

# Distributed Conditional Cooperation Model Predictive Control of Interconnected Microgrids\*

Ajay Kumar Sampathirao<sup>a</sup>, Steffen Hofmann<sup>b</sup>, Jörg Raisch<sup>b</sup>, Christian A. Hans<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Centrica Business Solutions, Roderveldlaan 2/b2, Antwerp, 2600, Belgium*

<sup>b</sup>*Technische Universität Berlin, Einsteinufer 11, 10587 Berlin, Germany*

<sup>c</sup>*University of Kassel, Wilhelmshöher Allee 71-73, 34121 Kassel, Germany*

---

## Abstract

In this paper, we propose a model predictive control based operation strategy that allows for power exchange between interconnected microgrids. Particularly, the approach ensures that each microgrid benefits from power exchange with others. This is realised by including a condition which is based on the islanded operation cost. The overall model predictive control problem is posed as a mixed-integer quadratically-constrained program and solved using a distributed algorithm that iteratively updates continuous and integer variables. For this algorithm, termination, feasibility and computational properties are discussed. The performance and the computational benefits of the proposed strategy are highlighted in an illustrative case study.

---

## 1. Introduction

Recent advances in renewable energies and growing concerns about environmental impacts of fossil-fuelled power plants led to a worldwide increase of renewable energy sources (RES). RES are often small-scale units which are characterised by intermittent power output and geographical proximity to consumers. At this juncture, the microgrid (MG) concept is a promising approach to facilitate the integration of a large number of RES. An MG refers to a self-contained system with local demand, generators and storage units. MGs can operate connected to or isolated from the power network, i.e., islanded. For both modes, operation control serves to coordinate all units on a timescale of minutes.

Connecting MGs and facilitating power exchange between them can increase flexibility compared to islanded operation (Shahidehpour et al., 2017). The interconnection allows the MGs to benefit from different infeed pattern of geographically distributed and technologically diverse RES. In this paper, we develop a strategy that manages power exchange while preserving the self-interest of each MG in a network. The derived conditional cooperation control scheme is composed of two parts: (i) estimation of a condition for each MG that reflects its self-interest; and (ii) determination of power exchange between the MGs in the network such that the condition from (i) is satisfied

for each MG. The scheme is based on model predictive control (MPC) which is widely adopted for the operation of MGs as it allows to explicitly consider unit limits as well as economic objectives (Ouammi et al., 2015).

Coordinating multiple MGs in a network has been widely discussed in literature, e.g., by Ouammi et al. (2015); Wang et al. (2015); Sandgani and Sirouspour (2017). They all highlight the benefits of coordinated power transfers in interconnected MGs. However, they focus on minimising the combined operating cost which does not always secure the self-interest of each individual MG. This drawback has been dealt with by Parisio et al. (2017); Savelli et al. (2019). Unfortunately, their approaches require a central unit and are therefore not suitable for a fully distributed implementation. Distributed MPC that considers cooperation of individual agents while prioritising local goals has been studied, e.g., by Venkat et al. (2005); Valencia et al. (2011). Valencia et al. (2011) formulated a feasible-cooperation MPC as a cooperative game that allows each agent to decide whether it cooperates or not. Venkat et al. (2005) proposed a cooperation-based distributed MPC approach, which iteratively exchanges information between the agents to find feasible control actions.

The main limitation of most approaches is their restriction to convex functions. In the context of MG operation control, this means that the on/off condition of conventional generators cannot be directly implemented. This limitation was addressed by Hans et al. (2019), where a hierarchical distributed MPC that includes the switching of conventional units was proposed. The binaries that represent their on/off condition were relaxed and power flow was decided using distributed optimization. However, the approach did not preserve the MGs' self-interest.

---

\*This work was partially supported by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy (BMWi), Project No. 0325713A.

*Email addresses:* [ajaykumarsampath@gmail.com](mailto:ajaykumarsampath@gmail.com) (Ajay Kumar Sampathirao), [hofmann@control.tu-berlin.de](mailto:hofmann@control.tu-berlin.de) (Steffen Hofmann), [raisch@control.tu-berlin.de](mailto:raisch@control.tu-berlin.de) (Jörg Raisch), [hans@uni-kassel.de](mailto:hans@uni-kassel.de) (Christian A. Hans)

We aim to fill this gap by introducing a novel MPC approach. Our main contributions are as follows. (i) A conditional cooperation MPC problem for the operation of interconnected MGs is posed as a mixed-integer quadratically-constrained program (MIQCP). It includes a condition that, contrary to Hans et al. (2019), preserves each MG's self-interest, based on the cost of islanded operation. (ii) We propose a feasible-decomposition-based algorithm to find a (not necessarily optimal) solution to aforementioned MIQCP which comes with a significant reduction in computational complexity. We study theoretical properties of the algorithm and provide a termination criterion. (iii) A fully distributed version of aforementioned algorithm is proposed. In contrast to Hans et al. (2019), power flows are determined using a distributed augmented Lagrangian method which does not require central coordinator. (iv) We compare our novel approaches with the ones proposed by Hans et al. (2019) in an extensive case study. In detail, we examine computational properties of the distributed approach and highlight its applicability.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, MG and network model are introduced. Then, in Section 3 a conditional cooperation MPC problem is derived. In Section 4, an algorithm to solve this MPC problem is deduced. In Section 5, a distributed implementation of the algorithm is discussed. Finally, in Section 6 a case study is presented.

### 1.1. Notation and mathematical preliminaries

The set of real numbers is  $\mathbb{R}$ , the set of nonpositive real numbers  $\mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}$ , the set of nonnegative real numbers  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , the set of positive real numbers  $\mathbb{R}_{> 0}$  and the set of negative real numbers  $\mathbb{R}_{< 0}$ . The set of positive integers is  $\mathbb{N}$ , the set of nonnegative integers  $\mathbb{N}^0$  and the set of the first  $n$  positive integers  $\mathbb{N}_n = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Moreover,  $\mathbb{N}_{[0,n]} = \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}_n$ . The cardinality of a set  $\mathbb{A}$  is  $|\mathbb{A}|$ . The vector  $x = [x_{v_1} \ x_{v_2} \ \dots \ x_{v_n}]$  with  $v_i \in V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n\} \subset \mathbb{N}$  and  $v_i < v_j$  for  $i < j$  is denoted by  $\text{vec}(x_{v_i})_{v_i \in V}$ . Moreover,  $\text{vec}(x_{v_i u_j})_{v_i \in V, u_j \in U}$  is shorthand for  $\text{vec}(\text{vec}(x_{v_i u_i})_{u_i \in U})_{v_i \in V}$ . The diagonal matrix with entries  $x_{v_1}, x_{v_2}, \dots, x_{v_n}$  is denoted by  $\text{diag}(x)$ . Finally,  $\|\cdot\|$  is the  $L_2$  norm and  $|c|$  the absolute value of  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ .

Consider an undirected connected graph  $\mathcal{G} = (N, E)$  where  $N = \mathbb{N}_n$  is the set of nodes and  $E \subseteq [N]^2$  the set of edges linking the nodes. Here,  $[N]^2$  denotes the set of all two-element subsets of  $N$ . Node  $j$  is a neighbour of node  $i$ , if there is an edge  $\{i, j\} \in E$ . The set of all  $n_j$  neighbours of node  $j$  is  $N_j = \{i \mid i \in N, \{i, j\} \in E\}$  with  $n_j = |N_j|$ .

## 2. Model of interconnected MGs

In this section, we introduce a control-oriented discrete-time model of a network of interconnected MGs. The model is motivated by Hans et al. (2019); Hans (2021) and considers  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  MGs that are linked by an electrical grid (see Fig. 1). Each MG $_j$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}_n$ , is connected to a bus




Figure 1: Topology of four interconnected MGs introduced by Hans et al. (2019).

in the grid via a point of common coupling (PCC) which allows for power exchange with others. Despite the connection, each MG is assumed to be always capable of running in island mode without power exchange via the PCC.

### 2.1. Model of a single microgrid

The presented mathematical model of an MG is composed of unit constraints, energy dynamics and constraints that account for a local power balance. Note that the control scheme derived in this paper can be easily modified to work with alternative MG configurations, such as, MGs with controllable loads or MGs in which renewable infeed cannot be curtailed.

Each MG $_j$  is composed of  $g_j \in \mathbb{N}$  distributed units (DUs) and  $l_j \in \mathbb{N}$  loads. A DU can be a conventional, a storage or a renewable unit. Unit  $i \in \mathbb{N}_{g_j}$  is labelled DU $_{j,i}$  such that we can define the index set of conventional units as  $C_j = \{i \mid i \in \mathbb{N}_{g_j}, \text{DU}_{j,i} \text{ is a conventional unit}\}$ . Similarly,  $S_j$  is the index set of storage units,  $R_j$  the index set of RES and  $L_j = \{g_j + 1, \dots, g_j + l_j\} \subset \mathbb{N}$  the index set of loads. The number of conventional, storage and renewable units is  $|C_j|$ ,  $|S_j|$  and  $|R_j|$  with  $g_j = |C_j| + |S_j| + |R_j|$ .

#### 2.1.1. Renewable energy sources

RES like photovoltaic generators or wind turbines are assumed to be the predominant energy providers in the MGs. The power from these units is uncertain as their availability depends on intermittent weather conditions. At time instant  $k \in \mathbb{N}^0$ , the available power of unit  $i \in R_j$  is denoted  $w_{j,i}(k)$ . The power infeed  $p_{j,i}(k)$  of this unit is limited by the available power  $w_{j,i}(k)$ , which, in turn, is bounded by the rated power  $\bar{p}_{j,i} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ , i.e.,

$$0 \leq p_{j,i}(k) \leq w_{j,i}(k) \leq \bar{p}_{j,i}, \quad \forall i \in R_j. \quad (1)$$

#### 2.1.2. Storage units

We consider grid-forming storage units that allow an operation where all conventional units are temporarily disabled. Stored energy and power of unit  $i \in S_j$  are denoted  $x_{j,i}(k)$  and  $p_{j,i}(k)$ , respectively. The dynamics depend on whether a storage is charging or discharging. Consider a

variable  $\delta_{j,i}(k) \in \{0, 1\}$ , which is 1 if unit  $i$  is charging and 0 if it is discharging. With power limits  $\underline{p}_{j,i} \in \mathbb{R}_{<0}$  and  $\bar{p}_{j,i} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  this relation can be implemented by

$$\underline{p}_{j,i} \delta_{j,i}(k) \leq p_{j,i}(k) \leq (1 - \delta_{j,i}(k)) \bar{p}_{j,i}, \quad \forall i \in S_j. \quad (2a)$$

With sampling time  $T_s \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  and storage efficiency  $\eta_{j,i} \in (0, 1]$ , the dynamics of storage unit  $i$  read

$$x_{j,i}(k+1) = x_{j,i}(k) - \eta_{j,i} \delta_{j,i}(k) T_s p_{j,i}(k) - \frac{1}{\eta_{j,i}} (1 - \delta_{j,i}(k)) T_s p_{j,i}(k), \quad \forall i \in S_j. \quad (2b)$$

The energy is bounded by  $\underline{x}_{j,i} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  and  $\bar{x}_{j,i} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ , i.e.,

$$\underline{x}_{j,i} \leq x_{j,i}(k) \leq \bar{x}_{j,i}, \quad \forall i \in S_j. \quad (2c)$$

**Remark 1.** Note that (2b) comprises a nonlinear multiplication of decision variables  $\delta_{j,i}(k)$  and  $p_{j,i}(k)$ . With the help of additional real-valued decision variables, (2b) can be transformed into a set of affine constraints (Parisio et al., 2014). Therefore, (2) can be used in MIQCPs.

### 2.1.3. Conventional generators

Typically, these units are used as a backup in times of low renewable infeed and little stored energy. Let us represent the on/off condition of unit  $i \in C_j$  by  $\delta_{j,i} \in \{0, 1\}$  where  $\delta_{j,i} = 0$  means ‘‘off’’ and  $\delta_{j,i} = 1$  ‘‘on’’. This can be combined with the limits  $\underline{p}_{j,i} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  and  $\bar{p}_{j,i} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  into

$$\underline{p}_{j,i} \delta_{j,i}(k) \leq p_{j,i}(k) \leq \bar{p}_{j,i} \delta_{j,i}(k), \quad \forall i \in C_j. \quad (3)$$

### 2.1.4. Loads

Uncontrollable electric demand is modelled as an uncertain input. It is denoted by  $w_{j,i}(k) \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq 0}$  for all  $i \in L_j$ .

### 2.1.5. Point of common of coupling (PCC)

The PCC connects  $MG_j$  with the transmission network and thus allows for power exchange with other MGs. Let us denote this power exchange by  $p_{j,p}(k) \in \mathbb{R}$ . If  $p_{j,p}(k) < 0$ , then power is provided by  $MG_j$ , if  $p_{j,p}(k) > 0$ , then power is drawn by  $MG_j$ . This power is constrained by  $\underline{p}_{j,p} \in \mathbb{R}_{<0}$  and  $\bar{p}_{j,p} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ , i.e.,

$$\underline{p}_{j,p} \leq p_{j,p}(k) \leq \bar{p}_{j,p}. \quad (4a)$$

The local power balance of  $MG_j$  can be expressed by

$$p_{j,p}(k) + \sum_{i=1}^{g_j} p_{j,i}(k) + \sum_{i=g_j+1}^{g_j+l_j} w_{j,i}(k) = 0. \quad (4b)$$

## 2.2. Power exchange over the electric grid

The transmission network is modelled as an undirected graph  $\mathcal{G} = (N, E)$ , where each node in  $N$  represents an MG, i.e.,  $|N| = n$ . Each element in  $E$  represents a power line that connects two nodes, i.e., two MGs. Let us denote the power exchange between two connected nodes oriented from  $j \in N$  to  $m \in N_j$  as  $p_{j,m}(k)$ .

The power provided or consumed by  $MG_j$  via the PCC is linked to the power exchange with its neighbours by

$$p_{j,p}(k) = \sum_{m \in N_j} p_{j,m}(k), \quad \forall j \in N. \quad (5)$$

We assume that the transmission network is composed of power lines with reactance to resistance ratio much greater than one. Therefore, line losses are assumed to be negligible (Ouammi et al., 2015; Parisio et al., 2017; Ananduta et al., 2018). For lossless lines, we then have that  $p_{j,m}(k) = -p_{m,j}(k)$  and that a global power balance of the form  $\sum_{j \in N} p_{j,p}(k) = 0$  holds.

## 3. Conditional cooperation (CC) MPC for inter-connected MGs

In MPC, control actions are found by solving a finite horizon optimization problem (Rawlings and Mayne, 2009). Typically, the optimal control actions associated with the first prediction step are applied to the system at each execution. At the next time step, initial conditions and forecasts are updated and the procedure is repeated.

### 3.1. Control objectives

The control objective of  $MG_j$  is given by

$$\ell_j(p_j, \delta_j) = \sum_{i \in C_j} \ell_{j,c}(p_{j,i}, \delta_{j,i}) + \sum_{i \in R_j} \ell_{j,r}(p_{j,i}) + \sum_{i \in S_j} \ell_{j,s}(p_{j,i}) + \ell_{j,p}(p_{j,p}), \quad (6)$$

with  $p_j = [\text{vec}(p_{j,i})_{i \in N_{g_j}} p_{j,p}]^\top$ ,  $\delta_j = \text{vec}(\delta_{j,i})_{i \in C_j \cup S_j}$ . The costs of the conventional, storage and renewable units are  $\ell_{j,c}(\cdot, \cdot) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ ,  $\ell_{j,s}(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  and  $\ell_{j,r}(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ . The cost associated with power exchange is  $\ell_{j,p}(\cdot) \in \mathbb{R}$ .

The objective function of conventional unit  $i \in C_j$  is based on running costs. These can be approximated by

$$\ell_{j,c}(p_{j,i}, \delta_{j,i}) = a_{j,i} \delta_{j,i} + a'_{j,i} p_{j,i} + a''_{j,i} p_{j,i}^2, \quad (7a)$$

with weights  $a_{j,i} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ ,  $a'_{j,i} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  and  $a''_{j,i} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  (Zhai et al., 2009). Note that the square term allows to model a maximum cost efficiency at power values below  $\bar{p}_{j,i}$ .

It is desirable to maximise infeed of RES. Therefore,  $\ell_{j,r}(\cdot)$  penalises a limitation of available infeed  $w_{j,i}$ . With weight  $a_{j,i} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ , it can be expressed for all  $i \in R_j$  by

$$\ell_{j,r}(p_{j,i}) = a_{j,i} (p_{j,i} - w_{j,i})^2. \quad (7b)$$

Charging or discharging at high power can have a negative impact on the ageing of batteries (Shi et al., 2017). This is modelled for storage unit  $i \in S_j$  with weight  $a_{j,i} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  by

$$\ell_{j,s}(p_{j,i}) = a_{j,i} p_{j,i}^2. \quad (7c)$$

With selling/buying price  $a_{j,p} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$  and trading cost weight  $a'_{j,p} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ , the power exchange cost reads

$$\ell_{j,p}(p_{j,p}) = a_{j,p} p_{j,p} + a'_{j,p} |p_{j,p}|. \quad (7d)$$

### 3.2. Central CC MPC

We assume that all MGs are capable of running in island mode. Therefore, motivated by Wang and Huang (2017), a condition is included which ensures that each MG's connected operation cost does not exceed its islanded operation cost. Before posing different MPC problems, we need to introduce the sets of feasible power and energy values.

Let us collect the forecasts of available renewable power and load in  $\hat{w}_j = \text{vec}(\hat{w}_{j,i})_{i \in R_j \cup L_j}$ . With this, the set of feasible power values of  $\text{MG}_j$  can be formulated as

$$\mathcal{P}_j(\hat{w}_j, \delta_j) = \{p_j \in \mathbb{R}^{g_j+1} \mid \text{eqs. (1), (2a), (3), (4)} \\ \text{hold and } w_j = \hat{w}_j\}.$$

Let us further define the vectors  $x_j(k) = \text{vec}(x_{j,i}(k))_{i \in S_j}$ ,  $p_{j,s}(k) = \text{vec}(p_{j,i}(k))_{i \in S_j}$ ,  $\delta_{j,s}(k) = \text{vec}(\delta_{j,i}(k))_{i \in S_j}$  and  $b_j(\delta_{j,s}(k)) = \text{vec}(\eta_{j,i}\delta_{j,i}(k) + \frac{1}{\eta_{j,i}}(1 - \delta_{j,i}(k)))_{i \in S_j}$ . For  $\text{MG}_j$ , constraint (2c), can be captured by the set

$$\mathcal{X}_j = \{x_j \in \mathbb{R}^{|S_j|} \mid \underline{x}_{j,i} \leq x_{j,i} \leq \bar{x}_{j,i}, \forall i \in S_j\}.$$

#### 3.2.1. Condition for cooperation (islanded operation)

The optimal islanded cost for each MG is deduced by solving an MPC problem with zero PCC power. At  $\text{MG}_j$ , we collect the decision variables over prediction horizon  $H \in \mathbb{N}$  in  $\mathbf{p}_j = [p_j(k|k) \cdots p_j(k+H|k)]$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\delta}_j = [\delta_j(k|k) \cdots \delta_j(k+H|k)]$ . Here,  $k+h|k$  refers to a prediction for time  $k+h$ ,  $h \in \mathbb{N}_{[0,H]}$ , performed at  $k$ .

Consider a measurement  $x_j^0$  and a forecast  $\hat{w}_j$  over prediction horizon  $H$ . The MPC problem associated with the islanded operation of  $\text{MG}_j$  reads as follows.

#### Problem 1 (Islanded MPC).

$$\min_{\mathbf{p}_j, \boldsymbol{\delta}_j} V_j(\mathbf{p}_j, \boldsymbol{\delta}_j)$$

with  $V_j(\mathbf{p}_j, \boldsymbol{\delta}_j) = \sum_{h=0}^H \gamma^h \ell_j(p_j(k+h|k), \delta_j(k+h|k))$   
subject to

$$x_j(k|k) = x_j^0, \quad (8a)$$

$$x_j(k+h+1|k) = x_j(k+h|k) - \\ \text{diag}(b_j(\delta_{j,s}(k+h|k)))T_s p_{j,s}(k+h|k), \quad (8b)$$

$$x_j(k+h+1|k) \in \mathcal{X}_j, \quad (8c)$$

$$p_j(k+h|k) \in \mathcal{P}_j(\hat{w}_j(k+h|k), \delta_j(k+h|k)), \quad (8d)$$

$$p_{j,p}(k+h|k) = 0, \quad (8e)$$

for all  $h \in \mathbb{N}_{[0,H]}$  where  $\gamma \in (0, 1]$  is a discount factor which is used to emphasize decisions in the near future.

**Assumption 1.** We assume that Problem 1 is always feasible. This is the case, if the load can be fully served by the conventional units and  $x_j^0 \in \mathcal{X}_j$ .

It is desired that no MG has a disadvantage from grid-connected over islanded operation. Using the optimal islanded operation cost  $V_j^I$ , this can be encoded in

$$\mathcal{C}_j(\boldsymbol{\delta}_j, V_j^I) = \{\mathbf{p}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{(g_j+1) \times (H+1)} \mid V_j(\mathbf{p}_j, \boldsymbol{\delta}_j) \leq V_j^I\}.$$

### 3.2.2. Conditional cooperation MPC

The MPC problem for a network of interconnected MGs decides the power of each DU in each MG along with the power exchange between the MGs. With  $\mathbf{P} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{p}_j)_{j \in N}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\delta} = \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\delta}_j)_{j \in N}$ , it reads as follows.

#### Problem 2 (Central CC MPC).

$$\min_{\mathbf{P}, \boldsymbol{\delta}} V(\mathbf{P}, \boldsymbol{\delta})$$

$$\text{with } V(\mathbf{P}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) = \sum_{j \in N} V_j(\mathbf{p}_j, \boldsymbol{\delta}_j) \quad (9)$$

subject to (8a)–(8d) and

$$0 = \sum_{j \in N} p_{j,p}(k+h|k), \quad (10a)$$

$$\mathbf{p}_j \in \mathcal{C}_j(\boldsymbol{\delta}_j, V_j^I), \quad (10b)$$

for all  $h \in \mathbb{N}_{[0,H]}$ ,  $j \in N$ .

Equation (10b) ensures that the cost of no MG in interconnected operation exceeds the islanded cost. Problem 2 can be cast as a MIQCP. Its computational complexity increases heavily with the number of MGs. One way to solve Problem 2 in a distributed manner is by relaxing the binary variables (Hans et al., 2019). This, however, does not always yield a feasible solution to the original problem. As an alternative, we propose an algorithm that ensures feasibility and can be solved in a distributed manner.

## 4. Feasible decomposition for solving CC MPC

The main idea of the proposed feasible-decomposition-based (FD-based) algorithm is to iteratively solve a sequence of feasible intermediate problems such that the cost is non-increasing. As stated in Algorithm 1, first a subproblem with fixed binary variables is solved to update the PCC power. Then, a subproblem with fixed PCC power is solved to update the binary variables. This scheme is repeated until a termination criterion is met.

#### 4.1. Subproblem with fixed binary variables

At iteration  $q$ , the fixed binaries of  $\text{MG}_j$  are denoted  $\boldsymbol{\delta}_j^q$ . With  $\boldsymbol{\delta}^q = \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\delta}_j^q)_{j \in N}$ , we modify Problem 2 as follows.

#### Problem 3 (Modified CC MPC).

$$\min_{\mathbf{P}} \sum_{j \in N} V_j(\mathbf{p}_j, \boldsymbol{\delta}_j)$$

subject to (8a)–(8d), (10) for all  $h \in \mathbb{N}_{[0,H]}$ ,  $j \in N$  with

$$\boldsymbol{\delta} = \boldsymbol{\delta}^q. \quad (11)$$

Because of (11), constraint (10b) becomes convex and Problem 3 can be cast as a convex second order cone problem which can be solved efficiently using interior-point methods. Note that at iteration  $q = 1$ , a feasible choice of  $\boldsymbol{\delta}^1$  is obtained from Problem 1. We will now use the optimal solution to Problem 3,  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^q$ , to formulate the subproblem for step 3 in Algorithm 1.

---

**Algorithm 1** Feasible decomposition for CC MPC

---

**Initialisation:** Find  $\mathbf{P}^1$  and  $\delta^1$  by solving Problem 1.  
for  $q = 1, \dots, q^{\max}$

1. Solve Problem 3 for  $\delta = \delta^q$  to obtain the optimal values  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^q = \text{vec}(\tilde{p}_{j,p}^q)_{j \in N}$  which include  $\tilde{p}_{j,p}^q(k+h|k)$  for all  $\text{MG}_j$ .
2. Check termination criterion:  
if  $V(\mathbf{P}^q, \delta^q) = V(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^q, \delta^q)$  holds, then go to end.
3. Solve Problem 4 for all  $\text{MG}_j$  with fixed PCC power  $p_{j,p}(k+h|k) = \tilde{p}_{j,p}^q(k+h|k)$  to obtain the optimal values  $\mathbf{P}^{q+1}, \delta^{q+1}$ .

**end:** Output  $\mathbf{P}^q, \delta^q$ .

---

#### 4.2. Subproblem with fixed PCC power

In Problem 2, (10a) accounts for the coupling between the MGs using only the PCC power of the different MGs. Fixing the PCC power at iteration  $q$  to the optimal result from Problem 3, which is part of  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^q$ , enables a decomposition into  $|N|$  subproblems. In Algorithm 1, we use the solutions to these subproblems, which can be stated as follows, to update the binary variables  $\delta^{q+1}$ .

#### Problem 4 (Binary update CC MPC).

$$\min_{\mathbf{p}_j, \delta_j} V_j(\mathbf{p}_j, \delta_j)$$

subject to (8a)–(8d) and

$$p_{j,p}(k+h|k) = \tilde{p}_{j,p}^q(k+h|k), \quad (12)$$

for all  $h \in \mathbb{N}_{[0,H]}$ .

**Remark 2.** In Problem 4, the PCC power is fixed via (12). Therefore, it can be solved for each MG separately, which is beneficial in two ways: (i) It enables a decentralized solution on different computing nodes. (ii) To solve Problem 4 for all MGs,  $\sum_{j=1}^n 2^{(H+1)(|C_j|+|S_j|)}$  possible combinations of binary variables need to be considered. For Problem 2, this number is  $2^{\sum_{j=1}^n (H+1)(|C_j|+|S_j|)}$ , which is typically much higher. For the example in Section 6, this would be  $2 \cdot 10^{31}$  combinations for Problem 2 compared to  $3 \cdot 10^8$  for Problem 4.

#### 4.3. Properties of FD-based algorithm

**Proposition 1 (Monotonicity).** Given  $\mathbf{P}^q$  and  $\delta^q$ , as well as the subsequent  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^q$  obtained by solving Problem 3 for  $\delta^q$ . Also given  $\mathbf{P}^{q+1}$  and  $\delta^{q+1}$ , obtained by solving Problem 4 using  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^q$ . Then,  $V(\mathbf{P}^{q+1}, \delta^{q+1}) \leq V(\mathbf{P}^q, \delta^q)$ .

*Proof:* Because of the common constraints of Problems 1, 3 and 4 and the structure of Algorithm 1,  $\mathbf{P}^q$  is always a feasible solution to Problem 3. Therefore,  $V(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^q, \delta^q) \leq V(\mathbf{P}^q, \delta^q)$ . Moreover,  $(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_j^q, \delta_j^q)$  is a feasible solution to Problem 4. Therefore,  $V_j(\mathbf{p}_j^{q+1}, \delta_j^{q+1}) \leq V_j(\tilde{\mathbf{p}}_j^q, \delta_j^q)$  and hence  $V(\mathbf{P}^{q+1}, \delta^{q+1}) \leq V(\mathbf{P}^q, \delta^q)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 1 (Cost at termination).** If Problem 4 exhibits a unique optimal solution, then the cost at termination  $V(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^q, \delta^q)$  represents the best (not necessarily optimal) cost one can obtain with Algorithm 1.

*Proof:* For fixed  $\delta^q$ , the cost  $V(\cdot, \delta^q)$  subject to (4b) is strongly convex. The solutions  $\mathbf{P}^q$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^q$  always satisfy (4b). Therefore,  $V(\mathbf{P}^q, \delta^q) = V(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^q, \delta^q) \iff \mathbf{P}^q = \tilde{\mathbf{P}}^q$ . Thus, for  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}^q = \mathbf{P}^q$  Problem 4 yields the same  $\delta^{q+1} = \delta^q$ . Because of the monotonic decrease (see Proposition 1), the result of Algorithm 1 does not change in subsequent iterations and can therefore be terminated.  $\square$

**Remark 3.** The solution to Problem 4 might not always be unique. If this is the case, then only one solution is used in Algorithm 1 and all others are discarded. Note that this does not affect Proposition 1. Further note that the cost at termination in such a case is the best that one can obtain for the selected solution to Problem 4.

## 5. Distributed solution for FD-based algorithm

In Algorithm 1, the binary variables are updated in a decentralised manner via Problem 4. To obtain a fully distributed implementation of the overall algorithm, we also need to solve Problem 3 in a distributed manner. This is desirable since changes in the structure or the objective of each MG can be handled by adapting local optimization problems and do not need to be shared with others. In this section, we provide an example of such a distributed scheme which is based the work of Chatzipanagiotis et al. (2015) and only requires communication between neighbouring MGs. Note that the presented approach could be easily replaced by others, e.g., the one presented by Braun et al. (2018).

As stated in Section 2.2, (10a) can be equivalently expressed by a combination of  $p_{j,p}(k) = \sum_{m \in N_j} p_{jm}(k)$  for all  $j \in N$  and  $p_{jm}(k) = -p_{mj}(k)$  for all  $j \in N, m \in N_j$ . The latter expression can be alternatively posed as  $0 = p_{j,t}(k) + \hat{p}_{j,t}(k)$  with  $p_{j,t}(k) = \text{vec}(p_{jm}(k))_{m \in N_j}$  and  $\hat{p}_{j,t}(k) = \text{vec}(p_{mj}(k))_{m \in N_j}$ . Hence, with matrices  $\mathbf{p}_{j,t} = [p_{j,t}(k|k) \ \dots \ p_{j,t}(k+H|k)]$  as well as  $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_{j,t} = [\hat{p}_{j,t}(k|k) \ \dots \ \hat{p}_{j,t}(k+H|k)]$  and  $\mathbf{p}_t = [\mathbf{p}_{1,t}^\top \ \dots \ \mathbf{p}_{n,t}^\top]$ , we can rewrite Problem 3 as follows.

#### Problem 5 (Modified CC MPC with line power).

$$\min_{\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{p}_t} \sum_{j \in N} V_j(\mathbf{p}_j, \delta_j)$$

subject to (8a)–(8d), (10b) and

$$p_{j,p}(k+h|k) = \sum_{m \in N_j} p_{jm}(k+h|k), \quad (13a)$$

$$0 = \mathbf{p}_{j,t} + \hat{\mathbf{p}}_{j,t}, \quad (13b)$$

for all  $h \in \mathbb{N}_{[0,H]}$ ,  $j \in N$  with  $\delta_j = \delta_j^q$ .

Let us introduce  $\mathbf{p}_{jm} = [p_{jm}(k|k) \cdots p_{jm}(k+H|k)]$  and the Lagrangian variable  $\lambda_{jm}(k) \in \mathbb{R}$  for all  $\{j, m\} \in E$ . Let us further define  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j = [\lambda_j(k|k) \cdots \lambda_j(k+H|k)]$  with entries  $\lambda_j(k) = \text{vec}(\lambda_{jm}(k))_{m \in \mathbb{N}_j}$  for all  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . With (13b) and fixed parameter  $\rho > 0$ , the local augmented Lagrangian (AL) of Problem 5 can then be formulated as

$$\hat{L}_{j,\rho}(\mathbf{p}_j, \mathbf{p}_{j,t}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j, \hat{\mathbf{p}}_{j,t}) = f_j(\mathbf{p}_j, \mathbf{p}_{j,t}) + \langle \boldsymbol{\lambda}_j, \mathbf{p}_{j,t} + \hat{\mathbf{p}}_{j,t} \rangle + \rho/2 \|\mathbf{p}_{j,t} + \hat{\mathbf{p}}_{j,t}\|^2. \quad (14)$$

This local AL can be used to find a distributed solution for Problem 5 along the lines of Chatzipanagiotis et al. (2015). At each iteration, the local AL (14) is minimised for fixed  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_{j,t}$  to update  $\mathbf{p}_j$  and  $\mathbf{p}_{j,t}$  at  $\text{MG}_j$ . Subsequently,  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{p}}_{j,t}$  are updated based on local optimal solutions  $\mathbf{p}_{m,t}$  from all neighbours  $m \in \mathbb{N}_j$ . For termination, the primal and dual residuals can be evaluated based on the updates of  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j$  and  $\mathbf{p}_{j,t}$  (Chatzipanagiotis et al., 2015).

**Remark 4.** *The termination criterion in step (2) of Algorithm 1 is equivalent to “ $V_j(\mathbf{p}_j^q, \boldsymbol{\delta}_j^q) = V_j(\hat{\mathbf{p}}_j^q, \boldsymbol{\delta}_j^q)$  holds for all  $\text{MG}_j$ ” because of (9) and the strongly convex nature of  $V_j(\cdot, \boldsymbol{\delta}_j^q)$  subject to (4b). This enables a distributed implementation of the overall scheme. In such a scheme, converge information could be spread over the network using, e.g., a flooding algorithm.*

## 6. Case study

In the case study, the topology in Fig. 1 is used. It is composed of four MGs that are connected by power lines. Each MG comprises a load, a renewable, a conventional and a storage unit. Parameters and weights are summarised in Table 1. Available renewable infeed was calculated from wind and irradiance measurements provided by ARM (2009). For the load, a realistic pattern was generated based on real-world MG data. For the MPC, a sampling rate of  $T_s = 30$  min, a prediction horizon of 6 h,

Table 1: Parameters of  $\text{MG}_j$ ,  $j \in \mathbb{N}_4$ . Values motivated by Hans et al. (2019); Živić Đurović et al. (2012).

Parameter	Value
$\text{vec}(\underline{p}_{j,c})_{c \in C_j, j \in \mathbb{N}_4}$	[0.1 0.25 0.1 0.25] pu
$\text{vec}(\bar{p}_{j,c})_{c \in C_j, j \in \mathbb{N}_4}$	[0.8 1 0.8 1] pu
$[\underline{p}_{j,p} \quad \bar{p}_{j,p}]$	[-1 1] pu $\forall s \in S_j$
$[\underline{p}_{j,s} \quad \bar{p}_{j,s}]$	[-1 1] pu $\forall s \in S_j$
$[\underline{p}_{j,r} \quad \bar{p}_{j,r}]$	[0 2] pu $\forall r \in R_j$
$[\underline{x}_{j,s} \quad \bar{x}_{j,s}]$	[0 6] pu h $\forall s \in S_j$
$\text{vec}(\eta_{j,s})_{j \in \mathbb{N}_4}$	[0.95 0.9 0.95 0.9]
$\text{vec}(a_{j,c})_{c \in C_j, j \in \mathbb{N}_4}$	[1.21 1.22 1.23 1.23] $\cdot 10^{-1}$
$\text{vec}(a_{j,e})_{c \in C_j, j \in \mathbb{N}_4}$	[1.53 1.54 1.54 1.55] $1/\text{pu}$
$\text{vec}(a_{j,c})_{c \in C_j, j \in \mathbb{N}_4}$	[1.82 1.90 2.01 2.04] $\cdot 10^{-2} 1/\text{pu}^2$
$[a_{j,p} \quad a'_{j,p}]$	[0.35 0.1] $1/\text{pu}$
$a_{j,s}$	0.1 $1/\text{pu}^2 \quad \forall s \in S_j$
$a_{j,r}$	1 $1/\text{pu}^2 \quad \forall r \in R_j$

Table 2: Closed-loop costs with different MPC approaches.

	(i) Island.	(ii) Centr.	(iii) Hier. dis.	(iv) Prob. 2	(v) Alg. 1
MG <sub>1</sub>	245.4	2.7	3.3	23.2	20.0
MG <sub>2</sub>	230.2	121.4	116.7	149.4	139.5
MG <sub>3</sub>	170.6	112.4	111.5	113.1	112.0
MG <sub>4</sub>	227.0	119.0	135.6	126.9	144.6
Sum	873.2	355.6	367.1	412.6	416.1

i.e.,  $H = 12$ , and a persistence forecaster for the prediction of load and available renewable infeed were chosen motivated by Hans et al. (2019). The power over the transmission lines was calculated using the linear AC power flow model from Hans et al. (2019). All simulations were carried out for 336 time steps using MATLAB R2018b with YALMIP (Löfberg, 2004) and Gurobi 9.0.2.

### 6.1. Closed-loop simulations

We performed closed-loop simulations with the following approaches: (i) Islanded MPC (Problem 1), (ii) central MPC without self-interest (Hans et al., 2019), (iii) hierarchical distributed MPC without self-interest (Hans et al., 2019), (iv) central CC MPC (Problem 2), and (v) FD-based CC MPC (Algorithm 1). The closed-loop cost determined via (6) is summarised in Table 2. It can be observed, that the cost with the CC MPC (iv) is around 16 % higher than with (ii), which does not respect the MGs’ self-interest. Similarly, using Algorithm 1 is around 13 % more expensive than using (iii). It appears that this increase is dominantly caused by (10b) which ensures that no MG has a disadvantage from power exchange. Still, we observe a decrease of more than 50 % compared to islanded operation when using Algorithm 1. Moreover, it can be noted that using Algorithm 1 leads to slightly higher costs compared to solving Problem 2. This, however, seems acceptable considering that Algorithm 1 is more scalable and can be implemented in a distributed manner.

In Fig. 2, the difference between optimal islanded costs and the costs obtained with approaches (ii)–(v) for  $\text{MG}_1$  is shown for all simulation steps. It can be seen that approaches (ii) and (iii) sometimes lead to costs that are




Figure 2: Difference between optimal islanded cost and the optimal cost of different control approaches for  $\text{MG}_1$  for 336 simulation steps.




Figure 3: Closed-loop simulation results obtained with distributed CC MPC approach.

higher than in islanded operation. In contrast, (iv) and (v) ensure that no MG has a disadvantage from trading.

Fig. 3 shows simulation results for Algorithm 1. MG<sub>3</sub> and MG<sub>4</sub> have photovoltaic based RES and therefore regularly receive power at night. Overall, the available renewable power can be very well used. Especially MG<sub>1</sub> provides a lot of renewable energy (which would have been partly curtailed in island mode) to the other MGs.

## 6.2. FD-based algorithm

In this section, we assess convergence and open-loop costs of a fully distributed implementation of Algorithm 1 using the approach proposed by Chatzipanagiotis et al. (2015). In Fig. 4, it can be seen that the algorithm requires on average 2.8 iterations to converge and rarely (in 12.5% of the executions) requires more than 4 iterations. The solve time was less than 90 s for all executions of Algorithm 1, which represents a significant decrease compared to Problem 2 which required 316 s on average.




Figure 4: Number of iterations required by Algorithm 1.

The fully distributed implementation of the CC MPC includes nested iterations, i.e., outer iterations of Algorithm 1 and inner iterations of a distributed AL algorithm used to solve Problem 3. This algorithm terminates if the primal and dual residuals are below  $5 \cdot 10^{-3}$ . Here,  $\mathbf{p}_{j,t}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_j$  from the previous outer iteration are used to warm-start the inner AL algorithm. Fig. 5 illustrates the number of inner iterations required at each outer iteration




Figure 5: Boxplots of iterations required by the distributed AL algorithm at each outer iteration of Algorithm 1 and sum at each use of Algorithm 1. Here, the large dots mark the median and the white areas the lower and upper quartiles. The lines are the whiskers and the small dots outliers.

as well as the sum over the entire execution of Algorithm 1. This sum is on average 140 with the maximum being 1435. Given the relatively short solve times at each iteration, the overall solve time of the distributed CC MPC is still much lower than the one of Problem 2 which underlines the applicability of our approach.

Similar convergence results were obtained for the IEEE 14 bus benchmark grid (University of Washington, 1993) with each bus having one MG with a renewable, a conventional, a storage and a load connected, leading to a setup with 14 MGs. Here, Algorithm 1 required on average 3.9 and at maximum 12 outer iterations. In sum, the inner AL algorithm required on average 418 and at maximum 958 iterations.

## 7. Conclusions

In this paper, we proposed a conditional cooperation MPC strategy for the operation of interconnected MGs.

The strategy preserves the self-interest of each MG by only trading power if this does not increase individual costs. A feasible-decomposition-based algorithm was proposed to find a (not necessarily optimal) solution to the associated mixed-integer program. The algorithm was posed in a distributed way by employing an augmented Lagrangian approach. A comprehensive case study illustrated that the presented scheme preserves the MGs' self-interests while enabling power exchange within the network. Future work will focus on the inclusion of uncertainty, e.g., in a similar fashion as proposed by Hofmann et al. (2019); Hans et al. (2020). Moreover, the performance of the algorithm as a function of the number of MGs and their individual setup shall be investigated.

## References

- Ananduta, W., Maestre, J.M., Ocampo-Martinez, C., Ishii, H., 2018. Resilient distributed energy management for systems of interconnected microgrids, in: 57th IEEE CDC, pp. 3159–3164.
- ARM, 2009. Atmospheric Radiation Measurement Climate Research Facility. Surface Meteorology System. June 2009–Oct. 2009, 39° 5' 28" N, 28° 1' 45" W: Eastern North Atlantic Facility, windspeed. ARM Data Archive: Oak Ridge, TN, USA. Data set accessed 2011-07-14 at [www.arm.gov](http://www.arm.gov).
- Braun, P., Faulwasser, T., Grüne, L., Kellett, C.M., Weller, S.R., Worthmann, K., 2018. Hierarchical distributed ADMM for predictive control with applications in power networks. *IFAC J. Syst. Control* 3, 10–22.
- Chatzipanagiotis, N., Dentcheva, D., Zavlanos, M.M., 2015. An augmented lagrangian method for distributed optimization. *Math. Program.* 152, 405–434.
- Hans, C.A., 2021. Operation control of islanded microgrids. Shaker Verlag.
- Hans, C.A., Braun, P., Raisch, J., Grüne, L., Reincke-Collon, C., 2019. Hierarchical distributed model predictive control of interconnected microgrids. *IEEE Trans. Sustain. Energy* 10, 407–416.
- Hans, C.A., Sopasakis, P., Raisch, J., Reincke-Collon, C., Patrianos, P., 2020. Risk-averse model predictive operation control of islanded microgrids. *IEEE Trans. Control Syst. Technol.* 28, 2136–2151.
- Hofmann, S., Sampathirao, A.K., Hans, C.A., Raisch, J., Heidt, A., Bosch, E., 2019. Saturation-aware model predictive energy management for droop-controlled islanded microgrids. preprint [ArXiv:2107.02719v1 \[math.OC\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.02719v1).
- Löfberg, J., 2004. YALMIP: A toolbox for modeling and optimization in MATLAB, in: *IEEE CACSD*, pp. 284–289.
- Ouammi, A., Dagdougui, H., Dessaint, L., Sacile, R., 2015. Coordinated model predictive-based power flows control in a cooperative network of smart microgrids. *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid* 6, 2233–2244.
- Parisio, A., Rikos, E., Glielmo, L., 2014. A model predictive control approach to microgrid operation optimization. *IEEE Trans. Control Syst. Technol.* .
- Parisio, A., Wiezorek, C., Kyntäjä, T., Elo, J., Strunz, K., Johansson, K.H., 2017. Cooperative MPC-based energy management for networked microgrids. *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid* 8, 3066–3074.
- Rawlings, J.B., Mayne, D.Q., 2009. Model predictive control: Theory and design. Nob Hill Pub.
- Sandgani, M.R., Sirouspour, S., 2017. Coordinated optimal dispatch of energy storage in a network of grid-connected microgrids. *IEEE Trans. Sustain. Energy* 8, 1166–1176.
- Savelli, I., Cornélusse, B., Paoletti, S., Giannitrapani, A., Vicino, A., 2019. A local market model for community microgrids, in: 58th IEEE CDC, pp. 2982–2987.
- Shahidehpour, M., Li, Z., Bahramirad, S., Li, Z., Tian, W., 2017. Networked microgrids: Exploring the possibilities of the IIT-bronzeville grid. *IEEE Power Energy Mag.* 15, 63–71.
- Shi, W., Li, N., Chu, C.C., Gadh, R., 2017. Real-time energy management in microgrids. *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid* 8, 228–238.
- University of Washington, 1993. Power system test case archive. <http://labs.ece.uw.edu/pstca/>.
- Valencia, F., Espinosa, J.J., De Schutter, B., Staňková, K., 2011. Feasible-cooperation distributed model predictive control scheme based on game theory. *IFAC Proc. Vol.* 44, 386–391.
- Venkat, A.N., Rawlings, J.B., Wright, S.J., 2005. Stability and optimality of distributed model predictive control, in: 44th IEEE CDC, pp. 6680–6685.
- Wang, H., Huang, J., 2017. Incentivizing energy trading for interconnected microgrids. *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid* PP, 2647–2657.
- Wang, Y., Mao, S., Nelms, R.M., 2015. On hierarchical power scheduling for the macrogrid and cooperative microgrids. *IEEE Trans. Ind. Informat.* 11, 1574–1584.
- Zhai, Q., Guan, X., Yang, J., 2009. Fast unit commitment based on optimal linear approximation to nonlinear fuel cost: Error analysis and applications. *Electr. Power Syst. Res.* 79, 1604–1613.
- Živić Đurović, M., Milačić, A., Kršulja, M., 2012. A simplified model of quadratic cost function for thermal generators. *Ann. DAAAM 2012 & Proc.* 23 Int. DAAAM Symp. 23, 25–28.