constraints (B.16)-(B.20) respectively compute the annual load shedding, CO₂ emissions, operating and fixed costs, and levelized investment costs. Finally, the non-negativity requirement of the decision variables is stated in constraints (B.21)-(B.24).

Appendix C. Mathematical model for simulating the solutions

The following mathematical model is applied to evaluate a given capacity layout \overline{Cap} using simulation.

Simulation problem (n, \overline{Cap}, s) :

$$SC_{s} = IC + FC + \min \left\{ OC_{s} + c^{tax} \cdot TE_{s} + c^{S} \cdot TS_{s} + BM \cdot LoL_{s} \right\}$$
(C.1)

subject to: (B.4)–(B.7), (B.9)–(B.24), (6), (9)

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}' \cup \{\mathbf{I}\}} \mathbf{E}_{s,r,p,t} - \mathbf{E}_{s,r,\mathbf{B},t} + \sum_{\substack{r' \in \mathcal{R} \\ (r,r') \in \mathcal{L}}} \left(\eta_{r',r}^{\mathsf{T}} \cdot \mathbf{T}_{s,r',r,t} - \mathbf{T}_{s,r,r',t} \right)$$

$$\geq \text{ts} \cdot \text{load}_{r,t} - \text{ES}_{s,r,t} - \text{EL}_{s,r,t}, \quad \forall r \in \mathcal{R}, \ t \in \mathcal{T}$$
(C.2)

$$\sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} UO_{s,r,t} = \mathbf{m} \cdot \mathbf{ts} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{os}'_{s,i,t}, \quad \forall t \in \mathcal{T}$$
(C.3)

$$\operatorname{Cap}_{r,p} = \overline{\operatorname{Cap}}_{r,p}, \quad \forall r \in \mathcal{R}, \ p \in \mathcal{P}$$
(C.4)

$$LoL_{s} = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{R}} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} EL_{s,r,t}$$
(C.5)

$$\operatorname{EL}_{s,r,t} \ge 0, \quad \forall r \in \mathcal{R}, \ t \in \mathcal{T}$$
 (C.6)

In the Simulation problem, Objective function (C.1) minimizes the total system cost, plus the penalty for LoL. Note that the investment and fixed costs (IC and FC) are dependent only on the given capacity mix and can be pre-computed; this allows them to be excluded from the optimization. Constraint (C.2) is analogous to Constraint (B.3) but incorporates the loss of load. Constraint (C.3) calculates unplanned nuclear power outages based on the generated hourly power outages and the unit capacity of nuclear plants. Note that Algorithm GenerateOutage-Samples(n) is applied to generate (simulate) the time series for nuclear power outages (denoted by $os'_{s,i,t}$). Constraint (C.4) ensures that the capacity mix remains fixed. Constraint (C.5) computes the annual loss of load for a given simulation year, and Constraint (C.6) enforces non-negativity for the loss of load variable.

Appendix D. Description of additional parameters in the case study

The investment cost, fixed cost, variable cost, fuel cost, efficiency, lifetime, and emission factor of each technology are given in Table G.1, which are mainly derived from the Danish Energy Agency [62]. For the transmission grids, the investment cost, c^T, is $0.4 \in kW^{-1} \text{ km}^{-1}$ with a lifetime equal to 40 years [63]. The transmission efficiency between the regions, $\eta_{r,r'}^{T}$, is calculated by $(1 - \alpha^{\text{Loss}})^{\text{dist}_{r,r'}/1000}$ where α^{Loss} is the electricity loss per kilometer and is assumed to be 0.016. A discharge time of four hours is assumed for the batteries, i.e., dt = 4h [64].

The capital recovery factor of each technology is calculated by $\frac{i}{1-(1+i)^{-T}}$, where i is the discount rate and is assumed to be 0.05, and T is the life of the technology. We assume that the total shed load at each time step should not exceed 5% of the electricity demand, i.e., sr = 0.05 [65]. Additionally, the carbon tax c^{tax}, load shedding cost c^S, and penalty cost for loss of load (in the simulation model) BM are set to $150 \in t_{CO_2}^{-1}$, $1000 \in MWh^{-1}$, and $10\,000 \in MWh^{-1}$, respectively. The planned outage rate, β , is also assumed to be 15%. Each region has some requirements to ensure that investment in solar and wind technologies does not exceed certain limits, due to the limited land availability. Additionally, the hydropower and reservoir capacity are assumed to be fixed in each region due to environmental regulations. The limitations on solar and wind capacities, along with the existing capacity of the hydropower technology and reservoir in the regions, are given in Table G.2; it should be mentioned that for the rest of the technologies, no capacity limitation is applied.

Appendix E. Sensitivity analysis based on D and WU models

For the sensitivity analysis, an additional constraint was added to the model presented in Section 3.1 to fix the total number of nuclear plants in the system. In Figure H.3, the dashed lines show the simulation results with only uncertainty in weather conditions, and the solid lines correspond to the simulation results with uncertainty in both weather conditions and nuclear power availability. As seen in this figure, increasing the penetration of nuclear power plants makes the system more vulnerable. Moreover, referring to Figure H.3, under the *Normal* simulation, the LoL of the D model's solution is always higher than that of the WU model's solution. Thus, the WU model provides some hedging also for nuclear power uncertainty (red line vs. blue line in Figure H.3), but the LoL still increases proportionally with increasing nuclear penetration. Based on the sensitivity analysis results, a Pareto front was derived for both models, as shown in Figure H.4. This figure demonstrates that the WU model outperforms the D model in terms of cost and LoL.

Appendix F. Algorithms

```
Function SolveRobustProblem(\mathcal{A}, N^{P}, N^{R}, s)
  os \leftarrow GenerateOutageSamples(N^R) // These outage
       samples are generated and used in the Master
       problem and Sub-problem.
  pareto \leftarrow \emptyset // Pareto front is initialized to empty.
  /* For every confidence level (\alpha) and nuclear plant
       size (n), the robust model is solved.
  for (n \in \mathcal{N}) and (\alpha \in \mathcal{A}) do
        \bar{z}_{i,s} \leftarrow 0, \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N^R\}, s \in S
        Solve Master problem (n, \bar{z})
        \operatorname{Cap}_{r,p} \leftarrow \operatorname{Cap}_{r,p}, \quad \forall r \in \mathcal{R}, \ p \in \mathcal{P}
        (AOP, MOP) \leftarrow \text{Percentiles}(n, \alpha, N^P) // \text{Annual}
             and maximum unplanned outages (AOP, MOP) are
             calculated.
        /* For each scenario, the sub-problem is solved
             to identify the start time and duration of
             nuclear power outages that may result in a
             loss of load risk.
                                                                                    */
        for s \in S do
              Solve Sub-problem(n, AOP, MOP, N<sup>R</sup>, \overline{Cap}, s)
             \bar{z}_{i,s} \leftarrow z_i, \quad \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N^R\}
        end
        Solve Master problem (n, \bar{z})
        \bar{c} \leftarrow 0 and \bar{l} \leftarrow 0
        \overline{\operatorname{Cap}}_{r,p} \leftarrow \operatorname{Cap}_{r,p}, \quad \forall r \in \mathcal{R}, \ p \in \mathcal{P}
        /* Solution \overline{Cap} is simulated to accurately
             assess the current cost (\bar{c}) and current loss
             of load (\overline{l}).
        for s \in S' do
              os'_{s} \leftarrow GenerateOutageSamples(n)
              Solve Simulation problem (n, \overline{Cap}) and obtain
               SC
              \bar{l} \leftarrow \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathrm{EL}_{s,r,t}
              \bar{c} \leftarrow \bar{c} + \mathrm{SC} - \mathrm{BM} \cdot \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathrm{EL}_{s,r,t} / / \text{Loss of load}
                   is excluded from the cost.
        end
        \bar{c} \leftarrow \frac{\bar{c}}{|S'|} and \bar{l} \leftarrow \frac{l}{|S'|}
        /* Update the Pareto front if solution (\bar{c}, \bar{l}, \overline{\text{Cap}})
             dominates the current solutions in Pareto
             front
                                                                                    */
        nonDominated \leftarrow \texttt{true}
        for sol \in pareto do
              if (\bar{c} \ge \text{sol.cost} \text{ and } \bar{l} \ge \text{sol.loss}) then
                   nonDominated \leftarrow \texttt{false}
                    break
              end
        end
        if nonDominated then
              pareto \leftarrow pareto \setminus
                {\text{sol} \in \text{pareto} : (\bar{c} \le \text{sol.cost} \text{ and } \bar{l} \le \text{sol.loss})}
              pareto \leftarrow pareto \cup {solution = (\bar{c}, \bar{l}, \overline{\mathbf{Cap}})}
        end
   end
   return pareto
```

Appendix G. Tables

Plant	Investment Cost € kW ⁻¹	Fixed Cost €MW ⁻¹ y ⁻¹	Variable Cost €MWh ⁻¹	Fuel Cost €MWh ⁻¹	Efficiency -	Lifetime y	Emission Factor $t_{CO_2} MWh^{-1}$
Н	0	30000	0	0	0.9	80	0
G	436	7893	4.79	32	0.43	25	0.202
W	1090	15602	1.85	0	1	30	0
Р	290	9900	0	0	1	40	0
В	65 ^a	0	0	0	1	15	0
Ι	200	38000	0	0	0.92	15	0
Ν	4000	126000	1.9	3	0.33	40	0

Table G.1: Cost parameters, operational characteristics, and environmental impacts of the technologies considered in the case study. Cost assumptions are drawn mainly from the Danish Energy Agency [62].

 ^a The unit for battery storage capacity is €kW⁻¹.
 ^b To assess the impact of uncertainty in nuclear availability, we assume a relatively low cost for nuclear power to ensure it plays a significant role in the optimal energy mix.

Table G.2: Maximum wind and solar potential [66], hydropower capacity, and reservoir storage capacity in each region [67].

		Regions						
Technologies	SE ^N	SE ^S	DK	DE ^N	DE ^S	BNL	PL	
Hydropower capacity, $cap_{r\mathbf{H}}^{max}(GW)$	13.7	2.5	0	0.21	1.17	0	0.47	
Wind capacity, $cap_{r,\mathbf{W}}^{max}(GW)$	46	60	19	73	42	22	125	
Solar capacity, $\operatorname{cap}_{r\mathbf{P}}^{\max}$ (GW)	11	39	59	233	142	59	432	
Reservoir capacity, $rl_r^{max}(TWh)$	27.2	6.6	0	0.05	0.25	0	1.6	

				Tota	al capacity						System co	osts			
Solution #	Hydropower (GW)	Gas (GW)	Wind (GW)	Solar (GW)	Nuclear (GW)	Transmission (GW)	Inverter (GW)	Battery (GWh)	Investment (M€)	Fixed (M€)	Operational (M€)	Emissions (M€)	Load shedding (M€)	SC (M€)	LoL (GWh)
1	18	60	182	223	38	90	32	297	31028	12077	6065	2979	38	52186	6.32
2	18	59	177	219	40	89	31	279	30931	12165	6130	2925	39	52190	6.26
3	18	59	177	217	40	89	31	279	30867	12145	6180	2960	39	52191	6.25
4	18	60	182	224	38	92	32	294	31059	12080	6051	2970	36	52196	5.99
5	18	60	183	224	38	90	32	281	31045	12110	6045	2976	34	52209	5.59
6	18	60	178	218	40	88	32	274	30928	12183	6133	2936	33	52212	4.83
7	18	60	178	219	40	88	31	273	30976	12196	6097	2912	32	52213	4.76
8	18	60	178	218	40	88	31	270	30931	12177	6136	2941	32	52217	4.75
9	18	58	169	208	44	85	30	251	30799	12385	6223	2789	37	52232	4.52
10	18	60	178	218	40	88	32	268	30953	12203	6118	2930	29	52233	3.93
11	18	61	183	224	38	91	33	281	31130	12134	6006	2949	27	52245	3.73
12	18	61	183	224	38	91	33	290	31147	12134	5999	2938	26	52245	3.61
13	18	61	179	218	40	88	31	273	31064	12205	6062	2890	24	52246	2.82
14	18	60	171	206	44	85	29	240	30846	12374	6223	2799	27	52270	2.60
15	18	59	171	211	44	84	31	246	30972	12477	6090	2711	27	52276	2.35
16	18	62	180	219	40	90	31	269	31136	12227	6037	2867	21	52288	1.78
17	18	62	181	219	40	90	31	258	31174	12236	6007	2860	20	52298	1.45
18	18	61	172	207	44	84	29	240	30972	12390	6162	2765	19	52309	1.25
19	18	63	185	223	38	93	32	273	31257	12132	5974	2928	18	52310	1.23
20	18	61	176	215	42	88	31	253	31143	12383	6018	2764	21	52329	0.96
21	18	60	167	205	46	81	29	232	30935	12558	6169	2663	19	52344	0.75
22	18	61	169	203	46	82	28	222	30984	12531	6165	2670	16	52365	0.73
23	18	63	173	208	44	84	28	229	31054	12400	6143	2763	13	52373	0.69
24	18	65	184	217	40	91	29	248	31344	12228	5978	2843	11	52405	0.28
25	18	66	191	228	36	96	32	282	31523	12067	5865	2949	11	52415	0.27
26	18	66	188	222	38	94	30	257	31435	12130	5939	2913	10	52427	0.27
27	18	61	165	200	48	80	27	214	31049	12659	6149	2559	12	52427	0.24
28	18	65	180	212	42	87	29	237	31324	12352	5995	2764	9	52444	0.02
29	18	63	166	201	48	79	28	215	31210	12724	6053	2497	7	52490	0.00

Table G.3: Summary of the Pareto solutions obtained by solving the Weather and Nuclear Uncertainty (WNU) model.

	Deterministic solution			S	tochastic soluti	ion	(I	Robust solution	n #1)	Robust solution (Pareto solution #29)		
Year	SC (M€)	LoL (GWh)	LoL (%)	SC (M€)	LoL (GWh)	LoL (%)	SC (M€)	LoL (GWh)	LoL (%)	SC (M€)	LoL (GWh)	LoL (%)
1979	51767	0	0	51639	0	0	51604	0	0	51962	0	0
1980	52154	0	0	52144	0	0	52301	0	0	52521	0	0
1981	52813	0	0	52711	1	9.1×10^{-3}	52644	0	0	52855	0	0
1982	53453	35	3.3×10^{-3}	52731	39	3.7×10^{-3}	52940	0	0	52931	0	0
1983	49930	0	0	50081	0	0	49930	0	0	50534	0	0
1984	53102	0	0	52933	0	0	53099	0	0	53289	0	0
1985	53937	42	4.0×10^{-3}	53784	52	5.0×10^{-3}	53893	0	0	53904	0	0
1986	50395	0	0	50471	0	0	50358	0	0	50917	0	0
1987	54900	0	0	54393	0	0	54700	0	0	54678	0	0
1988	50113	0	0	50279	0	0	50005	0	0	50763	0	0
1989	50862	13	1.3×10^{-3}	50966	20	1.9×10^{-3}	50837	0	0	51292	0	0
1990	50527	0	0	50588	0	0	50597	0	0	51064	0	0
1991	52403	97	9.3×10^{-3}	52233	82	7.9×10^{-3}	52251	40	3.8×10^{-3}	52520	0	0
1992	51356	136	1.3×10^{-3}	51405	9	8.2×10^{-3}	50991	0	0	51600	0	0
1993	51409	20	1.9×10^{-3}	51499	0	0	51508	0	0	51795	0	0
1994	52129	0	0	51920	0	0	51850	0	0	52248	0	0
1995	53286	94	9.0×10^{-3}	52952	37	3.5×10^{-3}	52773	0	0	53132	0	0
1996	54535	273	2.6×10^{-3}	54130	156	1.5×10^{-3}	54328	122	1.2×10^{-3}	54248	0	0
1997	53429	0	0	53290	0	0	53435	0	0	53544	0	0
1998	51058	36	3.5×10^{-3}	51197	36	3.5×10^{-3}	51192	0	0	51630	0	0
1999	51367	0	0	51358	0	0	51208	0	0	51717	0	0
2000	51790	0	0	51702	0	0	51825	0	0	52055	0	0
2001	54360	152	1.5×10^{-3}	53701	100	9.7×10^{-3}	53758	40	3.8×10^{-3}	53826	0	0
2002	52735	0	0	52497	0	0	52453	0	0	52722	0	0
2003	52664	0	0	52559	0	0	52604	0	0	52794	0	0
2004	52207	0	0	52221	0	0	52062	0	0	52522	0	0
2005	51989	269	2.6×10^{-3}	51955	128	1.2×10^{-3}	52002	57	5.5×10^{-3}	52213	0	0
2006	51779	0	0	51784	0	0	51777	0	0	52050	0	0
2007	51330	0	0	51458	0	0	51342	0	0	51924	0	0
2008	51903	0	0	51830	0	0	51686	0	0	52182	0	0
2009	54971	0	0	54516	0	0	54714	0	0	54632	0	0
2010	53712	0	1.3×10^{-3}	53376	11	1.0×10^{-3}	53308	0	0	53504	0	0
2011	51450	0	0	51778	0	0	51720	0	0	52135	0	0
2012	52395	28	2.7×10^{-3}	52512	29	2.7×10^{-3}	52501	0	0	52776	0	0
2013	52976	0	0	52779	0	0	52875	0	0	53122	0	0
2014	53501	202	1.9×10^{-3}	53423	45	4.3×10^{-3}	53173	0	0	53339	0	0
2015	50633	0	0	50687	0	0	50756	0	0	51211	0	0
2016	53450	0	0	53244	0	0	53100	0	0	53333	0	0
2017	52576	0	0	52469	0	0	52204	0	0	52714	0	0
2018	52259	0	0	52240	0	0	52509	0	0	52563	0	0
2019	50754	0	0	50964	0	0	50822	0	0	51336	0	0
Average	52301	34	3.3×10^{-3}	52205	18	1.7×10^{-3}	52186	6	6.1×10^{-3}	52490	0	0
Std.	1297	72	6.9×10^{-3}	1117	37	3.5×10^{-3}	1199	22	2.1×10^{-3}	1019	0	0
Max.	54971	273	2.6×10^{-3}	54516	156	1.5×10^{-3}	54714	122	1.2×10^{-3}	54678	0	0

Table G.4: 41 years simulation results considering unplanned nuclear power outages for the solutions depicted in Figures H.1 and H.2.

Appendix H. Figures





(b) Stochastic solution, with SC = 52205 M \in and LoL = 18 GWh.

Figure H.1: Optimal solution obtained by solving deterministic and stochastic models.





(b) Pareto solution #29, with SC = 52490 M \in and LoL = 0 GWh.

Figure H.2: Two of the Pareto solutions obtained by the heuristic algorithm.



Figure H.3: Loss of load (LoL) obtained from the simulation for the *Deterministic* (D) and *Weather Uncertainty* (WU) models plotted against different numbers of nuclear plants in the system.



Figure H.4: Pareto front of the *Deterministic* (D) and *Weather Uncertainty* (WU) models' solutions, illustrating the trade-off between the SC and LoL over a 41-year simulation.