

# Risk-limiting Load Restoration for Resilience Enhancement with Intermittent Energy Resources

Zhiwen Wang, *Student Member, IEEE*, Chen Shen, *Senior Member, IEEE*, Yin Xu, *Member, IEEE*, Feng Liu, *Member, IEEE*, Xiangyu Wu, *Student Member, IEEE*, Chen-Ching Liu, *Fellow, IEEE*

**Abstract**—Microgrids are resources to restore critical loads after a natural disaster, enhancing the resiliency of a distribution network. To deal with stochastic power generated by intermittent energy resources within microgrids, such as wind turbines (WTs) and photovoltaics (PVs), most existing methods require forecast information. However, some microgrids may not be equipped with power forecasting tools. To fill this gap, a risk-limiting strategy based on real-time measurements is proposed. The Gaussian mixture model (GMM) is used to represent a prior joint distribution of power outputs of WTs and PVs over multiple periods based on historical data. As time rolls forward, with latest measurement data, the distributions of WT/PV generation are updated in a recursive manner. The updated distributions are used as inputs for load restoration, enabling an equivalent transformation of the original probabilistic-constrained problem to a mixed integer linear programming (MILP) that is computationally tractable. Simulation cases on a distribution system with three microgrids demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed method. Results also indicate that networked microgrids have better uncertainty management capabilities than stand-alone microgrids.

**Index Terms**— Resilience; load restoration; microgrids; solar power; wind power, probabilistic distribution

## NOMENCLATURE

Most symbols used in this paper are listed below for ease of reference; others are explained following their first appearance.

### Indices

$t$	Indices for periods
$g$	Indices for generators and energy storage systems (ESSs)
$v$	Indices for WTs and PVs
$l$	Indices for loads

This work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 51190103, Foundation for Innovative Research Groups of National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 51621065, and Special Fund of the National Basic Research Program (973) of China under Grant 2013CB228201. This research is also partially funded by the State of Washington Department of Commerce through the Transactive Campus Energy Systems project with co-funding from U.S. Department of Energy. (Corresponding to: Yin Xu)

Z. W. Wang, C. Shen, F. Liu, and X. Y. Wu are with the State Key Lab. of Power Systems, Department of Electrical Engineering, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China (e-mail: wang-zw13@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn).

Y. Xu is with the School of Electrical Engineering, Beijing Jiaotong University (BJTU), Beijing 100044 China (e-mail: yxu2@eecs.wsu.edu).

C.-C. Liu is with the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science Washington State University, Pullman, WA 99164, USA. He is also Visiting Professor, School of Mechanical and Materials Engineering at University College Dublin, Ireland.

$m$	Indices for Gaussian components
<b>Parameters</b>	
$T$	Number of periods
$G$	Number of generators and ESSs
$W$	Number of WTs
$S$	Number of PVs
$L$	Number of loads
$M$	Number of Gaussian components
$\omega_m, \mu_m, \Sigma_m$	Parameters of the $m$ th component of a GMM
$\Omega$	$\Omega = \{\omega_m, \mu_m, \Sigma_m   m=1, \dots, M\}$
$p_g^{\max}, p_g^{\min}$	Maximum and minimum power outputs of generator $g$
$c_l$	Priority weight of load $l$
$\tau$	Length of each period. $\tau=1$ hour
$r_g^{\text{up}}, r_g^{\text{dn}}$	Ramp-up and ramp-down limits of generator $g$
$p_{t,l}$	Power of load $l$ in period $t$
$EN_g$	Generation resource of generator $g$
$EC_g$	Capacity of ESS $g$
$\rho_c, \rho_d$	Charging and discharging efficiency of ESS $g$

### Random Variables

$X_v^t$  power output of WT/PV  $v$  in period  $t$

### Decision Variables

$p_{t,g}$	Scheduled power output of generator $g$ in period $t$
$P_{t,g}^{\text{ch}}, P_{t,g}^{\text{dch}}$	Scheduled charging/discharging power of ESS $g$ in period $t$
$u_{t,l}$	Status of load $l$ to determine in period $t$ . $u_{t,l} = 1$ if load $l$ restored in period $t$ ; $u_{t,l} = 0$ , otherwise

## I. INTRODUCTION

**R**ESILIENCY is an essential feature of smart distribution systems. Resiliency refers to the ability of a distribution system to withstand and recover customer service rapidly from major disasters, such as earthquake, flooding, and hurricane [1]–[3]. Distributed energy resources (DERs), electric vehicles (EVs), energy storage systems (ESSs), as well as microgrids (MGs), are resources to enhance the resiliency of a distribution system as they can serve critical loads when the bulk power

system is not available after a major disaster.

Much research has been conducted on resiliency enhancement [4]-[7]. A three-stage restoration procedure for distribution networks is proposed in [4] that can be used to maximize the restored load using available DERs. Ref. [5] studies the automatic reconfiguration of microgrids with dynamical boundaries, considering transients of line faults and generators. The proposed method in [6] transforms a load restoration problem into a linear integer programming “maximum coverage,” resulting in an efficient solution. However, there is a great need for a systematic method to manage uncertainties arising from DERs.

The power output of renewable resources, e.g. WTs and PVs, is stochastic. Handling of uncertainties in a resiliency-oriented service restoration has been studied in [8]-[12]. Ref. [8] proposes an operation and self-healing strategy incorporating the power outputs of DERs as deterministic forecast values. A model predictive control approach is proposed in [9] for microgrids to enhance power system resiliency using short-term forecast. Alternatively, ref. [10] deals with uncertainties by the scenario generation and reduction technique using forecasts. In a relevant study, ref. [11] proposes a two-stage stochastic programming based on scenarios. Other papers take into account uncertainties by robust optimization, e.g., [12].

An important methodology concerning uncertainty is the well-known risk-limiting dispatch (RLD), in which power delivered at a particular time is determined in multiple decision stages. In each decision stage, risk metrics should be managed based on the latest conditional forecast of uncertainty [13]-[17]. RLD is practical for integration of renewables: risk is managed sequentially as the accuracy of descriptions about uncertainties increases with newly collected information. RLD is proposed in [13]; [14] extends it to multiple delivery periods; [15] discusses the congestion in a transmission network; [16] addresses the ramping issue. A comprehensive literature survey on RLD can be found in [17]. The scope of this paper is load restoration with microgrids in the distribution system level. A major concern on the application of RLD in the distribution level is the absence of power forecasting tools, resulting in infeasibility of forecast-based RLD.

To the best of authors’ knowledge, most existing methods either characterize WT/PV uncertainties solely through historical data; or it is assumed that there are continually updated power forecasts. Both assumptions can be invalid in the distribution level: 1) description of WT/PV uncertainties in the next period is not only determined by historical data but also conditional on current realizations of power outputs; 2) power forecasts may not be available in microgrids.

To address these important issues, this paper proposes a risk-limiting load restoration strategy based on observations. Relative to the state-of-the-art, the contributions of this paper are threefold:

(1) Resilience enhancement considering uncertainties is formulated as a multi-period risk-limiting decision-making problem in a rolling plan over time.

(2) A methodology is proposed to recursively update distributions of renewable energy as latest observations are

available. Both wind and solar power uncertainties are modeled in a universal manner considering the spatial-temporal correlation.

(3) Based on the observation-updated distributions, probabilistic constraints in the risk-limiting load restoration problem are converted into equivalent deterministic ones. By doing so, the computation performance becomes practical.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: Section II provides the problem formulation; Section III discusses the method to update distributions of uncertainties based on observations. Section IV transforms the original problem into an MILP. Case study results are presented in Section V. Conclusion and limitations are summarized at the end of this paper.

## II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

### A. Assumptions

(1) It is assumed that there is a centralized decision maker (such as an owner/operator/controller of the microgrid) to collect information and optimize the operation. Dispatchable generators, e.g., diesels, and ESSs, follow instructions from the central controller to regulate their outputs.

(2) Uncertainties arise from solar and wind power. Other uncertainties, e.g., load variation, forced outage of a generator, are not considered in this paper.

### B. Features of uncertainties in microgrids

Wind and solar power are commonly used in microgrids. During an outage, power from WTs and PVs can serve load, facilitating load restoration. Wind and solar power uncertainties in microgrids have three features:




Fig. 1 The spatial-temporal correlation matrix of two WTs over 10 hours

(1) Distribution of wind power is different from that of solar power. Normally, wind power can be modeled by *t-location*, *versatile*, or *Cauchy* distributions, etc., [18]-[20]. For solar power, *Beta* distribution is a good model [21]. In the presence of both WTs and PVs, different forms of distributions make it difficult to solve a load restoration problem in a universal

manner.

(2) Wind/solar power outputs have spatial-temporal correlations. First, in the distribution system level, renewables are geographically closely located. Hence, the spatial dependence of power outputs from adjacent wind farms/solar arrays is significant. Second, power outputs over continuous periods are also correlated. An illustration of the spatial-temporal correlation of two adjacent WTs over 10 hours is shown in Fig.1. Similar results can be obtained for PVs. Challenges arise when correlated random variables need arithmetical addition operation in constraints, e.g. power balance equation and energy consumption limits.

(3) Due to cost considerations, it is not guaranteed that all microgrids are equipped with power forecasting tools. Hence, in some cases, forecast information for WTs/PVs may be unavailable, increasing the difficulty of decision making for load restoration.

However, measurements of WT and PV generation are collected as time moves forward. Due to the temporal correlation, it is possible to use latest observations to update an inference to the future uncertainties. Suppose that power outputs in time  $t$  and  $t+1$  are positively correlated. If the power in  $t$  is observed and it is at a high value, there is a good chance that power in  $t+1$  is also at a high value. By doing so, operators can update the inference to make decisions correspondingly for the next periods.

### C. Rolling plan

The proposed load restoration is aimed to enhance resiliency. It determines the set of loads to be restored, the generation schedule of dispatchable generators, and the charging/discharging strategy of ESSs in a rolling plan as illustrated in Fig. 2 [10]. At the end of period  $\kappa$ , distributions of random variables are updated based on the latest observations. Thereafter, an optimal load restoration strategy is determined over the optimization window, in which only decisions in the first time interval are implemented to instruct generators/ESSs/loads for the next period  $\kappa+1$  whereas the rest are abandoned. Note that the time resolution in Fig. 2 can be changed from 1 hour to other frames, e.g. 10 min or 30 min, if needed.




Fig. 2 Illustration of a rolling plan. The outage is from 07:00 to 17:00

Indeed, the load restoration problem is a special case of RLD [13]-[17]. That is, multiple decision stages are merged into one decision stage. This modification is justified as follows:

In RLD, power delivered at a certain period  $t$  is accumulated for multiple decision stages. This is reasonable in the transmission system level with the market mechanism, where power determined in an earlier stage costs less. However, for the load restoration, as there is no additional reward for the objective function (1) to make decisions earlier than  $t$ , the power delivered at  $t+1$  is solely determined in the single stage  $t$ . In fact, it can be proved that even with multiple decision stages, decision variables determined in stages earlier than  $t$  will be zero [13]. Hence, concerning the objective function (1), there is no need to involve multiple decision stages. The computation complexity thereafter greatly decreases.

**Remark 1:** The proposed load restoration can be also regarded as model predictive control [9], [10].

### D. Objective

Resilience can be evaluated by the cumulative service time to loads weighted by their priority over the outage duration [6], [7]. Hence, in the period  $\kappa$ , the objective over the optimization window is to maximize the resilience index as follows:

$$\max \sum_{t=\kappa+1}^T \sum_{l=1}^L c_l \cdot u_{t,l} \cdot \tau \quad \kappa = 0, \dots, T-1 \quad (1)$$

Priority weights of critical loads should be sufficiently greater than that of non-critical ones so that they can be served preferentially by limited available capacities and resources.

### E. Constraints

#### 1) Probabilistic constraints associated with uncertainties

- Since power outputs of WTs/PVs are stochastic, the following adequacy requirement should be met in each period:

$$\Pr \left\{ \sum_{g=1}^G P_{t,g} + \sum_{v=1}^{W+S} X_t^v \geq \sum_{l=1}^L u_{t,l} P_{t,l} \right\} \geq \alpha \quad \forall t \geq \kappa+1 \quad (2)$$

Equation (2) indicates that the probability of load demand being restored with available resources is greater than a given confidence level. This is a typical risk-limiting constraint [13]. In this paper,  $\alpha$  is 90%.

- Similar to (2), energy adequacy requirement is formulated as follows:

$$\Pr \left\{ \sum_{g \notin ESS} EN_g(\kappa+1) + \sum_{t=\kappa+1}^T \sum_{v=1}^{W+S} X_t^v \tau \geq \sum_{t=\kappa+1}^T \sum_{l=1}^L u_{t,l} P_{t,l} \tau \right\} \geq \alpha \quad (3)$$

$$EN_g(\kappa+1) = EN_g(0) - \sum_{\tau=1}^{\kappa} \bar{P}_{\tau,g} \quad \forall g \notin ESS \quad (4)$$

where  $EN_g(0)$  is generation resource available at the beginning;  $\bar{P}_{\tau,g}$  is the power output of generator  $g$  in the past  $\kappa$  periods.

Note that when real time  $\kappa$  rolls forward, distributions for random variables  $X_t^v$  in (2)(3) need to be updated.

## 2) Deterministic constraints

- If  $g$  is a diesel or other dispatchable generator, then the following output limit, generation resource limit, and ramping limits should be satisfied:

$$P_g^{\min} \leq P_{t,g} \leq P_g^{\max} \quad \forall t \geq \kappa+1, g \notin ESS \quad (5)$$

$$\sum_{t=\kappa+1}^T P_{t,g} \tau \leq EN_g(\kappa+1) \quad \forall g \notin ESS \quad (6)$$

$$r_g^{\text{dn}} \leq P_{t,g} - P_{t-1,g} \leq r_g^{\text{up}} \quad \forall t \geq \kappa+2, g \notin ESS \quad (7)$$

- If  $g$  is an ESS, then two auxiliary binary variables are introduced:  $\chi_{t,g}$  being 1 represents the discharging mode; while  $\gamma_{t,g}$  being 1 for charging mode. The ESS cannot be in charging and discharging modes at the same time [8]:

$$\chi_{t,g} + \gamma_{t,g} \leq 1 \quad \forall t \geq \kappa+1, g \in ESS \quad (8)$$

By doing so, limits on charging/discharging power output, maximum/minimum  $SOC$ , and  $SOC$  transition can be formulated as follows:

$$0 \leq P_{t,g}^{\text{dch}} \leq \chi_{t,g} P_g^{\text{dch,max}}, \quad \forall t \geq \kappa+1, g \in ESS \quad (9)$$

$$-\gamma_{t,g} P_g^{\text{ch,max}} \leq P_{t,g}^{\text{ch}} \leq 0, \quad \forall t \geq \kappa+1, g \in ESS \quad (10)$$

$$SOC_g^{\min} \leq SOC_{t,g} \leq SOC_g^{\max} \quad \forall t \geq \kappa+1, g \in ESS \quad (11)$$

$$SOC_{t,g} = SOC_{t-1,g} - \tau (P_{t-1,g}^{\text{dch}} \rho_d^{-1} + P_{t-1,g}^{\text{ch}} \rho_c) / EC_g \quad \forall t \geq \kappa+2, g \in ESS \quad (12)$$

Besides, it is often required that the  $SOC$  of an ESS at the end of outage duration should not be changed from its initial value:

$$SOC_{1,g} = SOC_{T,g} \quad \forall g \in ESS \quad (13)$$

## F. Discussion

To solve the problem defined by (1)-(13), two sub-problems need to be solved:

(1) Updating distribution of  $X_t^v$  as time rolls forward and the latest observations are collected;

(2) Dealing with probabilistic constraints (2) and (3), e.g. computing the distribution of an aggregation of  $X_t^v$  from all WTs/PVs not only in a single period, but also over the whole outage duration. Usually, one may use the ‘‘convolution technique’’ [22] to compute the summation of  $X_t^v$ . However,  $X_t^v$  is not Gaussian distributed, nor independent. Hence, the ‘‘convolution technique’’ does not apply.

The two sub-problems are solved in Section III and IV.

## III. MODELING UNCERTAINTY

This section presents the model for power output uncertainties of a single intermittent energy resource and discusses the extension to incorporate multiple ones.

### A. A prior distribution of uncertainty

Let a random variable  $X_t$  denote the actual power output of an intermittent energy resource in period  $t$ . Then, a random vector,  $\mathbf{X}$ , for outputs over  $T$  periods is defined as:

$$\mathbf{X} = [X_1 \quad \cdots \quad X_t \quad \cdots \quad X_T]^T \quad (14)$$

In this paper, the prior joint distribution of  $\mathbf{X}$  is presented by

a GMM with an adjustable parameter set  $\Omega = \{\omega_m, \boldsymbol{\mu}_m, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_m; m=1, \dots, M\}$  as follows:

$$f_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{m=1}^M \omega_m N_m(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\mu}_m, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_m) \quad (15)$$

$$\sum_{m=1}^M \omega_m = 1, \quad \omega_m > 0 \quad (16)$$

$$N_m(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\mu}_m, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_m) := \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_m)^T \boldsymbol{\sigma}_m^{-1}(\mathbf{x}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_m)}}{(2\pi)^T \det(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_m)^{1/2}} \quad (17)$$

where  $\omega_m$  is the weight,  $N_m(\cdot)$  is the  $m$ th multivariate Gaussian density with mean vector  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_m$  and covariance matrix  $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_m$ .

An advantage of the GMM is its ability to characterize different kinds of non-Gaussian correlated random variables [23]-[25]. Thus, it is suitable for modeling uncertainties of WTs and PVs.

With historical data of  $\mathbf{X}$ , the parameter set  $\Omega$  of a GMM can be determined through maximum likelihood estimation [26]. Specifically, this paper adopts a solver *gmdistribution.fit* in MATLAB to estimate the parameter set  $\Omega$ .

### B. Using observations to update distribution

Suppose in the second period, the actual power output in the first period is observed. That is,

$$X_1 = x_1 \quad (18)$$

Then, the distribution of the remaining entries,  $\mathbf{X}_{2,\dots,T}$ , can be updated as a conditional distribution with respect to  $X_1=x_1$ . In Appendix A, the procedure for computation of conditional distributions is provided:

$$f_{\mathbf{X}_{2,\dots,T} | X_1}(\mathbf{x}_{2,\dots,T} / x_1) = \sum_{l=1}^M \omega_l'(x_1, \Omega) N_l(\mathbf{x}_{2,\dots,T}; \boldsymbol{\mu}_l(x_1, \Omega), \boldsymbol{\sigma}_l(x_1, \Omega)) \quad (19)$$

Note that the updated distribution of  $\mathbf{X}_{2,\dots,T}$  has the form of a GMM. This is important. Indeed, when the third period comes with a realization of  $X_2$  observed, the distribution of  $\mathbf{X}_{3,\dots,T}$  can be updated in a similar way as (19) via the formulae in Appendix A. A more general updating formula for the period  $t+1$  based on an observation of  $X_t$  is given as:

$$f_{\mathbf{X}_{t+1,\dots,T} | \mathbf{X}_{1,\dots,t}}(\mathbf{x}_{t+1,\dots,T} / \mathbf{x}_{1,\dots,t}) = \sum_{l=1}^M \omega_l'(\mathbf{x}_{1,\dots,t}, \Omega) N_l(\mathbf{x}_{t+1,\dots,T}; \boldsymbol{\mu}_l(\mathbf{x}_{1,\dots,t}, \Omega), \boldsymbol{\sigma}_l(\mathbf{x}_{1,\dots,t}, \Omega)) \quad (20)$$




Fig. 3 A recursive procedure to update the distribution of power uncertainties

A flow chart is given in Fig.3. The distribution of power uncertainties for the next periods with respect to observations in the past can be updated in a recursive manner.

If there are multiple PVs and WTs, the random vector  $\mathbf{X}$  is augmented as:

$$\mathbf{X} = [X_1^1 \dots X_1^{W+S} \dots X_t^1 \dots X_t^{W+S} \dots X_T^1 \dots X_T^{W+S}]^T \quad (21)$$

In period  $t$ , an aggregated observation of  $W+S$  components is obtained, i.e.,

$$[X_t^1 \dots X_t^{W+S}] = [x_t^1 \dots x_t^{W+S}] \quad (22)$$

Then, the distribution of  $[X_{t+1}^1 \dots X_{t+1}^{W+S} \dots X_T^1 \dots X_T^{W+S}]^T$  with respect to such an observation can be updated via the formulae in Appendix A for a GMM form.

### C. Discussion

The proposed method modeling uncertainties has the following advantages:

(1) Even if distributions of power outputs of WTs and PVs are complicated and different from one another, the proposed method is able to provide a universal model with satisfactory estimation by adjusting the parameter set  $\Omega$ . Also, the spatial-temporal correlation can be taken into account.

(2) Based on latest collected observations, the proposed method is able to infer distributions recursively as time rolls forward, increasing the accuracy of the description about future uncertainties.

(3) The updated distribution in each period being a GMM facilitates the solution of the original problem (1)-(13).

## IV. SOLUTION METHODOLOGY

This section transforms probabilistic constraints (2)(3) into equivalent deterministic linear constraints.

### A. Equivalent transformation of power constraint (2)

Define the aggregation of  $X_t^v$  in period  $t$  by

$$X_t^{\text{sum}} = \sum_{v=1}^{W+S} X_t^v \quad \forall t \geq \kappa+1 \quad (23)$$

Using *Lemma 1* in Appendix B results in

$$f_{X_t^{\text{sum}}}(x_t^{\text{sum}}) = \sum_{l=1}^M \omega_l'(\mathbf{x}_t^{1,\dots,S+W}, \Omega) \times N_l(x_t^{\text{sum}}; \mathbf{1}^T \boldsymbol{\mu}_l(\mathbf{x}_t^{1,\dots,S+W}, \Omega), \mathbf{1}^T \boldsymbol{\sigma}_l(\mathbf{x}_t^{1,\dots,S+W}, \Omega) \mathbf{1}) \quad (24)$$

$\forall t \geq \kappa+1$

where  $\mathbf{1}$  is a unit vector with a proper dimension. Note that *Lemma 1* holds even if  $X_t^v$  is correlated with others. Hence, the correlation of random variables can be handled.

Thereafter, probabilistic constraint (2) is converted into:

$$\sum_{l=1}^L u_{t,l} P_{t,l} - \sum_{g=1}^G P_{t,g} \leq \text{CDF}_{X_t^{\text{sum}}}^{-1}(1-\alpha) \quad \forall t \geq \kappa+1 \quad (25)$$

where  $\text{CDF}^{-1}(\cdot)$  denotes quantile of the random variable  $X_t^{\text{sum}}$ . It can be computed through its distribution function (24) [27].

### B. Equivalent transformation of energy constraint (3)

Adopting a similar idea as (23) and (24), this method computes the distribution of the aggregation of  $X_t^v$  over multiple periods from  $\kappa+1$  to  $T$  as:

$$X_{\kappa+1,T}^{\text{sum}} = \sum_{t=\kappa+1}^T \sum_{v=1}^{W+S} X_t^v \quad (26)$$

$$f_{X_{\kappa+1,T}^{\text{sum}}}(x_{\kappa+1,T}^{\text{sum}}) = \sum_{l=1}^M \omega_l'(\mathbf{x}_{1,\dots,\kappa}^{1,\dots,S+W}, \Omega) \times \quad (27)$$

$$N_l(x_{\kappa+1,T}^{\text{sum}}; \mathbf{1}^T \boldsymbol{\mu}_l(\mathbf{x}_{1,\dots,\kappa}^{1,\dots,S+W}, \Omega), \mathbf{1}^T \boldsymbol{\sigma}_l(\mathbf{x}_{1,\dots,\kappa}^{1,\dots,S+W}, \Omega) \mathbf{1})$$

The equivalent transformation of (3) is:

$$\sum_{t=\kappa+1}^T \sum_{l=1}^L u_{t,l} P_{t,l} - \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{g \in \text{ESS}} \text{EN}_g(\kappa+1) \leq \text{CDF}_{X_{\kappa+1,T}^{\text{sum}}}^{-1}(1-\alpha) \quad (28)$$

where  $\text{CDF}^{-1}(\cdot)$  of  $X_{\kappa+1,T}^{\text{sum}}$  can be computed through its distribution function (27)[27].

### C. Equivalent MILP

Now, the original problem in Section III is converted to an equivalent MILP as follows:

$$\text{Objective :} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Subject to:} \quad (5)-(13), (25), \text{ and } (28)$$

The MILP can be solved efficiently by commercial available solvers, such as *intlinprog* in MATLAB.

### D. Discussion

Alternatively, probabilistic constraints (2)(3) are formulated as expectations [28], [29]. That is:

- power adequacy requirement

$$\sum_{g=1}^G P_{t,g} + \mathbf{E} \left[ \sum_{v=1}^{W+S} X_t^v \right] = \sum_{l=1}^L u_{t,l} P_{t,l} \quad \forall t \geq \kappa+1 \quad (29)$$

- limited energy requirement

$$\sum_{g \in \text{ESS}} \text{EN}_g(\kappa+1) + \mathbf{E} \left[ \sum_{t=\kappa+1}^T \sum_{v=1}^{W+S} X_t^v \tau \right] = \sum_{t=\kappa+1}^T \sum_{l=1}^L P_{t,l} \tau \quad (30)$$

where  $\mathbf{E}[\cdot]$  is the expectation operation.

Since the distributions of the aggregation of  $X_t^v$  have been derived in (24)(27), the expected values can be computed as:

$$\mathbf{E}[X_t^{\text{sum}}] = \sum_{l=1}^M \omega_l'(\mathbf{x}_t^{1,\dots,S+W}, \Omega) \left[ \mathbf{1}^T \boldsymbol{\mu}_l(\mathbf{x}_t^{1,\dots,S+W}, \Omega) \right] \quad (31)$$

$\forall t \geq \kappa+1$

$$\mathbf{E}[X_{\kappa+1,T}^{\text{sum}}] = \sum_{l=1}^M \omega_l'(\mathbf{x}_{1,\dots,\kappa}^{1,\dots,S+W}, \Omega) \left[ \mathbf{1}^T \boldsymbol{\mu}_l(\mathbf{x}_{1,\dots,\kappa}^{1,\dots,S+W}, \Omega) \right] \quad (32)$$

## V. CASE STUDY

### A. Test system and data

In the following tests, there are three microgrids, each with a diesel generator and an ESS. Besides, MG1 and MG2 both have a WT; MG3 has a PV. The duration of an outage is 10 hour with 1-hour time resolution from 07:00 to 17:00. As a result, the total number of random variables is 30 (=3×10). Historical data of WTs/PVs comes from public datasets “*solar integration data set*” and “*wind integration data set*” of National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) [30]. Load information of the IEEE 342-node system comes from Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL) [31]. Due to the limited space, only important information about the test system is listed in Table I.

TABLE I  
IMPORTANT SYSTEM INFORMATION

MG No.	Information
MG1	Diesel1 : 2.0 MW, 16.0 MWh
	ESS1 : 0.5 MW, 2.0 MWh, SOC70%
	WT1 : 2.0 MW
	Loads : 32 loads, 6.48MW in total
MG2	Diesel2 : 3.0 MW, 18.0 MWh
	ESS2 : 1.5 MW, 3.0 MWh, SOC60%
	WT2 : 2.0 MW
	Loads : 30 loads, 8.79 MW in total
MG3	Diesel3 : 2.5 MW, 15.0 MWh
	ESS3 : 1.0 MW, 4.0 MWh, SOC70%
	PV3 : 2.0 MW
	Loads : 34 loads, 6.54 MW in total

### B. Validation of modeling uncertainty

This subsection provides the results using the GMM to model uncertainties and update distributions based on observations.

First, a GMM with 20 components is adopted to fit the historical data of the actual power outputs of WTs/PVs over 10 periods. Since it is impossible to use a picture to visualize the fitting performance when the dimension of a random vector is greater than three, this paper shows the fitting results one by one in Fig. 4. It can be seen that GMM approximations are consistent with actual distributions of WTs/PVs both in 08:00 and 14:00. Similar results are obtained for the other eight periods, which are omitted due to space limitation. Such results indicate that the GMM is able to represent prior distributions of WTs/PVs according to historical data.




Fig. 4 The GMM fits historical data of WFs/PVs in 08:00 and 14:00

Secondly, this paper computes the recursively updated distributions as detailed in Section III. Take WT1 in MG1 as an example, in Fig. 5, the width of confidence levels of the updated distribution becomes narrower as time rolls forward, i.e., more observations are available. Meanwhile, the actual power is well

bounded within confidence intervals. As a comparison, with the same confidence level, the width of the distribution without update is relatively broad, indicating a rough description of wind power uncertainties. Fig. 5 reveals that the updated distribution provides a more elaborate description of wind power uncertainties than the one without updating. Similar results are obtained for WT2 in MG2, and PV3 in MG3.




Fig. 5 distributions of WT1 in MG1 over 10 hours with/without update

### C. Results of the load restoration plan

#### 1) Individual microgrid case

With the validated model of uncertainties, this subsection is concerned with load restoration using the updated distributions. In this test, each microgrid operates in a stand-alone mode with no connection to others, instructs its own energy resources, and supplies its own loads.

The load restoration strategy is tested in an operation simulation: First, a generation/load instruction for the next arriving time is determined and implemented. At this point, loads restored are called “scheduled restored loads (SRL)”. Then, as the next time arrives, power outputs of WTs/PVs are observed. Since power outputs of WTs/PVs are random, there should follow an adjustment: if the power supply is less than the SRL demand, a portion of the SRL should not be served according to their priority; otherwise, there should be wind and solar spillage. After the adjustment, loads restored are called “deployed restored load (DRL).” For brevity, it is assumed that there is no way to regulate power outputs of diesels and ESSs once they are determined. By doing so, it is straightforward and convenient to use the load reduction and wind/solar spillage to evaluate the effectiveness of the load restoration strategy.

Fig. 6 shows SRL, DRL, wind spillage, and load reduction of MG1 (MG2 and MG3 are omitted). In order to show the advantage of the recursively updated distribution, SRLs/DRLs of the distribution solely determined by historical data without update are also provided as a comparison. Three results can be obtained from Fig. 6:

- (1) At the beginning, SRLs/DRLs of distributions with/without update are the same, since there has not been any observation to update the distribution.
- (2) As time rolls forward, the recursively updated distribution takes advantages with more SRLs/DRLs and less wind spillage

over the distribution without update. This can be explained as follows: based on the distribution without update which provides a rough description about wind uncertainties, operators have to make conservative decisions to ensure that the probabilistic power/energy adequacy constraints (2)(3) are satisfied. That is, one uses more energy from the diesel of limited generation resources to serve loads, resulting in more wind spillage. As a comparison, the updated distribution provides an accurate estimation for the future uncertainties. Therefore, even with more wind power utilized, operators are confident that the adequacy requirements (2)(3) can be satisfied. Objective function comparisons in Table II verify such results.

TABLE II  
COMPARISON OF DISTRIBUTION WITH/WITHOUT UPDATE

Case	Actual objective function value
With update	144.43
Without update	122.65




Fig. 6 SRLs, DRLs, wind spillage and load reduction of MG1

(3) An interesting phenomenon in Fig. 6 is that the SRLs are always equal to DRLs, e.g. the load reduction is zero. Here is an explanation: the confidence levels  $\alpha$  in probabilistic constraints (2)(3) are 90%. That is, once the SRL is determined, there is only a 10% chance that the SRL demand cannot be met, i.e., load reduction is thereafter activated. Therefore, in this test, the load reduction is not observed. If  $\alpha$  is small, e.g. 60%, there is load reduction. Such results are omitted.

## 2) Networked microgrids case

In this test, the three microgrids connect with each other, merge an aggregation of networked microgrids, and share resources to restore loads. It is assumed that there is a central controller to do the optimization. Distributed algorithms, e.g., the consensus method [32], are beyond the scope of this paper.

This subsection discusses the advantage of networked microgrids over individual ones. In addition to tests with

individual stand-alone microgrid, this method computes the SRLs/DRLs of networked microgrids. In Fig. 7, the networked SRLs/DRLs are greater than the summation of three individual SRLs/DRLs. This is reasonable: in networked microgrids, generation resources from one microgrid can be transferred to another microgrid to restore critical loads if needed.




Fig. 7 SRLs/DRLs of networked microgrids

As far as the computation time is concerned, all tests are implemented on a Core-i5 PC, with a 2.39-GHz processor, and 8 GB of RAM. In the rolling plan, the optimization problem at the first period ( $\kappa=0$ ) has the heaviest computational burden since it determines decisions with the longest optimization window (see Fig. 2). Such a problem costs 34s in the individual case, and 75s in the networked case.

## VI. CONCLUSION

To enhance the resilience of a distribution system through microgrids restoring critical loads, this paper proposes a method using observations to infer distributions of uncertainties of WTs/PVs. The transformation of the original risk-limiting load restoration problem into an MILP benefits from the recursively updated distributions being a GMM.

This paper is focused on dealing with uncertainties. The power/energy adequacy requirements are considered, which lay a foundation of the load restoration with intermittent energy resources for practical use. Further, concerning the operational and dynamic constraints, there are two on-going works:

(1) Transmission limits should be considered. If the power flow is linear, e.g., the linearized DistFlow, a method proposed in previous authors' work [27] is readily applicable to deal with linear chance-constrained line power limits without major change. For the AC power flow in which the line power is a nonlinear implicit function of random power injections, the tractable computation of the risk pertaining to line limits remains an issue to resolve. The sample average approximation (SAA) is a potential solution.

(2) Dynamic constraints should be considered. Usually, distributed generators/ESSs have limited capabilities to withstand large transient shocks. Therefore, it is necessary to run dynamic simulations to ensure that the load restoration strategy does not cause instability or damage to equipment. Further discussions that are useful for the future work can be found in [5], [6].

## APPENDIX A

Let the random vector  $X$  be decoupled into two parts:

$$\mathbf{X} := [\mathbf{Y}^T \quad \mathbf{Z}^T]^T \quad (33)$$

where  $\mathbf{Y}$  represent observations, and  $\mathbf{Z}$  represent the rest entries of  $\mathbf{X}$ .

The distribution of  $\mathbf{X}$  is a GMM. That is:

$$f_X(\mathbf{x}) = f_{YZ}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) := \sum_{m=1}^M \omega_m N_m(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}; \boldsymbol{\mu}_m, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_m) \quad (34)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_m := \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\mu}_m^y \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}_m^z \end{bmatrix}, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_m := \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_m^{yy} & \boldsymbol{\sigma}_m^{yz} \\ \boldsymbol{\sigma}_m^{zy} & \boldsymbol{\sigma}_m^{zz} \end{bmatrix} \quad (35)$$

Then, the conditional distribution of  $\mathbf{Z}$  with respect to  $\mathbf{Y}=\mathbf{y}$  is given as follows [33]:

$$f_{Z|Y}(\mathbf{z} | \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{i=1}^M \omega'_i(\mathbf{y}, \Omega)_i N_i(\mathbf{z}; \boldsymbol{\mu}_i(\mathbf{y}, \Omega), \boldsymbol{\sigma}_i(\mathbf{y}, \Omega)) \quad (36)$$

$$\omega'_i(\mathbf{y}, \Omega) = \omega_i \frac{N_i(\mathbf{y}; \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^y, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_i^y)}{\sum_{m=1}^M \omega_m N_m(\mathbf{y}; \boldsymbol{\mu}_m^y, \boldsymbol{\sigma}_m^y)} \quad (37)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_i(\mathbf{y}, \Omega) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^z + \boldsymbol{\sigma}_i^{zy} (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i^{yy})^{-1} (\mathbf{y} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i^y) \quad (38)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i(\mathbf{y}, \Omega) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}_i^{zz} - \boldsymbol{\sigma}_i^{zy} (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_i^{yy})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\sigma}_i^{yz} \quad (39)$$

The distribution of  $\mathbf{Z}$  with respect to  $\mathbf{Y}=\mathbf{y}$  is still a GMM, enabling a recursive way to update distributions.

#### APPENDIX B

**Lemma 1** [33]: If the distribution of  $\mathbf{X}$  is a GMM as shown in (15), and  $\mathbf{X}_{LT}$  is a defined as a linear transformation of  $\mathbf{X}$ :

$$\mathbf{X}_{LT} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{X} + \mathbf{C} \quad (40)$$

Then, the distribution of  $\mathbf{X}_{LT}$  is given as:

$$f_{X_{LT}}(\mathbf{x}_{LT}) = \sum_{m=1}^M \omega_m N_m(\mathbf{x}_{LT}; \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\mu}_m + \mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}\boldsymbol{\sigma}_m\mathbf{A}^T) \quad (41)$$

*Lemma 1* holds even if entries of  $\mathbf{X}$  are correlated.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Office of the Press Secretary of the White House, Presidential Policy Directive – Critical Infrastructure Security and Resilience [Online]. Available: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/02/12/presidential-policy-directive-critical-infrastructure-security-and-resil>
- [2] U.S. Department of Energy and National Energy Technology Laboratory, Operates Resiliently Against Attack and Natural Disaster [Online]. Available: [http://www.smartgridinformation.info/pdf/1438\\_doc\\_1.pdf](http://www.smartgridinformation.info/pdf/1438_doc_1.pdf)
- [3] V. Madani *et al.*, “Distribution Automation Strategies Challenges and Opportunities in a Changing Landscape,” *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 2157-2165, July 2015.
- [4] T. T. H. Pham, Y. Besanger, and N. Hadjsaid, “New Challenges in Power System Restoration With Large Scale of Dispersed Generation Insertion,” *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 398-406, Feb. 2009.
- [5] Y. J. Kim, J. Wang, and X. Lu, “A Framework for Load Service Restoration Using Dynamic Change in Boundaries of Advanced Microgrids with Synchronous-Machine DGs,” *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid*, early access article.
- [6] Y. Xu, C. C. Liu, K. Schneider, F. Tuffner, and D. Ton, “Microgrids for Service Restoration to Critical Load in a Resilient Distribution System,” *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid*, early access article.
- [7] H. Gao, Y. Chen, Y. Xu, and C. C. Liu, “Resilience-Oriented Critical Load Restoration Using Microgrids in Distribution Systems,” *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid*, vol. 7, no. 6, pp. 2837-2848, Nov. 2016.
- [8] Z. Wang, B. Chen, J. Wang, and C. Chen, “Networked Microgrids for Self-Healing Power Systems,” *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 310-319, Jan. 2016.
- [9] H. Farzin, M. F. Firuzabad and M. M. Aghtae, “Enhancing Power System Resilience Through Hierarchical Outage Management in Multi-Microgrids,” *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid*, vol. 7, no. 6, pp. 2869-2879, Nov. 2016.
- [10] Z. Wang, and J. Wang, “Self-Healing Resilient Distribution Systems Based on Sectionalization into Microgrids,” *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 3139-3149, Nov. 2015.
- [11] A. Gholami, T. Shekari, F. Aminifar and M. Shahidehpour, “Microgrid Scheduling with Uncertainty: The Quest for Resilience,” *IEEE Trans. on Smart Grid*, vol. 7, no. 6, pp. 2849-2858, Nov. 2016.
- [12] A. Khodaei, “Resiliency-Oriented Microgrid Optimal Scheduling,” *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 1584-1591, Jul. 2014.
- [13] P. P. Varaiya, F. F. Wu, and J. W. Bialek, “Smart Operation of Smart Grid: Risk-Limiting Dispatch,” *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 99, no. 1, pp. 40-57, Jan. 2011.
- [14] R. Rajagopal, E. Bitar, P. Varaiya, and F. Wu, “Risk-Limiting Dispatch for Integrating Renewable Power,” *Int. J. Elec. Power*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 615-628, Jan. 2013.
- [15] B. Zhang, R. Rajagopal, and D. Tse, “Network Risk Limiting Dispatch: Optimal Control and Price of Uncertainty,” *IEEE Trans. Autom. Control*, vol. 59, no. 9, pp. 2442-2456, Sep. 2014.
- [16] C. Wu, G. Hug, and S. Kar, “Risk-Limiting Economic Dispatch for Electricity Markets with Flexible Ramping Products,” *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 1990-2003, May 2016.
- [17] C. Peng, Y. Hou, N. Yu, and W. Wang, “Risk-Limiting Unit Commitment in Smart Grid with Intelligent Periphery,” *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, early access article.
- [18] R. Doherty and M. O'Malley, “A New Approach to Quantify Reserve Demand in Systems with Significant Installed Wind Capacity,” *IEEE Trans. Sustain. Energy*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 587-595, May 2005.
- [19] F. Bouffard, and F. D. Galiana, “Stochastic Security for Operations Planning with Significant Wind Power Generation,” *IEEE Trans. Sustain. Energy*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 306-316, May 2008.
- [20] Z. S. Zhang, Y. Z. Sun, D. W. Gao, J. Lin, and L. Cheng, “A Versatile Probability Distribution Model for Wind Power Forecast Errors and Its Application in Economic Dispatch,” *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 3114-3125, Aug. 2013.
- [21] M. Fan, V. Vittal, G. T. Heydt, and R. Ayyanar, “Probabilistic Power Flow Studies for Transmission Systems with Photovoltaic Generation Using Cumulants,” *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 2251-2261, Nov. 2012.
- [22] S. M. Ross, *Introduction to Probability Models 11<sup>th</sup> Edition*. San Diego, CA, USA: Elsevier, 2015.
- [23] M. Nijhuis, M. Gibescu, and J. F. G. Cobben, “Gaussian Mixture Based Probabilistic Load Flow for LV-Network Planning,” *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, early access article.
- [24] R. Singh, B. Pal, and R. Jabr. “Statistical Representation of Distribution System Loads Using Gaussian Mixture Model,” *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 29-37, Feb. 2010.
- [25] G. Valverde, and A. T. Saric, “Probabilistic Load Flow with Non-Gaussian Correlated Random Variables Using Gaussian Mixture Models,” *IET Gen., Trans. & Distri.*, vol. 6, no. 7, pp. 701-709, 2012.
- [26] A. Hald, “On the History of Maximum Likelihood in Relation to Inverse Probability and Least Squares,” *Statistical Science*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 214-22, 1999.
- [27] Z. W. Wang, C. Shen, F. Liu, X. Y. Wu, C-C Liu, and F. Gao. “Chance-Constrained Economic Dispatch with Non-Gaussian Correlated Wind Power Uncertainty,” *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.* early access article.
- [28] X. Liu, and W. Xu, “Economic Load Dispatch Constrained by Wind Power Availability: a Here-and-Now Approach,” *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 2-9, Apr. 2010.
- [29] X. Liu, “Economic Load Dispatch Constrained by Wind Power Availability: a Wait-and-See Approach,” *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 347-355, Dec. 2010.
- [30] C. Draxl, B. M. Hodge, A. Clifton, and J. McCaa. “Overview and Meteorological Validation of the Wind Integration National Dataset Toolkit,” *Technical Report, NREL/TP-5000-61740*. National Renewable Energy Laboratory. Golden, CO. 2015.
- [31] K. P. Schneider, P. Phanivong, and J. S. Lacroix, “IEEE 342-node Low Voltage Networked Test System,” in *Proc. IEEE PES General Meeting*, National Harbor, MD, 2014.
- [32] R. O. Saber, A. Fax, and R. M. Murray, “Consensus and Cooperation in Networked Multi-agent Systems,” *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 95, no. 1, pp. 215-233, 2007.
- [33] J. T. Flam, “The Linear Model Under Gaussian Mixture Inputs,” Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Elect. & Telecom. Norwegian Univ. of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway, 2013.