

# A Stochastic Online Forecast-and-Optimize Framework for Real-Time Energy Dispatch in Virtual Power Plants under Uncertainty

Wei Jiang, Zhongkai Yi\*, Li Wang, Hanwei Zhang, Jihai Zhang, Fangquan Lin, Cheng Yang  
Alibaba Group, Hangzhou, China

## ABSTRACT

Aggregating distributed energy resources in power systems significantly increases uncertainties, in particular caused by the fluctuation of renewable energy generation. This issue has driven the necessity of widely exploiting advanced predictive control techniques under uncertainty to ensure long-term economics and decarbonization. In this paper, we propose a real-time uncertainty-aware energy dispatch framework, which is composed of two key elements: (i) A hybrid forecast-and-optimize sequential task, integrating deep learning-based forecasting and stochastic optimization, where these two stages are connected by the uncertainty estimation at multiple temporal resolutions; (ii) An efficient online data augmentation scheme, jointly involving model pre-training and online fine-tuning stages. In this way, the proposed framework is capable to rapidly adapt to the real-time data distribution, as well as to target on uncertainties caused by data drift, model discrepancy and environment perturbations in the control process, and finally to realize an optimal and robust dispatch solution. The proposed framework won the championship in CityLearn Challenge 2022, which provided an influential opportunity to investigate the potential of AI application in the energy domain. In addition, comprehensive experiments are conducted to interpret its effectiveness in the real-life scenario of smart building energy management.

## 1 INTRODUCTION

In recent years, virtual power plants (VPPs) as an aggregation of distributed energy resources (DERs), have enabled the efficient exploitation of a large number of renewable energy into power systems [31]. While the sustainable development has been promoted to a new level, however, the intermittent and fluctuating nature of renewable energy generation also poses a huge challenge to the traditional dispatching mode [33]. In fact, the effectiveness of dispatch largely relies on the precise prediction of future information [8]. To guarantee the economy and decarbonization of long-term operations, it is necessary to develop an uncertainty-aware decision-making method for VPPs. For further investigation, we first classify the uncertainty factors into three types:

- (1) *Data drift*: The data distribution changes over time [13]. Apart from the intermittency and fluctuation of the renewable energy generation (e.g., wind power and solar power), time-varying electricity prices and flexible load demand can further lead to inferior dispatch solution [47].
- (2) *Model discrepancy*: The model assumption does not fully correspond to the real mechanism of data generation, which

can result in a large variance in the dispatch effect [1]. For instance, prediction errors appear ubiquitously and show limited generalization ability, due to structural mismatch between the forecasting model and the real process.

- (3) *Environment perturbation*: The environment simulator does not match the true process that occurs. For example, the physical system of energy storage devices may involve a mismatch of parameters [43]. As a result, random perturbation widely occurs in the control process.

Existing approaches, such as conventional model predictive control (MPC) framework, have employed rolling-horizon control to correct the parameter mismatch in environment with real-time feedback mechanism [8, 17]. However, the other forms of uncertainty still weaken the advantages of VPPs. As a representative example of industrial applications, the sequential MPC framework can usually be decomposed into point forecasting of the target variables (e.g., solar power, load demand, etc.), followed by deterministic optimization, which cannot capture the uncertainties of the probabilistic data distribution [11, 30]. More recently, stochastic approaches have received more attention which eliminate the influence of some uncertain factors [23, 47]. Despite these recent advances, the increased model complexity with numerous DERs makes it difficult to meet real-time dispatch requirements; at the same time, the existing schemes are not designed for real scenarios.

Motivated by these requirements in practice, we aim to provide decision-making support on real-time dispatch commands under uncertainty, to achieve the economy and decarbonization of long-term operations of VPPs. The main contributions are as follows:

- A novel and complete framework—Stochastic Online Forecast-and-Optimize Framework (SOFO) is proposed for real-time uncertainty-aware decision-making. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to comprehensively investigate various types of uncertainties in the control process, from the perspectives of both data drift and model discrepancy.
- To tackle the explored uncertainties, two data-driven modules are proposed to achieve the optimal and robust dispatch control, including a hybrid forecast-and-optimize sequential task integrating deep learning-based forecasting and stochastic optimization, and an efficient online data augmentation scheme involving model pre-training and fine-tuning stages.
- The proposed framework is application-driven, which won the 1st place of the CityLearn Challenge 2022 [32], which provided an influential opportunity to investigate the potential of AI for application in the energy domain. A novel and practical industrial application is illustrated in a real-life scenario of smart building energy management. Empirical comparison against various baselines is demonstrated.

## 2 RELATED WORK

In this section, we briefly review the classic approaches of model predictive control, and then focus on the recent advances of energy dispatch. Specifically, we discuss the two essential branches of dispatch approaches in VPPs, including uncertainty-aware control and learning-based control.

### 2.1 Model Predictive Control

As a conventional decision-making strategy, the MPC framework has been widely studied and employed in many fields of application [5, 44], including the power systems for energy dispatch [12, 24, 35, 39]. Generally speaking, MPC is a constrained optimal control strategy, based on finite-horizon iterative optimization of a plant model. Recently, one center of application has been specifically switched to VPPs, for example, energy management of smart buildings [2, 10]. The task can be decomposed into forecasting and optimization stages. Usually, the target variables of forecasting consist of power generation, load demand, market price, *etc.* Regarding optimization, cases with multiple objectives are quite common, including electricity price cost and greenhouse gas emission. Dispatch solutions for energy devices in VPPs are optimized with constraints considering power balance and device attributes [10, 47].

### 2.2 Uncertainty-Aware Control

In real-life applications, implementations of dispatch strategies suffer from multiple uncertainty factors. As pointed out in [25], considering forecast uncertainty can lead to increased energy savings in the range of 15% to 30% for VPPs. Existing works that mitigate uncertainties include stochastic approaches and adaptive approaches [15]. Firstly, stochastic approaches include chance-constraint approximations and feedback parameterizations, which both require prior knowledge of the system uncertainties [34, 45]. Another representative stochastic approach is scenario-based, generating a number of realizations of the stochastic variables [6, 36]. Alternatively, adaptive approaches mainly focus on the online update of the predictive control [3, 18]. For example, predictions and dispatch solutions can be updated via the autoregression in a rolling-horizon framework [27]. Adaptive control approaches are typically restricted to specific model types, which affects the ability to generalize. In recent years, adaptive approaches have been revised in order to combine various machine learning approaches, as discussed in the following.

### 2.3 Learning-Based Control

As an active area that involves new applications, learning-based control aims to learn the prediction model from data with uncertainty quantification [17]. Compared to typical adaptive control, learning-based control involves various statistical learning methods to improve system dynamics in various domains [7, 20, 26]. In the literature on VPPs, there is a multitude of data-driven approaches to represent the prediction variables [14, 16, 28, 40]. Common prediction models consist of tree-based ones, including random forests and boosting trees [19, 37]. Recently, deep learning-based methods have been adopted to provide more accurate prediction results [14]. One essential challenge is to overcome the overfitting, caused by the differences in the data distribution during training and inference stages.

In this paper, we combine both the scopes of stochastic and adaptive approaches, to target various types of uncertainty simultaneously. First, the prediction model and scenario generation are connected by the uncertainty estimation at multiple temporal resolutions. In addition, the proposed prediction model is learning-based, which enables the two-stage adaptive approach of model pre-training and fine-tuning. Specifically, application-driven method in the field of VPPs is introduced in the following section.

## 3 PROBLEM STATEMENT AND DEFINITIONS

Formally, we denote that a VPP consists of various DERs, including a set of power generation devices  $\mathcal{G}$ , a set of user devices  $\mathcal{U}$  and a set of energy storage devices  $\mathcal{S}$ . The dispatch period with total  $T$  timestamps. Given a timestamp  $t \in \mathcal{T} = \{1, \dots, T\}$ , we define the load demand of the user  $u \in \mathcal{U}$  as  $L_{u,t}$ . Meanwhile, we assume the market price unit at a timestamp  $t$  is  $p_t$ . More generally, if there are a set of multiple market  $\mathcal{M}$  (e.g., electricity market and carbon market), then  $p_t$  is the average of the price units among all markets.

The target variables of energy management include the electricity consumption from grid  $P_{\text{grid},t}$ , the power generation  $P_{g,t}$  of device  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ , the charging or discharging power  $P_{s,t}^+$  or  $P_{s,t}^-$  and the state-of-charge  $E_{s,t}$  of device  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ . Let the set of decision variables be  $X = \{P_{\text{grid},t}, P_{g,t}, P_{s,t}^+, P_{s,t}^-, E_{s,t}\}$ , where  $t \in \mathcal{T}, s \in \mathcal{S}, g \in \mathcal{G}$ , then the objective is to achieve the economic optimum of all markets on average, formally defined as follows:

$$\underset{X}{\text{minimize}} \quad \sum_{t=1}^T p_t \cdot P_{\text{grid},t} \quad (1)$$

s.t.:

$$P_{\text{grid},t} \geq 0 \quad t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (1a)$$

$$P_{g,t}^{\min} \leq P_{g,t} \leq P_{g,t}^{\max} \quad g \in \mathcal{G}, t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (1b)$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} 0 \leq P_{s,t}^+ \leq P_{s,t}^{+\max} \\ 0 \leq P_{s,t}^- \leq P_{s,t}^{-\max} \\ P_{s,t}^+ \cdot P_{s,t}^- = 0 \end{aligned} \right\} s \in \mathcal{S}, t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (1c)$$

$$E_{s,t}^{\min} \leq E_{s,t} \leq E_{s,t}^{\max} \quad s \in \mathcal{S}, t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (1d)$$


$$E_{s,t} = E_{s,t-1} + P_{s,t}^+ - P_{s,t}^- \quad s \in \mathcal{S}, t \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \{1\}$$

$$P_{\text{grid},t} + \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} P_{g,t} + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P_{s,t}^- = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P_{s,t}^+ + \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} L_{u,t} \quad t \in \mathcal{T} \quad (1e)$$

Their brief explanation of the above constraints is provided as follows with the necessary description of parameters:

- (1a) Bounds of electricity consumption from grid;
- (1b) Power generation device attributes: lower bounds ( $P_{g,t}^{\min}$ ) and upper bounds ( $P_{g,t}^{\max}$ ) of power;
- (1c) Energy storage attributes: upper bounds of charging ( $P_{s,t}^{+\max}$ ), upper bounds of discharging ( $P_{s,t}^{-\max}$ ) and status constraints;
- (1d) State-of-charge constraints: lower bounds ( $E_{s,t}^{\min}$ ), upper bounds ( $E_{s,t}^{\max}$ ) and update formulas;
- (1e) Power balance constraints of the VPP system.

However, in practice, when planning dispatch, we are unable to obtain the precise values of load, power generation, and market price in advance. Therefore, we propose a stochastic online forecast-and-optimize framework, as detailed in the following section.



**Figure 1: An Overview of the SOFO framework. It consists of two major modules: i) A hybrid forecast-and-optimize sequential task, as shown in the subplot (a) deep learning-based forecasting, followed by the subplot (b) stochastic optimization; ii) An online data augmentation scheme as demonstrated in the subplot (c). Based on these stochastic and adaptive techniques, the SOFO framework contributes to generate optimal and robust dispatch solutions under uncertainties.**

## 4 STOCHASTIC ONLINE FORECAST-AND-OPTIMIZE FRAMEWORK

The overview of the proposed framework is visualized in Figure 1, which consists of two modules: (i) A hybrid forecast-and-optimize sequential task, integrating deep learning-based forecasting and stochastic optimization, where these two stages are connected by the uncertainty estimation at multiple temporal resolutions; (ii) An efficient online data augmentation scheme, involving model pre-training and online fine-tuning stages.

### 4.1 Stochastic Forecast-and-Optimize

*Deep Learning-based Forecasting Model.* Firstly, we build forecasting models to estimate the variables at each timestamp  $t$  of the control horizon, as illustrated in subplot (a) of Figure 1. The target variables consist of: i) Capacity of renewable power generation  $p_{g,t}^{\max}$ ; ii) Load demand  $L_{u,t}$ ; iii) Market price  $p_t$ . Note that the other bounding parameters in the problem (1) are constant given the physical models of the devices. The input features of the forecasting models can be classified into the following genres: i) Discrete time-related features, such as hours of day, days of week, months of year, etc.; ii) Historical sequences of target variables; iii) Exogenous features, such as weather predictions and market information.

Deep learning-based models are involved in the forecasting task. Here we mainly describe the recurrent neural network (RNN) as a representative algorithm, but note that the proposed framework can be naturally superimposed on any deep learning-based algorithm

(e.g., CNN, transformer). RNN has shown good performance in many sequential tasks of signal processing [4, 38]. Though less active in the energy domain, there are studies showing that RNN is well-performed in smaller-sample datasets, especially with specific design of gating mechanisms [9]. Formally, given a sequence of input  $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_T)$ , the RNN layer expresses its recurrent hidden state  $h_t$  and the output variable  $y_t$  by:

$$h_t = \phi_1(h_{t-1}, x_t), \quad y_t = \phi_2(h_t), \quad t \in \mathcal{T}.$$

where  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  are non-linear functions such as the composition of an activate function with affine transformations. By maximizing the likelihood of the models given the training data, we denote the learned models as  $f_{p_g}$ ,  $f_{L_u}$ ,  $f_p$  for capacity of power generation, load demand and market price, respectively.

*Stochastic Optimization.* Then we apply the trained models to infer the predictions of the target variables on the control horizon:  $\hat{p}_{g,t}^{\max}$ ,  $\hat{L}_{u,t}$  and  $\hat{p}_t$ , where  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ . In addition, the variance of forecasting models are estimated on the validation data by the empirical prediction errors, denoted by  $\hat{\Sigma}_{p_g}$ ,  $\hat{\Sigma}_{L_u}$  and  $\hat{\Sigma}_p$ , to quantify the level of uncertainty. To further address the uncertainty of the forecasting, we propose stochastic optimization for real-time energy dispatch, as demonstrated in subplot (b) of Figure 1. Realizations of the stochastic Gaussian process are generated with mean and variance parameters equal to  $(\hat{p}_{g,t}^{\max}, \hat{\Sigma}_{p_g})$ ,  $(\hat{L}_{u,t}, \hat{\Sigma}_{L_u})$  and  $(\hat{p}_t, \hat{\Sigma}_p)$ , respectively. That means, Gaussian noises are added on the predicted values, to generate a multi-scenarios optimization problem which

we solve coordinately. Consider the case with  $N$  scenarios, then the  $n$ -th realizations of the parameters can be denoted by ( $n \in \mathcal{S}_N$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{p}_g^{\max})^n &= \left[ (\tilde{p}_{g,1}^{\max})^n, (\tilde{p}_{g,2}^{\max})^n, \dots, (\tilde{p}_{g,T}^{\max})^n \right], \\ (\tilde{L}_u)^n &= \left[ (\tilde{L}_{u,1})^n, (\tilde{L}_{u,2})^n, \dots, (\tilde{L}_{u,T})^n \right], \\ (\tilde{p})^n &= \left[ (\tilde{p}_1)^n, (\tilde{p}_2)^n, \dots, (\tilde{p}_T)^n \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Based on the above notation, we solve the stochastic optimization problem by substituting the objective in problem (1) with:

$$\underset{X}{\text{minimize}} \quad \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}_{n \in \mathcal{S}_N} (\tilde{p}_t)^n \cdot P_{\text{grid},t}. \quad (2)$$

Meanwhile, the constraint (1b) is replaced by:

$$P_{g,t}^{\min} \leq P_{g,t} \leq (\tilde{p}_{g,t}^{\max})^n \quad n \in \mathcal{S}_N, g \in \mathcal{G}, t \in \mathcal{T}.$$

And the constraint (1e) is replaced by:

$$P_{\text{grid},t} + \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} P_{g,t} + \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P_{s,t}^- = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} P_{s,t}^+ + \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} (\tilde{L}_{u,t})^n \quad n \in \mathcal{S}_N, t \in \mathcal{T}.$$

By solving the optimization problem (2), we obtain the dispatch decision solution:  $\hat{X} = \{\hat{P}_{\text{grid},t}, \hat{P}_{g,t}, \hat{P}_{s,t}^+, \hat{P}_{s,t}^-, \hat{E}_{s,t}\}$ .

## 4.2 Online Data Augmentation

As shown in subplot (c) of Figure 1, the second module in the proposed SOFO framework is online data augmentation.

*Pre-training and Fine-tuning Scheme.* For neural network-based forecasting models, the online data augmentation can be handled via an efficient scheme involving pre-training and fine-tuning: (i) With offline training data, we train the neural network from scratch  $f_{P_g}, \hat{f}_{L_u}, \hat{f}_p$ ; (ii) With online data, we fine-tune the neural network, either when the fine-tuning horizon (denoted by  $T_{\text{ft}}$ ) is reached, or the prediction errors are larger than a given threshold. Regarding the fine-tuning techniques, we freeze the weights of the first few layers of the pre-trained neural networks, then fine-tune the last layer to specifically adapt to the distribution of the newly collected data. Denote the fine-tuned neural network as  $\hat{f}_{P_g}, \hat{f}_{L_u}, \hat{f}_p$ .

*Rolling-horizon Feedback Correction.* In addition, rolling-horizon control is involved (with rolling horizon denoted by  $T_{\text{rl}}$ ). At a timestamp  $t$ , we predict and optimize for the next  $T$  timestamps; then after  $T_{\text{rl}}$ , we take new measurements, and correct the previous predictions and actions. This procedure is conducted repeatedly.

To conclude, the summary of the proposed SOFO framework is described in Algorithm 1.

## 5 EXPERIMENT STUDY

### 5.1 Experiment Setup

*Dataset.* Experiments are conducted on building energy management from the CityLearn Challenge 2022 [32]. The challenge utilizes 1 year of electricity demand and photo-voltaic generation data from 17 single-family buildings in Fontana, California. In this competition, we won the 1<sup>st</sup> place<sup>1</sup> using the proposed framework for energy management. After the competition, we have investigated various extension of the framework modules to further improve the performance.

<sup>1</sup>[www.aicrowd.com/challenges/neurips-2022-citylearn-challenge/leaderboards](http://www.aicrowd.com/challenges/neurips-2022-citylearn-challenge/leaderboards)

---

### Algorithm 1 Stochastic Online Forecast-and-Optimize Framework

---

**Input:** Training data  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ , validation data  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}$ .

**Parameter:** Set of hyperparameters of neural networks; constant values of bounding parameters in problem (2).

- 1: Pre-train forecasting models with  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}} \rightarrow f_{P_g}, \hat{f}_{L_u}, \hat{f}_p$ ;
  - 2: Estimate prediction variance  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}} \rightarrow \hat{\Sigma}_{P_g}, \hat{\Sigma}_{L_u}, \hat{\Sigma}_p$ .
  - 3: **while**  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  in control horizon **do**
  - 4:   // **Forecast-and-Optimize**
  - 5:   Infer predictions  $\rightarrow \hat{P}_{g,t}^{\max}, \hat{L}_{u,t}$  and  $\hat{p}_t, t \in \mathcal{T}$ ;
  - 6:   Scenarios generation with  $(\hat{P}_{g,t}^{\max}, \hat{\Sigma}_{P_g}), (\hat{L}_{u,t}, \hat{\Sigma}_{L_u}), (\hat{p}_t, \hat{\Sigma}_p)$ ;
  - 7:   Solving stochastic optimization problem (2)  $\rightarrow \hat{X} = \{\hat{P}_{\text{grid},t}, \hat{P}_{g,t}, \hat{P}_{s,t}^+, \hat{P}_{s,t}^-, \hat{E}_{s,t}\}$ .
  - 8:   // **Online Data Augmentation**
  - 9:   **if**  $t > T_{\text{ft}}$  fine-tuning horizon or prediction errors  $\geq \epsilon$  **then**
  - 10:     Update online datasets  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_{\text{train}}$  and  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_{\text{val}}$ ;
  - 11:     Fine-tune forecasting models  $\hat{f}_{P_g}, \hat{f}_{L_u}, \hat{f}_p$ ;
  - 12:     Estimate prediction variance  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_{\text{val}} \rightarrow \hat{\Sigma}_{P_g}, \hat{\Sigma}_{L_u}, \hat{\Sigma}_p$ .
  - 13:   **end if**
  - 14:   **if**  $t > T_{\text{rl}}$  in rolling-horizon **then**
  - 15:     Infer predictions  $\rightarrow \hat{P}_{g,t}^{\max}, \hat{L}_{u,t}$  and optimize  $\rightarrow \hat{X}$ .
  - 16:   **end if**
  - 17: **end while**
  - 18: **return** Dispatch solution  $\hat{X}$ .
- 

*Evaluation.* The evaluation framework follows the official competition setup. Based on the location, the dataset is divided into training set (buildings 1-5), validation set (buildings 6-10), and testing set (buildings 11-17). We focus on the performance on the testing set, as well as the overall performance of the whole district. Metrics contain emission cost, price cost and grid cost, which correspond to the goal of economics, decarbonization and fluctuation-reducing, respectively. Formally, consider there are  $I$  buildings and  $T$  timestamps. For building  $i$  at a timestamp  $t$ , denote the load demand as  $L_{i,t}$ , the solar generation as  $P_{i,t}$ , the dispatch solution as  $X_{i,t}$ , the carbon intensity as  $c_t$  and the price unit as  $p_t$ , then we define the electricity consumption of a single building as  $E_{i,t} = L_{i,t} - P_{i,t} + X_{i,t}$ , and the district-level consumption as  $E_t^{\text{dist}} = \sum_{i=1}^I E_{i,t}$ .

With these notations, the evaluation metrics are calculated as:

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\text{Emission}} &= \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \sum_{i=1}^I \max(E_{i,t}, 0) \right) \cdot c_t, \quad C_{\text{Price}} = \sum_{t=1}^T \max(E_t^{\text{dist}}, 0) \cdot p_t, \\ C_{\text{Grid}} &= \frac{1}{2} (C_{\text{Ramping}} + C_{\text{Load Factor}}) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} |E_{t+1}^{\text{dist}} - E_t^{\text{dist}}| + \sum_{m=1}^{\text{\#months}} \frac{\text{avg}_{t \in [\text{month } m]} E_t^{\text{dist}}}{\max_{t \in [\text{month } m]} E_t^{\text{dist}}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

*Baselines.* We evaluate SOFO by comparing with the baselines:

- **RBC:** Rule-based control. We consider a time-dependent strategy, which charges at 10% of battery capacity from 10am to 2pm, then discharges at equal amount from 4pm to 8pm.
- **MPC** [39]: Conventional approach of model predictive control. A simple yet efficient approach of GBDT model [22] is considered as the prediction model, followed by a deterministic optimization problem of day-ahead dispatch.

**Table 1: Comparison of dispatch performance in the testing set (a community with 7 buildings) with baselines over a year, as well as overall performance in the entire district (communities with 17 buildings in total). All cost presented above are normalized against the simple baseline without electrical energy storage in batteries, such that lower values of cost are preferred. The *Improv.* row show the relative improvements of SOFO framework over the best performed baselines for each metric, respectively, where the positive value indicates that the cost is relatively reduced.**

	Overall Performance				Testing Set Performance			
	Average Cost	Emission	Price	Grid	Average Cost	Emission	Price	Grid
RBC	0.921	0.964	0.817	0.982	0.944	0.994	0.840	0.997
MPC	0.861	0.921	0.746	0.916	0.906	0.965	0.820	0.933
AMPC	0.827	<u>0.859</u>	0.750	0.872	0.901	0.914	0.835	0.955
ES	0.812	<u>0.863</u>	0.748	<u>0.827</u>	<u>0.883</u>	0.923	0.815	<u>0.911</u>
SAC	0.834	<u>0.859</u>	0.737	0.905	0.901	<u>0.913</u>	0.821	0.968
PPO	<u>0.808</u>	0.869	<u>0.724</u>	0.830	0.887	0.930	<u>0.809</u>	0.921
<b>SOFO</b>	<b>0.795</b>	<b>0.857</b>	<b>0.717</b>	<b>0.810</b>	<b>0.862</b>	<b>0.911</b>	<b>0.796</b>	<b>0.881</b>
<i>Improv.</i>	+1.3%	+0.2%	+0.7%	+1.7%	+2.1%	+0.2%	+1.3%	+3.0%

**Table 2: Effectiveness of the framework components in the testing set. The *Improv.* columns show the relative improvements of each added component, where the positive value indicates that the cost is relatively reduced.**

	Overall Performance					Testing Set Performance				
	Average Cost	<i>Improv.</i>	Emission	Price	Grid	Average Cost	<i>Improv.</i>	Emission	Price	Grid
MPC	0.861	-	0.921	0.746	0.916	0.906	-	0.965	0.820	0.933
+ Rolling-Horizon	0.839	+2.2%	0.901	0.753	0.863	0.896	+1.0%	0.946	0.812	0.929
+ Stochastic Optimization	0.805	+3.4%	0.869	0.723	0.823	0.875	+2.1%	0.934	0.794	0.897
+ Online Fine-tuning	0.795	+1.0%	0.857	0.717	0.810	0.862	+1.3%	0.911	0.796	0.881

In addition, we compare it with the state-of-the-art methods, which are implemented by top-ranked teams in the competition. Both optimization and reinforcement learning-based approaches are evaluated to provide a comprehensive comparison.

- **AMPC** [39]: An adaptive version of MPC, with an online update scheme of forecasting models.
- **ES** [41]: Evolution strategy with the covariance matrix adaptation for optimization problem.
- **SAC** [21]: Soft Actor-Critic algorithm which controls each agent in a decentralized way with shared parameters.
- **PPO** [46]: Proximal policy optimization, which is a recent advancement of reinforcement learning algorithm.

*Implementation.* The environment simulator and evaluation framework are implemented with CityLearn [42]. The deep neural network is implemented using PyTorch. The optimization problem is solved using MindOpt [29]. We run all the experiments on a machine equipped with Intel(R) Xeon(R) Platinum 8163 CPU @ 2.50GHz, and Nvidia Tesla v100 GPU.

## 5.2 Performance Comparison

Table 1 illustrates the performance of the proposed method. All cost presented above are normalized against the simple baseline without electrical energy storage in batteries, such that lower values in the

table are preferred. Relative improvements of SOFO over the best-performed baseline are also reported. In particular, the proposed SOFO framework has improved over the state-of-the-art baselines in all metrics, as indicated by the bold scores in Table 1. For example, SOFO contributes to reduce 2.1% average cost, 0.2% carbon emission, 1.3% price cost and 3.0% grid fluctuation, compared with the best-performed baselines for each metric on the testing set. For further investigation, we analyze how the essential model components impact the model performance. As shown in Table 2, the modules of rolling-horizon control, stochastic optimization and online fine-tuning are added in succession on the MPC method. We observe that all modules can significantly impact performance, which shows the indispensability of these modules.


## 5.3 Ablation Study

Ablation experiments are conducted over several modules and hyperparameters to understand their impact on SOFO framework.

*Effectiveness of Online Data Augmentation.* We compare the performance of various online update approaches as shown in Figure 2: (1) No-Ft: Without using fine-tuning for online data; (2) Self-Adapt: Self-adaptive linear correction by minimizing the MSE between the historical real values and predicted values; (3) Scratch: Learning from scratch repeatedly; (4) Small-LR: Continual learning with online data, but using a smaller learning rate; (5) Freeze: Continual learning with online data, but freezing the weights of the first

**Table 3: Comparing the dispatch performance, forecast performance and execution time of SOFO framework with the variation of forecasting models, as well as the approaches of online updating.**

Forecast Model	Online Update	Dispatch Performance					Forecast Performance	
		Average	Emission	Price	Grid	Time (24h dispatch)	WMAPE-Load	WMAPE-Solar
Linear	✗	0.878	0.929	0.806	0.899	7.96s	42.12%	27.25%
GBDT		0.875	0.934	0.794	0.897	8.17s	44.70%	10.74%
RNN		0.876	0.921	0.805	0.902	9.30s	45.97%	10.66%
Transformer		0.879	0.920	0.802	0.916	10.64s	45.25%	10.60%
Linear	✓ Self-Adaptive Linear Correction	0.871	0.918	0.804	0.890	8.17s	39.35%	21.23%
GBDT		0.868	0.913	0.801	0.889	8.99s	39.48%	9.38%
RNN		0.866	0.913	0.802	0.888	10.01s	39.29%	9.25%
Transformer		0.869	0.913	0.802	0.892	11.03s	39.86%	9.12%
RNN	✓ Online Fine-tuning	<b>0.862</b>	<b>0.911</b>	<b>0.795</b>	<b>0.881</b>	11.45s	<b>38.98%</b>	<b>9.01%</b>
Transformer		0.864	0.912	0.799	0.880	12.15s	39.30%	9.07%

**Figure 2: Evaluation of average score and execution time with respect to different online parameter update schemes.**


few layers and keeping only the last layer updated. To compare the model efficiency, we evaluate the average execution time of real-time dispatch in a period of 24 hours. Empirical results demonstrate the advantages of fine-tuning with a smaller learning rate, considering both efficiency and effectiveness.

*Effectiveness of Forecasting Models.* As demonstrated in Table 3, different forecasting models are compared in our framework. Apart from dispatch performance and execution time, the forecasting performance is also reported with weighted mean absolute percentage error (WMAPE). Empirically, the RNN forecasting model with online fine-tuning has achieved superior performance compared to other setups, with low incremental computational cost.

*Ablation Study of Stochastic Optimization.* We also analyze the effect of scenario number, as plotted in Figure 3. When the scenario number increases, the expectation of the score has converged to fix value around 0.862, with the standard deviation decreasing.

## 6 CONCLUSION

This paper explores the application of real-time energy dispatch in VPPs under uncertainty. To achieve this, we design an application-driven learning framework to investigate various forms of uncertainties in the control process. In this framework, two data-driven

**Figure 3: Hyperparameter study: different scenario number  $N$ . The curve represents the expectation, and the area represents the standard deviation over the stochastic samples.**

modules are proposed: a hybrid forecast-and-optimize sequential task integrating deep learning-based forecasting and stochastic optimization, and an efficient online data augmentation scheme involving model pre-training and fine-tuning stages. From empirical point of view, the proposed framework won the 1st place of the CityLearn Challenge 2022, and its effectiveness is further interpreted according to comprehensive experiments in the real-life scenario against various state-of-the-art methods.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank the organizers of CityLearn Challenge 2022 who provide an influential competition and high-quality dataset for researchers to investigate the AI application in energy domain. We thank other competition participants who shares pearls of wisdom in the discussions during and after the competition. We thank Professor Wotao Yin who provided insight and expertise that greatly assisted the research. We would also like to show our gratitude to Jiayu Han for technical support during this research.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Paul D Arendt, Daniel W Apley, and Wei Chen. 2012. Quantification of Model Uncertainty: Calibration, Model Discrepancy, and Identifiability. *Journal of mechanical design* 134, 10 (2012).
- [2] Javier Arroyo, Carlo Manna, Fred Spiessens, and Lieve Helsen. 2022. Reinforced model predictive control (RL-MPC) for building energy management. *Applied Energy* 309 (2022), 118346.
- [3] Karl J Åström and Björn Wittenmark. 2013. *Adaptive control*. Courier Corporation.
- [4] Ben Athiwaratkun and Jack W Stokes. 2017. Malware classification with LSTM and GRU language models and a character-level CNN. In *2017 IEEE international conference on acoustics, speech and signal processing (ICASSP)*. IEEE, 2482–2486.
- [5] Julian Berberich, Johannes Köhler, Matthias A Müller, and Frank Allgöwer. 2020. Data-driven model predictive control with stability and robustness guarantees. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control* 66, 4 (2020), 1702–1717.
- [6] Eric Bradford, Lars Inslund, Dongda Zhang, and Ehecatl Antonio del Rio Chanona. 2020. Stochastic data-driven model predictive control using gaussian processes. *Computers & Chemical Engineering* 139 (2020), 106844.
- [7] Monimoy Bujarbaruah, Xiaojing Zhang, Ugo Rosolia, and Francesco Borrelli. 2018. Adaptive MPC for iterative tasks. In *2018 IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*. IEEE, 6322–6327.
- [8] Eduardo F Camacho and Carlos Bordons Alba. 2013. *Model predictive control*. Springer science & business media.
- [9] Junyoung Chung, Caglar Gulcehre, KyungHyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. 2014. Empirical evaluation of gated recurrent neural networks on sequence modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.3555* (2014).
- [10] Ján Drgoňa, Javier Arroyo, Iago Cupeiro Figueroa, David Blum, Krzysztof Arendt, Donghun Kim, Enric Perarnau Ollé, Juraj Oravec, Michael Wetter, Draguna L Vrabie, et al. 2020. All you need to know about model predictive control for buildings. *Annual Reviews in Control* 50 (2020), 190–232.
- [11] Adam N Elmachtoub and Paul Grigas. 2022. Smart “predict, then optimize”. *Management Science* 68, 1 (2022), 9–26.
- [12] Damien Ernst, Mevludin Glavic, Florin Capitanescu, and Louis Wehenkel. 2008. Reinforcement learning versus model predictive control: a comparison on a power system problem. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part B (Cybernetics)* 39, 2 (2008), 517–529.
- [13] João Gama, André Žliobaitė, Albert Bifet, Mykola Pechenizkiy, and Abdelhamid Bouchachia. 2014. A survey on concept drift adaptation. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)* 46, 4 (2014), 1–37.
- [14] Saleh Sadeghi Gougheri, Hamidreza Jahangir, Mahsa A Golkar, Ali Ahmadian, and Masoud Aliakbar Golkar. 2021. Optimal participation of a virtual power plant in electricity market considering renewable energy: A deep learning-based approach. *Sustainable Energy, Grids and Networks* 26 (2021), 100448.
- [15] Tor Aksel N Heirung, Joel A Paulson, Jared O’Leary, and Ali Mesbah. 2018. Stochastic model predictive control—how does it work? *Computers & Chemical Engineering* 114 (2018), 158–170.
- [16] Luis Hernández, Carlos Baladron, Javier M Aguiar, Belen Carro, Antonio Sanchez-Esguevillas, Jaime Lloret, David Chinarro, Jorge J Gomez-Sanz, and Diane Cook. 2013. A multi-agent system architecture for smart grid management and forecasting of energy demand in virtual power plants. *IEEE Communications Magazine* 51, 1 (2013), 106–113.
- [17] Lukas Hewing, Kim P Wabersich, Marcel Menner, and Melanie N Zeilinger. 2020. Learning-based model predictive control: Toward safe learning in control. *Annual Review of Control, Robotics, and Autonomous Systems* 3 (2020), 269–296.
- [18] Petros A Ioannou and Jing Sun. 2012. *Robust adaptive control*. Courier Corporation.
- [19] Achin Jain, Francesco Smarra, and Rahul Mangharam. 2017. Data predictive control using regression trees and ensemble learning. In *2017 IEEE 56th annual conference on decision and control (CDC)*. IEEE, 4446–4451.
- [20] Wei Jiang, Fangquan Lin, Jihai Zhang, Cheng Yang, Hanwei Zhang, and Zhiqiang Cui. 2021. Dynamic sequential recommendation: Decoupling user intent from temporal context. In *2021 International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW)*. IEEE, 18–26.
- [21] Anjukan Kathirgamanathan, Kacper Twardowski, Eleni Mangina, and Donal P. Finn. 2020. A Centralised Soft Actor Critic Deep Reinforcement Learning Approach to District Demand Side Management through CityLearn. In *Proceedings of the 1st International Workshop on Reinforcement Learning for Energy Management in Buildings & Cities (Virtual Event, Japan) (RLEM’20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, 11–14.
- [22] Guolin Ke, Qi Meng, Thomas Finley, Taifeng Wang, Wei Chen, Weidong Ma, Qiyue Ye, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2017. LightGBM: A Highly Efficient Gradient Boosting Decision Tree. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (Long Beach, California, USA) (NIPS’17)*. Curran Associates Inc., Red Hook, NY, USA, 3149–3157.
- [23] Xiangyu Kong, Jie Xiao, Dehong Liu, Jianzhong Wu, Chengshan Wang, and Yu Shen. 2020. Robust stochastic optimal dispatching method of multi-energy virtual power plant considering multiple uncertainties. *Applied Energy* 279 (2020), 115707.
- [24] Samir Kouro, Patricio Cortés, René Vargas, Ulrich Ammann, and José Rodríguez. 2008. Model predictive control—A simple and powerful method to control power converters. *IEEE Transactions on industrial electronics* 56, 6 (2008), 1826–1838.
- [25] Fiorella Lauro, Luca Longobardi, and Stefano Panzieri. 2014. An adaptive distributed predictive control strategy for temperature regulation in a multizone office building. In *2014 IEEE international workshop on intelligent energy systems (IWIES)*. IEEE, 32–37.
- [26] Fangquan Lin, Wei Jiang, Jihai Zhang, and Cheng Yang. 2021. Dynamic popularity-aware contrastive learning for recommendation. In *Asian Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 964–968.
- [27] Xiaoqi Liu, Parth Paritosh, Nimish M Awalgaonkar, Ilias Bilonis, and Panagiota Karava. 2018. Model predictive control under forecast uncertainty for optimal operation of buildings with integrated solar systems. *Solar energy* 171 (2018), 953–970.
- [28] Pamela MacDougall, Anna Magdalena Kosek, Hendrik Bindner, and Geert Deconinck. 2016. Applying machine learning techniques for forecasting flexibility of virtual power plants. In *2016 IEEE electrical power and energy conference (EPEC)*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [29] MindOpt. 2022. MindOpt Studio. <https://opt.aliyun.com>
- [30] K Muralitharan, Rathinasamy Saktivel, and R Vishnuvarthan. 2018. Neural network based optimization approach for energy demand prediction in smart grid. *Neurocomputing* 273 (2018), 199–208.
- [31] Seyyed Mostafa Nosratabadi, Rahmat-Allah Hooshmand, and Eskandar Gholipour. 2017. A comprehensive review on microgrid and virtual power plant concepts employed for distributed energy resources scheduling in power systems. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 67 (2017), 341–363.
- [32] Kingsley Nweye, Sankaranarayanan Siva, and Gyorgy Zoltan Nagy. 2023. The CityLearn Challenge 2022. <https://doi.org/10.18738/T8/0YLJ6Q>
- [33] Daniel E Olivares, Ali Mehrizi-Sani, Amir H Etemadi, Claudio A Cañizares, Reza Irvani, Mehrdad Kazerani, Amir H Hajimiragha, Oriol Gomis-Bellmunt, Maryam Saadedifard, Rodrigo Palma-Behnke, et al. 2014. Trends in microgrid control. *IEEE Transactions on smart grid* 5, 4 (2014), 1905–1919.
- [34] Joel A Paulson, Edward A Buehler, Richard D Braatz, and Ali Mesbah. 2020. Stochastic model predictive control with joint chance constraints. *Internat. J. Control* 93, 1 (2020), 126–139.
- [35] James B Rawlings. 2000. Tutorial overview of model predictive control. *IEEE control systems magazine* 20, 3 (2000), 38–52.
- [36] Chao Shang and Fengqi You. 2019. A data-driven robust optimization approach to scenario-based stochastic model predictive control. *Journal of Process Control* 75 (2019), 24–39.
- [37] Francesco Smarra, Achin Jain, Tullio De Rubens, Dario Ambrosini, Alessandro D’Innocenzo, and Rahul Mangharam. 2018. Data-driven model predictive control using random forests for building energy optimization and climate control. *Applied energy* 226 (2018), 1252–1272.
- [38] Yuanhang Su and C.-C. Jay Kuo. 2019. On Extended Long Short-Term Memory and Dependent Bidirectional Recurrent Neural Network. *Neurocomput.* 356, C (sep 2019), 151–161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neucom.2019.04.044>
- [39] W Razia Sultana, Sarat Kumar Sahoo, Sukruedee Sukchai, S Yamuna, and D Venkatesh. 2017. A review on state of art development of model predictive control for renewable energy applications. *Renewable and sustainable energy reviews* 76 (2017), 391–406.
- [40] Akin Tascikaraoglu, Ozan Erdinc, Mehmet Uzunoglu, and Arif Karakas. 2014. An adaptive load dispatching and forecasting strategy for a virtual power plant including renewable energy conversion units. *Applied energy* 119 (2014), 445–453.
- [41] Konstantinos Varelas, Anne Auger, Dimo Brockhoff, Nikolaus Hansen, Ouassim Ait ElHara, Yann Semet, Rami Kassab, and Frédéric Barbaresco. 2018. A comparative study of large-scale variants of CMA-ES. In *Parallel Problem Solving from Nature—PPSN XV: 15th International Conference, Coimbra, Portugal, September 8–12, 2018, Proceedings, Part I 15*. Springer, 3–15.
- [42] José R Vázquez-Canteli, Jérôme Kömpf, Gregor Henze, and Zoltan Nagy. 2019. CityLearn v1.0: An OpenAI gym environment for demand response with deep reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 6th ACM International Conference on Systems for Energy-Efficient Buildings, Cities, and Transportation*. 356–357.
- [43] Cheng Wang, Hongting Hua, He Peng, and Ze Wang. 2021. Adaptive Control for Parallel-Connected Energy Storage Converters with Line Parameter Mismatch. *Frontiers in Energy Research* (2021), 599.
- [44] Yang Wang and Stephen Boyd. 2009. Fast model predictive control using online optimization. *IEEE Transactions on control systems technology* 18, 2 (2009), 267–278.
- [45] Shuhao Yan, Paul Goulart, and Mark Cannon. 2018. Stochastic model predictive control with discounted probabilistic constraints. In *2018 European Control Conference (ECC)*. IEEE, 1003–1008.
- [46] Chao Yu, Akash Velu, Eugene Vinitzky, Jiaxuan Gao, Yu Wang, Alexandre Bayen, and Yi Wu. 2021. The Surprising Effectiveness of PPO in Cooperative Multi-Agent Games. (2021).
- [47] Songyuan Yu, Fang Fang, Yajuan Liu, and Jizhen Liu. 2019. Uncertainties of virtual power plant: Problems and countermeasures. *Applied energy* 239 (2019), 454–470.