Aggregator of Electric Vehicles Bidding in Nordic FCR-D Markets: A Chance-Constrained Program

Gustav A. Lunde, Emil V. Damm, Peter A.V. Gade, and Jalal Kazempour, Senior Member, IEEE

Abstract-The Danish transmission system operator, Energinet, has recently released innovative grid codes allowing stochastic flexible resources to bid their flexibility in Nordic ancillary service markets, provided that the probability of the reserve capacity bid to be successfully realized is at least 90%. For resources like batteries with a limited energy reservoir, Energinet imposes additional requirements when bidding into Nordic ancillary service markets. Taken into account all these requirements, this paper develops a chance-constrained optimization model for an aggregator of electric vehicles to optimally place a reserve capacity bid in the Nordic Frequency Containment Reserve for Disturbances (FCR-D) market while accounting for uncertainty in its future consumption baseline. We consider both FCR-D up and down markets, reformulate and solve the proposed joint chance-constrained model using two distinct sample-based methods, namely ALSO-X and conditional value-at-risk. Using real data from 1400 charging boxes in Denmark in the time period of March 2022 to March 2023, we present the out-ofsample profit, showing the vehicle owners could have a saving of 6-10% in their annual electricity bill by providing FCR-D services. We have also observed a synergy effect, implying more vehicles in a single portfolio enables placing a larger bid per vehicle, compared to a collective bid of multiple portfolios with the same number of vehicles in total.

Index Terms—Stochastic flexibility, electric vehicles, Nordic ancillary services, bidding, chance-constrained optimization

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background and Motivation

A new regulatory framework has recently emerged in Denmark, called the "P90 requirement" [1], which addresses how stochastic flexible resources, either in supply or demand side, can provide ancillary services by allowing some level of uncertainty in their reserve capacity bid. This requirement has potential to increase liquidity of the Nordic ancillary service markets by lowering barriers to entry for stochastic flexible resources. Examples of such resources are wind turbines, heat pumps, supermarket freezers, and grid-connected electric vehicles (EVs). The focus of this paper is on EV aggregators who have already proven their capability to provide fast automatic reserve services [2].

Among various Nordic ancillary services, we focus on a particular service called Frequency Containment Reserve for Disturbances (FCR-D), which is a reserve service in the Nordic synchronous area being activated in operational circumstances

with extreme frequency deviations, i.e., when frequency drops below 49.9 Hz or exceeds 50.1 Hz. The Danish Transmission System Operator (TSO), Energinet, books certain amounts of FCR-D services for every hour through a market. For that, Energinet clears the FCR-D market in a day-ahead time stage (it consists of two distinct markets for up and down services). Unlike the Nordic area, such a market does not exist in the Continental Europe synchronous area where is less likely to observe extreme frequency deviations. The reason for our selection to focus on the FCR-D market is that this market in Denmark has experienced soaring prices in the past few years with the peak price of 16531 DKK/MW (approximately 2215 €/MW) for FCR-D down services observed in early 2024. This has recently triggered considerable investments in technologies that can bid in such a market. Demand-side flexibility is a reasonable choice to be offered in the FCR-D market as it does not require additional investments, owed to the P90 requirement that allows stochastic demand-side assets to bid in that market.

By allowing stochastic flexible resources to offer their flexibility in the FCR-D market, one can envision lower prices for the service due to increased supply, but at the cost of increased uncertainty of successful reserve activation when needed. Imagine an EV aggregator, given its day-ahead prognosis on the future consumption level of its EV portfolio, offers 500 kW upwards reserve for a certain hour in the next day, but later it realizes the true consumption level is 400 KW. This ends up in a reserve shortfall of 100 kW. To mitigate the reserve shortfall uncertainty, the P90 requirement of Energinet lets stochastic resources offer reserve capacity, provided that the probability for the successful realization of their offer, given their prognosis in the day-ahead stage, is at least 90%. Energinet pre-qualifies ex-ante the method used for the dayahead prognosis, and on top, checks ex-post the performance. In addition, Energinet has mandated extra technical requirements for resources with limited energy reservoirs (LERs) such as batteries, so called the "LER requirement" [1], further tightening grid codes for EV aggregators to offer flexibility.

This paper takes the perspective of an EV aggregator, who exploits both P90 and LER requirements of Energinet, to optimally place hourly reserve capacity bids (in kW) in both FCR-D up and down markets. This decision making occurs in the day-ahead stage when the aggregator does not know with certainty the future consumption level, so it must make a bidding decision based on a prognosis of its uncertain consumption baseline. This paper also explores the *synergy effect* in the portfolio of the aggregator, monetizing how an increased number of EVs lets the aggregator offer a larger reserve bid per EV complying the allowed probability.

This work was supported in part by Innovation Fund Denmark under grant number 0153-00205B. G. A. Lunde, E. V. Damm, P. A. V Gade, and J. Kazempour are with the Department of Wind and Energy Systems, Technical University of Denmark, Kgs. Lyngby 2800, Denmark (e-mails: Lunde.gustav@gmail.com, ev.damm@yahoo.com, {pega, jalal}@dtu.dk). P. A. V Gade is also with IBM Client Innovation Center, Copenhagen, Denmark. The first two co-authors contributed equally.

B. Literature review and our contributions

Energinet has been taking a pioneering position among European TSOs by releasing and implementing grid codes like P90 and LER requirements in practice, explicitly stating how flexible resources in supply/demand side with stochastic production/consumption baseline are allowed to participate in ancillary service markets. Similar efforts but without stating an explicit number for probability and mostly focused on batteries have been made by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Orders 755 [3] and 784 [4] in the U.S. markets, by which independent system operators and regional transmission organizations are obliged to implement pay-forperformance frequency regulation markets and account for battery constraints in their regulation dispatch model. We are not aware of any existing work in the literature that addresses Nordic P90 and LER requirements. For completeness, we present a literature review in the following from methodological, TSO, and aggregator perspectives.

From a methodological point of view, the P90 requirement of Energinet falls into a chance-constrained optimization domain, as it indicates a minimum probability allowed for the successful realization of the bid. There are several papers in the literature that use chance-constrained programming for reserve decision-making purposes. From a TSO's perspective, [5] develops a chance-constrained reserve dimensioning model enabling a TSO to make informed decisions on the quantity of reserve services to be procured. Reference [6] defines a probabilistic reserve service for a TSO. Chance-constrained models are developed for a TSO in [7], [8] to optimally dispatch flexible resources in various reserve markets. From an aggregator's perspective, [9] develops a distributionally robust chance-constrained model for strategic bidding in a generic reserve market. In a similar line to this paper, [10] develops an offering strategy model for batteries bidding in frequency regulation markets, enforcing a chance constraint to satisfy the market performance requirement of FERC. A similar model for a battery is proposed in [11], where a chance-constrained model provides a probabilistic guarantee for the reserve availability in the real-time stage. None of the aforementioned papers models the specific requirements of Nordic ancillary service markets. In the recent publication of the authors [12], a stylized distributionally robust chance-constrained model is developed, discarding the LER requirement, FCR-D down services, and the synergy effect of stochastic flexible resources being aggregated in the same portfolio.

The contributions of this paper are as follows: We develop an offering strategy model for an aggregator of flexible demand-side assets (EVs in our case) with stochastic consumption baseline to optimally place reserve capacity bids in Nordic FCR-D up and down markets, fulfilling the P90 and LER requirements of Energinet. This results in an optimization problem with joint chance constraints. We use two distinct sample-based methods to reformulate joint chance constraints and solve the resulting model. The first method is based on an iterative ALSO-X algorithm [13], where a linear program is solved in every iteration. The second method is based on a Conditional Value-at-Risk (CVaR) [14] approximation of joint chance constraints, which also leads to a linear program.

Using real data from 1400 EV charging boxes in Denmark in the time period of March 2022 to March 2023, we compare both methods out-of-sample, exhibiting the satisfactory performance of both methods, although results obtained from the CVaR method look more conservative (in an unnecessary way from the aggregator's perspective) compared to those of the ALSO-X method. As our numerical conclusion for our case study from Denmark, we have realized in a case wherein the aggregator shares all benefits among EV owners, a typical EV owner could have a saving of 6-10% on average in its annual electricity bill by providing FCR-D services. We have also observed a synergy effect among EVs within the portfolio. This means having more EVs in a single portfolio enables the aggregator to place a larger reserve capacity bid per EV, compared to a collective bid of multiple portfolios with the same number of EVs in total.

C. Paper organization

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II gives an overview of the Nordic FCR-D market, P90 and LER requirements, and the EV data used. Section III describes the simulation setup for the case study. Section IV provides the proposed chance-constrained model incorporating P90 and LER requirements. This section also introduces both ALSO-X and CVaR methods used for solving the chance-constrained model. Section V presents and discusses the numerical results. Finally, Section VI concludes the paper.

II. OVERVIEW

This section first introduces the Nordic FCR-D services and markets, and then describes the P90 and LER requirements of Energinet. It finally explains how we use historical data to estimate available flexibility of an EV aggregator.

A. FCR-D

The Nordic TSOs, including Energinet, book FCR-D services in advance to be activated during operational circumstances with extreme frequency deviations from the nominal rate of 50 Hz. We refer the interested reader to [15] and [16] how much FCR-D up and down services (in MW) are bought by every Nordic TSO nowadays, and how the need for various services including FCR-D is envisioned to be increased in Denmark by 2030-2040. The Nordic TSOs procure FCR-D up services in the corresponding market, and activate them when the frequency falls into the domain of 49.9 Hz to 49.5 Hz. The percentage of activation linearly depends on the frequency drop, being 0% activation when the frequency is 49.9 Hz, and 100% when the frequency is 49.5 Hz. Similarly, the Nordic TSOs procure FCR-D down services for events when the frequency is in the range of 50.1 Hz to 50.5 Hz. Again, the extent of activation depends linearly on the frequency. Under *normal* operation when the frequency lies within 49.9 Hz and 50.1 Hz, the Nordic TSOs activate another service called FCR for normal operation (FCR-N), which is outside the scope of this paper. One can imagine FCR-N services are being activated way often than FCR-D services. The FCR-D service providers must respond rapidly



Fig. 1: Weighted average hourly prices for the FCR-D up (\uparrow) and down (\downarrow) markets in Denmark from January 1, 2022, to May 1, 2024 [18]. The maximum price was 16531 DKK/MW. We consider the time period highlighted in grey in our case study.

in 2.5 seconds from the activation time [1]. When activated (which is a rare event for FCR-D services), it usually lasts for a very short time duration, and therefore the total energy delivery upon FCR-D activation is nearly negligible. For example, a 1-MW FCR-D up and a 1-MW FCR-D down services booked during all hours from March 24, 2022 to March 21, 2023, in Denmark yielded a total energy activation of 3.25 MWh and 4.05 MWh, respectively. These numbers are equal to 0.037% and 0.046% of the total FCR-D up and down bid capacities, respectively, which are insignificant. The rare activation and negligible energy delivery are the two main reasons making the Nordic FCR-D services very attractive, among other assets, for batteries and EV aggregators¹. Note also that vehicle-to-grid technologies enabling power injection from the battery to the grid are excluded in this study. Therefore, flexibility of the EV aggregator is realized only by adjusting the total consumption level of grid-connected EVs. All the aforementioned reasons ensure that the provision of FCR-D services by EVs will not cause any extra degradation and therefore compromising the lifetime of their batteries.

The historical hourly reservation prices in Denmark for both FCR-D up and down services in the period of January 1, 2022, to May 1, 2024, are shown in Fig. 1, indicating quite volatile and high prices. The FCR-D up and down markets are used to be cleared using a pay-as-bid scheme, however it has been changed to a uniform pricing scheme since February 2024. This implies Fig. 1 presents the volume-weighted average prices for procured services until February 2024, and uniform prices afterwards. There are long periods with extremely high prices, e.g., FCR-D down prices for most of 2023. The FCR-D up and down markets are composed of two early and late auctions, both cleared the day before operation, D-1. As illustrated in Fig. 2, for the sake of simplicity, we consider the early auction only, where reserve capacity bids for FCR-D up and down services $c_h^{\uparrow}, c_h^{\downarrow}$ (in MW) are placed for every hour h of the following day D. The decision for these hourly bids in day D-1 is made based on the available prognosis for the future stochastic consumption baseline. This prognosis lets the aggregator draw scenarios $\omega \in \Omega$ of the available flexibility



Fig. 2: Timeline of FCR-D up and down markets in Denmark. We consider the early FCR-D market only. The optimization variables are denoted with lower-case letters, whereas upper-case/Greek letters are used for parameters.

 $F_{m,\omega}$ (in MW) of the EV portfolio for every minute *m*. We consider a minute-level resolution imposed by our available historical data for this study. In case of data availability with a higher resolution, e.g., second level, we recommend using higher-resolution data. Our proposed model is general to be used in that case too.

On the operation day D, once activated, energy A_m (in MWh) must be delivered according to the realized frequency deviation and the realized available flexibility of the EV portfolio \hat{F}_m . Finally, FCR-D service providers are remunerated ex-post at FCR-D reservation prices π_h (in DKK/MW) and penalized for any missed reserve $p_h^{\uparrow}, p_h^{\downarrow}$ during activation (in MW) at price λ_h (in DKK/MW).

B. The P90 requirement

Energinet has recently implemented the P90 requirement, addressing how stochastic flexible resources either in the supply or demand side can provide various ancillary services including FCR-D. The following text is borrowed from [1].

Definition 1 (The P90 requirement): "[...] This means, that the participant's prognosis, which must be approved by Energinet, evaluates that the probability is 10% that the sold capacity is not available. This entails that there is a 90% chance that the sold capacity or more is available. This is when the prognosis is assumed to be correct. The probability is then also 10%, that the entire sold capacity is not available. If this were to happen, it does not entail that the sold capacity is not available at all, however just that a part of the total capacity is not available. The available part will with a high probability be close to the sold capacity."

Definition 1 allows flexibility providers including the EV aggregator to place a bid in the FCR-D up and down markets in the day-ahead stage, provided that the *probability* of the bid to be successfully realized is at least 90%. The probability analysis should be conducted based on the prognosis of the aggregator in the day-ahead stage on its future consumption baseline, and the method for driving such a prognosis should be verified *ex-ante* by the TSO. This means, a service provider should be pre-qualified by the TSO on its prognosis method, and from that time on, it is eligible to participate in ancillary service markets. In addition, Energinet checks ex-post how often the bid placed by every service provider is not fully available. By unavailability, it does not necessarily mean there was an activation event and the service provider failed to respond. Rather, Energinet checks the realized consumption level no matter there was an activation event or not, and by that, it determines whether the placed reserve bid was

¹Historical frequency dataset used in this paper is from [17], which has been down-sampled to a minute resolution based on the maximum and minimum grid frequencies recorded on the millisecond level within that given minute.



Fig. 3: The historical consumption level (baseline) and the available capacity for upwards and downwards flexibility in a random hour for one or the aggregation of 1400 EVs with and without the implementation of the LER requirement.

indeed available. In case the bid was fully or partially unavailable, it ends up in a reserve shortfall, also often called overbid. Energinet usually conducts such an ex-post check in 3-month periods. This means Energinet checks the occurrence frequency of reserve shortfall in the last three months, and in case it violates the P90 requirement, the corresponding service provider will be excluded from the market and should apply again for the pre-qualification by the TSO. Energinet usually considers an extra buffer of 5% in practice, meaning the service provider should be able to prove that it placed successful bids in the last 3 months such that in at least 85% of the times, the placed reserve bid was *fully* available. Although Definition 1 does not explicitly restrict the magnitude of overbidding (reserve shortfall), it indicates such a magnitude is not allowed to be extreme, therefore discouraging severe overbidding.

C. The LER requirement

For conventional flexible resources bidding in the FCR-D up and down markets, full activation should be possible for at least two hours continuously. For LER units such as batteries and EV aggregators, the 2-hour requirement has been *relaxed* to be at least 20 minutes only. In turn, the LER requirement of Energinet adds extra constraints for the LER units as per the following definition. Again, the text is borrowed from [1].

Definition 2 (The LER requirement): [...] "For FCR-D you must reserve 20% of the prequalified FCR-D amount to [Normal State Energy Management] NEM in the opposite direction. E.g., if you wish to prequalify 1 MW for FCR-D upwards, you must reserve 0.2 MW in the downwards direction for NEM as well as 20 minutes of full FCR-D upwards delivery, or 0.33 MWh of energy."

The interpretation of this definition is that for an LER unit, bidding 1 MW in a certain direction of FCR-D requires a *buffer* of 0.2 MW for being capable of providing reserve in the opposite direction. Therefore, a 1-MW bid requires a 1.2 MW LER unit. In the case of EV aggregators, we apply the LER requirement in the downwards direction only, since the activation (i.e., increasing power consumption) is restricted by the battery energy storage capacity (in MWh). In the case of upwards direction, when activated, the EV aggregator simply reduces its consumption level, similar to other demand-side non-LER flexible assets. Discarding indexes for notational simplicity, constraints imposed by the LER requirement can be formulated as

$$\frac{1}{5}c^{\downarrow} + c^{\uparrow} \le F^{\uparrow} \tag{1a}$$

$$0 \le c^{\downarrow} \le F^{\downarrow} \tag{1b}$$

$$0 \le c^{\uparrow}. \tag{1c}$$

The FCR-D down bid c^{\downarrow} is restricted in (1a) by the available FCR-D up flexibility F^{\uparrow} (in MW). This constraint does not necessarily enforce both capacity bids c^{\downarrow} and c^{\uparrow} to take nonzero values simultaneously. However, if c^{\downarrow} takes a non-zero value, it will be restricted not only by the available FCR-D down flexibility F^{\downarrow} (in MW) in (1b), but also by F^{\uparrow} in (1a). Note that (1a) is a more restricted constraint than $c^{\uparrow} \leq F^{\uparrow}$, so such a constraint for upper-bounding c^{\uparrow} is unnecessary.

Given Definition 2, the FCR-D down bid c^{\downarrow} should also be restricted by the capability of the LER unit to be fully activated for 20 minutes. This enforces an extra constraint as

$$c^{\downarrow} \le F^{\mathrm{E}},$$
 (4)

where $F^{\rm E}$ is the highest power rate (in MW), capped by the maximum charging power, that the EV aggregator can additionally charge the EV fleet for the next 20 minutes continuously without being limited by their total energy storage capacity (in MWh).

D. Flexibility of the EV aggregator

This study uses real-world data of 1400 EV charging boxes located at residential houses in Denmark. This is a dataset recorded from March 24, 2022, to March 21, 2023. It is assumed that each charging box is only utilized by the same EV. On average, measurements were registered every 2.84 minutes, from which a minute-resolution consumption profile has been interpolated for each EV. The historical EV consumption level serves as the baseline for the flexibility estimation.



Fig. 4: Conditional cumulative distribution function (CCDF) of available flexibility for a portfolio of 1400 EVs from March 24, 2022, to March 21, 2023.

Fig. 3 illustrates the historical consumption level (baseline) for two different EV portfolio sizes in a random hour. Fig. 3(a) shows the consumption baseline of a single EV, which is disconnected from the grid around minute 42. While it is connected to the grid, the upwards flexibility refers to its capability to reduce its consumption up to zero, whereas the downwards flexibility refers to its capability to increase its consumption up to its maximum charging power (in MW). Note that the battery energy storage capacity constraint (in MWh), included in the LER requirement, is not enforced in this plot. Fig. 3(b) is similar but for a portfolio of 1400 EVs. Since the number of grid-connected EVs are changing throughout the hour, the maximum charging power (thick red curve) is time-variant. Fig. 3(c) is similar to Fig. 3(b) but the LER requirement is enforced. To better interpret this plot, let us assume the aggregator prioritizes bidding in the FCR-D down over the FCR-D up market due it its comparatively higher historical prices (this assumption is for illustration purposes. We do not have that assumption in the model). Constraints (1a) and (4) are key to consider. In this exemplifying plot, (1a) is binding while (4) is not. Let us first explain how (1a) is restricting the feasible space for reserve capacity bids. Observe the first minute in Fig. 3(c) when the available upwards flexibility (equal to the baseline) is around $F^{\uparrow} = 200$ kW. In the same minute, the available downwards flexibility is around $F^{\downarrow} = 1600$ kW, which is equal to the capacity of 1800 kW (thick red curve) minus the consumption level of 200 kW. According to (1a), the maximum FCR-D down bid that the aggregator can place is $5F^{\uparrow}$, i.e., 1000 kW, provided that $c^{\uparrow} = 0$. Therefore, in minute 1, the maximum available downwards flexibility is 1000 kW (depicted by the thin red curve) and not 1600 kW. The shaded blue area under the consumption baseline states that, although there is potential for upwards flexibility, we leave it as buffer to be able to sell downwards flexibility. In case we let c^{\uparrow} take a non-zero value, it further restricts the upper bound for c^{\downarrow} . In the time duration after minute 30, (1a) is no longer binding c^{\downarrow} as long as the FCR-D up bid c^{\uparrow} is low enough. Therefore, the aggregator can place non-zero bids for both FCR-D up and down services.

We now focus on the LER constraint (4). For the calculation of F^{E} , we have used available historical information about the charging session to estimate the initial state-of-charge when every EV connects to the grid. For the end of charging session, we have assumed it happens when the state-of-charge is 90% full as it is recommended by some manufacturers due to degradation issues [19]. While an EV is connected to the grid although not charging, it can still provide FCR-D down services with the remaining 10% energy storage capacity. For our real-world case study, we found out (4) is not binding, although this might not be the case for other case studies with different setup and data.

Finally, we emphasize that Fig. 3(c) is provided for illustration purposes only to clarify how the LER requirement may bind the bidding problem. Otherwise, the input data F^{\uparrow} and F^{\downarrow} are as illustrated in Fig. 3(b). In other words, we do not change F^{\uparrow} and F^{\downarrow} ex-ante based on the LER requirement. It is the optimization problem that figures out to what extent the LER requirement binds the optimal bidding decision. Recall that the optimal bids c^{\uparrow} and c^{\downarrow} take fixed values over an hour, while F^{\uparrow} and F^{\downarrow} are variant across that hour.

E. Probabilistic estimation of the available flexibility

In contrast to the previous subsection that considered a single random historical hour, this subsection considers all historical data to derive a probabilistic estimation of the available flexibility. This estimation will be used as a prognosis for available flexibility during every hour of the next day. This mean, instead of using historical data to probabilistically predict the available flexibility, we use historical data as a proxy for the prediction. For simplicity, we do not use any classification or similar methods to capture seasonality or other effects, and exploit *all* available historical data for the flexibility estimation over the next day. A potential direction for future work is to consider conditionality, i.e., to choose most relevant samples to the current operating condition. Using all historical samples, Fig. 4 shows how various types of flexibility, i.e., upwards (F^{\uparrow}) , downwards (F^{\downarrow}) , and energy $(\frac{F^{E}}{3})$, with a minute-level resolution, are distributed throughout the day for a portfolio containing all 1400 EVs. The last plot shows the maximum amount of energy (in KWh) to be additionally consumed during the next 20 minutes, such that the portfolio does not capped by their energy storage constraint. One can multiply it by 3 to convert it to F^{E} (in kW), as appeared in (4). The conditional cumulative distribution function describes the associated probability of the aggregator possessing a certain level of flexibility. For example, based on Fig. 4(a), the

probability for available upwards flexibility in the first minute to be 1000 kW or less is around 60%, while it is 100% to be 500 kW or less. We observe that there is a larger spread in the distribution for the upwards flexibility compared to the other two distributions. For example, in the middle of the day, we observe a large right-tailed skewness for the upwards flexibility. Furthermore, there is a large discrepancy between the available upwards and downwards flexibility, meaning the primary flexibility of EVs in this case study consists of their capability to increase their consumption level. We refer the interested reader to [20] for a distributionally robust flexibility estimation of the EV aggregator, which could be a useful tool for cases with limited data availability.

III. SIMULATION SETUP

This section describes the process for in-sample and outof-sample scenario generation, cross validation analysis, and a metric for synergy effect. All source codes for this work are publicly available at [21], although the historical EV consumption data is proprietary.

A. Scenario generation for the in-sample analysis

Recall the three-stage timeline in Fig. 2, whose first stage makes optimal decisions in day D-1 for hourly reserve capacity bids c_h^{\uparrow} and c_h^{\downarrow} of the EV aggregator. As a decision-making tool for this stage, we will propose a chance-constrained program in the next section. Here, we explain the process to draw a set of samples (also called scenarios, interchangeably), which will be used when reformulating the chanceconstrained program. We refer to this sample set, denoted by $\omega \in \Omega$, *in-sample* scenarios, and thereby the proposed chance-constrained optimization model constitutes the basis for our in-sample analysis. The sample set should represent the uncertain nature of three sources of uncertainty, namely available upwards, downwards, and energy flexibility, grouped in $\{F_{m,\omega}^{\uparrow}, F_{m,\omega}^{\downarrow}, F_{m,\omega}^{E}\}$ for every minute *m*. Recall these uncertain parameters are already depicted in Fig. 4. Recall also that, although we represent the available flexibility and its corresponding uncertainty in the minute-level resolution, the reserve capacity bids are hourly, i.e., the bid stays unchanged within the hour. We randomly draw $|\Omega|$ number of samples, each sample representing a real historical profile. By this, we preserve the potential correlation of flexibility among minutes. The next key point is the number of samples $|\Omega|$, ensuring the underlying uncertainty is well represented. Although it will also be checked out-of-sample, we follow the analytical finding of [22], suggesting a lower bound for $|\Omega|$ as

$$|\Omega| \ge \frac{2}{\epsilon} \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + 2n + \frac{2n}{\epsilon} \log\left(\frac{2}{\epsilon}\right), \tag{5}$$

where $\epsilon = 0.1$ as per the P90 requirement, n = 2 is the number of variables (i.e., c_h^{\downarrow} and c_h^{\uparrow} for the optimization problem in hour h), and $\delta = 0.01$ is our choice, resulting in a confidence level of 99% that the set of samples represents the underlying distribution. This concludes that a set of *at least* 216 randomlyselected samples is needed. Note that (5) only holds when the underlying data-generating process is stationary, which might not be the case in reality. However, our ex-post cross validation process shows the aforementioned process works satisfactory for our application.

B. Ex-post out-of-sample analysis

We have merged the second and third stages of Fig. 2, where the true consumption of the EV aggregator is realized. Energinet checks ex-post the occurrence frequency of reserve shortfall in a time period (usually the past 3 months). Recall Energinet checks it based on reserve availability no matter the service was activated or not. If it happened beyond 10% (or 15% with an extra buffer) of the times, the aggregator loses its qualification for bidding in Nordic ancillary service markets. On the contrary, if the ex-post check is satisfactory, the aggregator will still be penalized for unsuccessful activation (for the events of activation only) while preserving its qualification.

As our ex-post out-of-sample analysis, for every realization ω' that might be different than in-sample scenarios $\omega \in \Omega$, we determine the highest FCR-D up and down shortfall (in kW) within every hour h when the service was activated $(p_{h,\omega'}^{\uparrow})$ and $p_{h,\omega'}^{\downarrow}$). We check the need for activation based on historical frequency record obtained from [17], and penalize the aggregator for the unsuccessful activation at λ_h^{\uparrow} and λ_h^{\downarrow} . Energinet defines these penalty rates as the substitution cost of replacing a missed activation. However, as no historical register of the replacement cost exists, we assume a value equal to the corresponding reservation price multiplied by five, i.e., $\lambda_h^{\uparrow} = 5\pi_h^{\uparrow}$ and $\lambda_h^{\downarrow} = 5\pi_h^{\downarrow}$. Therefore, the eventual out-of-sample profit for the aggregator under realization ω' is

$$\underbrace{\sum_{h} \left(c_{h}^{\uparrow} \pi_{h}^{\uparrow} + c_{h}^{\downarrow} \pi_{h}^{\downarrow} \right)}_{h \text{ constraints of equal}} - \underbrace{\sum_{h} \left(\lambda_{h}^{\uparrow} p_{h,\omega'}^{\uparrow} - \lambda_{h}^{\downarrow} p_{h,\omega'}^{\downarrow} \right)}_{h,\omega'}.$$
 (6)

Reservation payment (in-sample) Penalty cost (out-of-sample)

C. Cross validation

Given the access to historical data for 363 days and the need for at least 216 samples for our in-sample analysis, we ended up in conducting a 3-fold cross-validation simulation. For every hour $h = \{1, 2, ..., 24\}$, we randomly divide our available historical data (i.e., 363 samples) into three groups, two groups (with 242 samples in total, which satisfies the need for at least 216 samples) being used for the in-sample analysis, and the remaining group with 121 samples for the out-of-sample analysis. We repeat our simulations three times, every time a different combination of groups is used for in-sample and out-of-sample analyses. Hereafter, we will report the average results over the three simulations. By this, we ensure that our results are not biased to the selection of scenarios.

D. Metric for the synergy effect

We hypothesize there is a synergy effect when aggregating EVs, such that a large portfolio of EVs can place a larger reserve quantity bid per EV compared to multiple small portfolios with the same number of EVs in total. We define two metrics to validate our hypothesis. The first metric is the aggregator's profit (6) resulting by the 3-fold cross validation process. The second one is the percentage of total flexibility

bid (in %), so-called utilized bidding capacity (UBC), defined for every hour h as

$$\mathrm{UBC}_{h}^{\uparrow} = \frac{c_{h}^{\uparrow}}{\frac{1}{60}\sum_{m}F_{m}^{\uparrow}}; \quad \mathrm{UBC}_{h}^{\downarrow} = \frac{c_{h}^{\downarrow}}{\frac{1}{60}\sum_{m}F_{m}^{\downarrow}}.$$
 (7)

An increase in both metrics (6) and (7) indicates a synergy effect. Furthermore, we define a third metric to measure the compliance with the P90 requirement, i.e., how often bids exceed the *realized* flexibility. We refer to this metric, calculated ex-post, as the frequency of overbid (in %), defined as

Frequency of overbid
$$= \frac{1}{H \times N} \sum_{m,h} y_{m,h},$$
 (8)

where $y_{m,h}$ takes a value of one whenever an overbid occurs, and zero otherwise. In addition, H denotes the number of hours and N is the number of minutes being tested for the outof-sample analysis. Without loss of generality, we will use this metric in a daily horizon, i.e., we will calculate how often the reserve shortfall occurs in every day of the historical 363-day time period.

IV. MATHEMATICAL MODELING

This section presents the proposed joint chance-constrained model, followed by two sample-based reformulations. Hereafter, every optimization problem corresponds to the bidding problem in hour h, wherein index m is associated with minutes within hour h. For notational simplicity, we remove index h.

A. Proposed joint chance-constrained model

Following the P90 requirement as per Definition 1 and the LER requirement as per Definition 2, we propose a joint chance-constrained program as

$$\begin{array}{ll} \underset{(c^{\downarrow},c^{\uparrow})\geq 0}{\operatorname{Maximize}} & c^{\downarrow}+c^{\uparrow} \\ & \left\langle \frac{1}{5}c^{\downarrow}+c^{\uparrow}\leq F_{m}^{\uparrow}, \quad \forall m \right\rangle \end{array}$$
(9a)

s.t.
$$\mathbb{P}\begin{pmatrix} 5c^{\vee} + c^{\vee} \leq I_{m}^{\vee}, \forall m \\ c^{\downarrow} \leq F_{m}^{\downarrow}, \forall m \\ c^{\downarrow} \leq F_{m}^{\mathrm{E}}, \forall m \end{pmatrix} \geq 1 - \epsilon, \quad (9b)$$

where the objective function (9a) maximizes the amount of FCR-D down and up quantity bids. In case the aggregator forecasts the reservation prices or prioritizes a service in one of the two directions, it is straightforward to add weights to (9a). For the sake of generality, we consider the same weights (i.e., one). The joint chance-constraint (9b) is developed according to the LER constraints (1) and the P90 requirement. Note that $\mathbb{P}(.) \geq 1 - \epsilon$ enforces the probability of meeting all minute-level probabilistic constraints within the corresponding hour to be at least $1 - \epsilon$. Recall, $\epsilon = 0.1$ as per the P90 requirement. There exist 180 probabilistic constraints in (9b), i.e., 3 constraints per minute, letting at most 18 constraints be violated.

Chance-constrained programs are generally computationally intractable. If the underlying probability distribution has certain properties, one may develop an analytical reformulation for chance constraints [23]. To keep generality avoiding the assumption that our empirical data follows a certain type of distribution, we use sample-based techniques to reformulate

Algorithm 1 ALSO-X

Input: Stopping tolerance parameter δ **Require:** Relax binary variables $y_{m,\omega}$ $\underline{q} \leftarrow 0$, $\overline{q} \leftarrow 60\epsilon |\Omega|$ **while** $\overline{q} - \underline{q} \ge \delta$ **do** Set $q = \frac{(\underline{q} + \overline{q})}{2}$ Retrieve Θ^* as an optimal solution to relaxed (10) Set $\underline{q} = q$ if $\mathbb{P}(.) \ge 1 - \epsilon$; otherwise, $\overline{q} = q$ **end while** Output: A feasible solution to (10)

chance constraints, and leave it for the future work to explore how satisfactory the bidding results could be if one fits a distribution with certain properties instead of using empirical distribution. By sampling, the uncertain parameters $\{F_m^{\uparrow}, F_m^{\downarrow}, F_m^{\rm E}\}$ will be represented by the set of samples $\{F_{m,\omega}^{\uparrow}, F_{m,\omega}^{\downarrow}, F_{m,\omega}^{\rm E}\}$ as already discussed in Section III-A. We use two sample-based techniques to solve (9), namely (*i*) the ALSO-X algorithm [13] and (*ii*) the CVaR approximation [14].

B. ALSO-X algorithm

This algorithm reformulates (9) as

$$\underset{(c^{\downarrow},c^{\uparrow})\geq 0, \ y_{m,\omega}\in\{0,1\}}{\text{Maximize}} \quad c^{\downarrow}+c^{\uparrow}$$
(10a)

s.t.
$$\frac{1}{5}c^{\downarrow} + c^{\uparrow} - F_{m,\omega}^{\uparrow} \le y_{m,\omega} M^{\uparrow} \qquad \forall m, \omega$$
 (10b)

$$c^{\downarrow} - F^{\downarrow}_{m,\omega} \le y_{m,\omega} M^{\downarrow} \qquad \forall m,\omega \qquad (10c)$$

$$c^* - F_{m,\omega}^2 \le y_{m,\omega} M^2 \qquad \forall m, \omega$$
 (10d)

$$\sum_{m,\omega} y_{m,\omega} \le q,\tag{10e}$$

where $\{M^{\uparrow}, M^{\downarrow}, M^{\rm E}\}$ are large enough positive constants, and $y_{m,\omega}$ is an auxiliary binary variable corresponding to minute m and sample ω . This makes (10) a mixed-integer linear program. If $y_{m,\omega} = 0$, it implies all three LER constraints are fulfilled. In other words, (10b)-(10d) are enforced identically to (1). On the contrary, if $y_{m,\omega} = 0$, the original LER constraints are violated, so big-M values in (10b)-(10d) keep the optimization problem feasible. Constraint (10e) enforces the budget q, indicating how many times over minutes and samples we are allowed to violate constraints. We set the budget q to $\epsilon = 0.1$ times $60|\Omega|$. We also set the values of $\{M^{\uparrow}, M^{\downarrow}, M^{\rm E}\}$ to the largest value of corresponding available flexibility within our empirical data.

One may experience a computational challenge to solve (10) due to increased number of binary variables, one per minute per sample. Reference [13] suggests the ALSO-X algorithm by which a feasible solution to (10) can be found by iteratively solving its linear version with relaxed binaries, i.e., $0 \le y_{m,\omega} \le 1 \forall m, \omega$. This solution strategy is represented in Algorithm 1. We set δ to be 10^{-5} .

C. CVaR approximation

Here, we use the CVaR to approximate the joint chance constraint (9b) by controlling the *magnitude* of reserve shortfall. The advantage is that the resulting optimization model is linear. The limitation is that it constrains the magnitude of the violation while the original problem (9) does not intend to do so. Therefore, this approximation may result in a conservative solution which the aggregator may find it unnecessary. This approach constraints the expected violation for the worst $(1-\alpha)$ samples which is the value-at-risk. Here $\alpha = 0.1$ as per Definition 1. This linear problem reads as

$$\underset{(c^{\downarrow},c^{\uparrow})\geq 0, \ \beta\leq 0, \ \zeta_{m,\omega}}{\text{Maximize}} \quad c^{\downarrow} + c^{\uparrow} \tag{11a}$$

s.t.
$$\frac{1}{5}c^{\downarrow} + c^{\uparrow} - F_{m,\omega}^{\uparrow} \le \zeta_{m,\omega} \qquad \forall m,\omega \qquad (11b)$$

$$c^{\downarrow} - F^{\downarrow}_{m,\omega} \leq \zeta_{m,\omega} \qquad \forall m,\omega \qquad (11c)$$

$$C - F_{m,\omega} \ge \zeta_{m,\omega} \qquad \forall m, \omega \qquad (11d)$$

$$\frac{1}{60|\Omega|}\sum_{m,\omega}\zeta_{m,\omega} \le (1-\alpha)\beta \tag{11e}$$

$$\beta \le \zeta_{m,\omega} \qquad \forall m,\omega, \qquad (11f)$$

where $\zeta_{m,\omega}$ and β are auxiliary variables.

We refer the interested reader to [24], comparatively discussing the performance of CVaR approximation, ALSO-X algorithm, and its extended version to solve chance-constrained problems with several numerical examples. We discuss the performance of these two methods for our application in the next section.

V. NUMERICAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section provides numerical bidding results obtained by ALSO-X and CVaR methods. It also contains results of an *oracle* model, when the aggregator has perfect foresight into the future consumption of the EV portfolio. Although the oracle model is not practical, it provides an upper bound for the profit, by which we can gain insight to what extent the performance of the proposed chance-constrained model could be potentially improved. We first present profits, then investigate the synergy effect, and eventually explore the frequency of overbid (reserve shortfall) and whether the P90 requirement is fulfilled.

A. Profit

Consider a case that all 1400 EVs are within the portfolio of a single aggregator. Assuming the aggregator fully distributes the profit among EVs uniformly, every EV in the portfolio would earn an annual profit of 857 DKK using ALSO-X and 638 DKK with CVaR by bidding 24.4% and 18.5% of its total flexibility, respectively. This brings a cost saving of 6-10% for a typical EV in Denmark over a year. The main takeaway so far is that there is a considerable monetary benefit of pooling available EVs and bidding in the FCR-D markets.

B. Synergy effect quantification

Fig. 5 shows the mean profit of the aggregator (in DKK/hour) when 1400 EVs are split in different number of portfolios with the same size, ranging from 20 portfolios (each portfolio with 70 EVs) to one large portfolio (including all 1400 EVs). The rationale behind this study is to explore whether there is a synergy effect by aggregating EVs in one



Fig. 5: Mean profit (DKK/hour) of the aggregator. In the x-axis, the first case is the one where 1400 EVs are divided into 20 portfolios of 70 EVs (i.e., the aggregator bids for every portfolio separately), whereas the last case corresponds to the largest portfolio where the aggregator bids the flexibility of all 1400 EVs. The profit for every method (oracle, ALSO-X, and CVaR) is calculated out-of-sample as in (6), following a 3-fold cross validation process described in Section III-C.

	CVaR	ALSO-X	Oracle
UBC [†] (%)	2.0	4.7	40.0
UBC \downarrow (%)	10.8	16.0	40.0

TABLE I: Average percentage of utilized bidding capacity, as defined in (7), across 1400 EVs for all portfolio sizes and hours.

portfolio rather than grouping them in multiple portfolios. Recall that we report ex-post out-of-sample profits (6), calculated using the 3-fold cross validation process described in Section III-C.

Overall, Fig. 5 reveals a significant synergy effect, as larger portfolios consistently result in higher earnings. The synergy effect is immediately observed when we increase the portfolio size from 20 to 50 EVs (i.e., reducing the number of portfolios from 70 to 28). The reason for this synergy is that by making larger portfolios, the variability and uncertainty of total EV consumption in the portfolio decrease, providing an opportunity to effectively leverage the P90 requirement for placing a larger reserve quantity bid per EV. Although the mean profit keeps increasing by making larger portfolios, the rate of profit increase declines to some extent.

As expected, we observe from Fig. 5 that the ALSO-X algorithm yields a higher profit than the CVaR approximation as the latter tends to provide a conservative solution. Nevertheless, the profit obtained by ALSO-X is still way less than that in the oracle with the perfect foresight. This indicates that there is a significant potential to improve the performance of the proposed model by better representing the future consumption uncertainty using historical data. As mentioned earlier, a potential improvement can be obtained by optimally picking a part of (not all) historical samples which are most relevant to the target hour (i.e., modeling conditionality). One may also be careful to what extent (old) historical samples should be used if the underlying stochastic environment is non-stationary.

We now focus on the utilized bidding capacity as another metric of synergy defined in (7). Consistent to the result of Fig. 5, Table I shows that the oracle model bids a significantly higher proportion of the available flexibility. ALSO-X manages to sell more flexibility than the CVaR and thus outperforms it from a monetary point of view. However, all three models are far from bidding 100% of their total flexibility. In particular, it is noteworthy that the oracle model only bids 40% of the total available flexibility. There are two reasons: (i) bids are hourly, meaning some flexibility is lost, and (*ii*) a subset of both upwards and downwards flexibility is not accessible due to the buffer imposed by the LER requirement. It would be of interest from a TSO perspective to explore how reducing the FCR-D market granularity to 30 or even 15 minutes, and also optimizing the LER requirement can harness more flexibility potential of stochastic assets.

C. Frequency of overbid

We now compare ALSO-X and CVaR with respect to the compliance of the P90 requirement. Fig. 6 shows the daily frequency of overbid, as defined in (8), for the portfolio of 1400 EVs during all 363 historical days. Recall we use 242 days for in-sample analysis and the remaining 121 days for the ex-post out-of-sample analysis, in a 3-fold cross validation process. According to the upper plot of Fig. 6, the ALSO-X algorithm hits the desired reserve shortfall rate of 10% almost perfectly, as the frequency of overbid across all simulated days is 10.15%. Such a rate for the CVaR approximation (lower plot) is well below the threshold, i.e., we observe reserve overbidding in 3.89% of minutes only. The CVaR results show 190 days with no overbidding, and almost no days exceeding the exclusion rate of 15%. The spread amongst the days is broader for ALSO-X, with a larger subset of days above the exclusion threshold of 15%. The individual days with very large overbidding are not a problem according to Definition 1 of the P90 requirement, as it refers to the average violation rate over the whole period in question, which is usually a three-month period for Energinet. Therefore, both ALSO-X and CVaR methods adhere to the P90 requirement.

Nonetheless, if the examination period was shorter than 363 days, the ALSO-X algorithm would be prone to violate the P90 requirement as there exists a subset of days that go above the 15% excluding threshold, whereas CVaR offers more adequacy in that sense. Hence, these two methods present a trade-off between the potential profit and adequacy, meaning even though the ALSO-X method seems desirable from a profit viewpoint, the CVaR method could also be preferable, as it is inherently conservative and offers a margin for any error with respect to the P90 requirement. From a system perspective, the TSO gets less liquidity in the market if aggregators and other service providers use conservative approaches like CVaR, but less uncertainty of supply, and vice versa if methods like ALSO-X are used which fully exploits the rule set. The takeaway is that an adequate representation of uncertainty



Fig. 6: Frequency of overbids (i.e., reserve shortfall) tested for a portfolio of 1400 EVs for 363 days.

on available flexibility $\{F_m^{\uparrow}, F_m^{\downarrow}, F_m^{\rm E}\}$ is especially important when applying ALSO-X, while CVaR would be more likely to produce feasible results out-of-sample adhering to the P90 requirement with an inaccurate representation.

VI. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

The frequency stability of the power grid is challenged by the increased penetration of renewable energy sources with stochastic supply. Demand flexibility contains significant, untapped potential. We investigated how a portfolio of grid-connected EVs can deliver Nordic FCR-D services in Denmark through an aggregator, thus making a profit while contributing to balancing extreme frequency disturbances in the power grid. We showed how an aggregator can model the newly implemented P90 requirement of the Danish TSO while adhering to the LER requirement. We developed a joint chance-constrained program for the bidding decision-making problem of the aggregator. This problem was reformulated using samples and solved via two solution strategies namely the ALSO-X algorithm and the CVaR approximation.

A remarkable synergy was identified upon aggregation of EVs, as the quantity of flexibility enabled for FCR-D bidding increased for larger portfolios, yielding a higher profit for the aggregator and less uncertainty of available flexibility. We observed the CVaR method provides more conservative bidding results as opposed to ALSO-X, which fully exploited the allowed frequency of reserve shortfall, i.e., the 10% threshold, while that rate for CVaR is less than half of it, thus not leveraging the full potential of the P90 requirement.

The reserve quantity bid is especially limited by the LER constraint reserving 20% of the downwards bid in upwards flexibility. The future work should investigate whether the LER requirement can be improved, as it would be of interest

for both the aggregator and the TSO to leverage more of the portfolio flexibility into the market. From the aggregator's perspective, we suggest introducing a more diverse technology portfolio, which could further reduce the uncertainty of available flexibility. From a TSO's perspective, it would be of interest to compare the added security of supply versus exposed liquidity and procurement costs when modifying the LER requirement.

Another potential direction for future research is to explore the influence of the simplifications and assumptions inherent in this study. Our stylized approach to the probabilistic representation of the underlying flexibility of the EV portfolio is an element with potential for improvement, highlighted by the large discrepancy between the stochastic and oracle results. We recommend for aggregators to develop a more advanced forecasting method such as generalized linear models. Furthermore, distributionally robust optimization can help in cases where the empirical distribution of the underlying flexibility is misspecified.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to acknowledge Spirii for data sharing and Edoardo Simioni (Reel) for providing feedback. We thank Torine Herstad Reed (DTU) for fruitful discussions. We also thank Thomas Dalgas Fechtenburg (Energinet) for his guidance on current pre-qualifications and grid codes in Denmark.

REFERENCES

- Energinet, "Prequalification of units and aggregated portfolios," 2024, version 2.1.01, valid from April 24, 2024. [Online]. Available: https: //en.energinet.dk/electricity/ancillary-services/prequalification-and-test
- [2] I. Pavić, H. Pandžić, and T. Capuder, "Electric vehicle aggregator as an automatic reserves provider under uncertain balancing energy procurement," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 396–410, 2023.
- [3] Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), "Frequency regulation compensation in the organized wholesale power markets (order no. 755)," 2011. [Online]. Available: https://www.ferc.gov/sites/default/ files/2020-06/OrderNo.755.pdf
- [4] —, "Third-party provision of ancillary services; accounting and financial reporting for new electric storage technologies (order no. 784)," 2014. [Online]. Available: https://www.ferc.gov/sites/default/ files/2020-06/RM11-24-001.pdf
- [5] A. Papavasiliou, A. Bouso, S. Apelfröjd, E. Wik, T. Gueuning, and Y. Langer, "Multi-area reserve dimensioning using chance-constrained optimization," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 3982–3994, 2022.
- [6] G. Tsaousoglou, "A new notion of reserve for power systems with high penetration of storage and flexible demand," *IEEE Trans. Energy Markets, Policy and Regulation*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 131–144, 2023.
- [7] L. Liu, Z. Hu, X. Duan, and N. Pathak, "Data-driven distributionally robust optimization for real-time economic dispatch considering secondary frequency regulation cost," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 36, no. 5, pp. 4172–4184, 2021.
- [8] M. Vrakopoulou, K. Margellos, J. Lygeros, and G. Andersson, "A probabilistic framework for reserve scheduling and N-1 security assessment of systems with high wind power penetration," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 3885–3896, 2013.
- [9] H. Zhang, Z. Hu, E. Munsing, S. J. Moura, and Y. Song, "Data-driven chance-constrained regulation capacity offering for distributed energy resources," *IEEE Trans. Smart Grid*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 2713–2725, 2018.
- [10] B. Xu, Y. Shi, D. S. Kirschen, and B. Zhang, "Optimal battery participation in frequency regulation markets," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 6715–6725, 2018.

- [11] J.-F. Toubeau, J. Bottieau, Z. D. Grève, F. Vallée, and K. Bruninx, "Datadriven scheduling of energy storage in day-ahead energy and reserve markets with probabilistic guarantees on real-time delivery," *IEEE Trans. Power Syst.*, vol. 36, no. 4, pp. 2815–2828, 2021.
- [12] P. A. V. Gade, H. W. Bindner, and J. Kazempour, "Leveraging P90 requirement: Flexible resources bidding in Nordic ancillary service markets," 2024. [Online]. Available: https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.12807
- [13] S. Ahmed, J. Luedtke, Y. Song, and W. Xie, "Nonanticipative duality, relaxations, and formulations for chance-constrained stochastic programs," *Math. Prog.*, vol. 162, p. 51–81, 2017.
- [14] R. T. Rockafellar and S. Uryasev, "Optimization of conditional valueat-risk," J. Risk, vol. 2, pp. 21–42, 2000.
- [15] Energinet, "Outlook for ancillary services 2023-2040," 2023. [Online]. Available: https://en.energinet.dk/electricity/ancillary-services/ ancillary-services-in-the-future/
- [16] M. Saretta, E. Raheli, and J. Kazempour, "Electrolyzer scheduling for Nordic FCR services," in *IEEE International Conference on Communications, Control, and Computing Technologies for Smart Grids* (SmartGridComm), Glowgow, UK, 2023, pp. 1–6.
- [17] "Datasets / frequency historical data." [Online]. Available: https: //beta-data.fingrid.fi/en/datasets/339
- [18] Energi Data Service, "FCR N and D, Frequency Containment Reserves, DK2," https://www.energidataservice.dk/tso-electricity/FcrNdDK2.
- [19] Brendan Mcaleer, Car and Driver, "Electric car battery life: Everything you need to know, including how long they last," 2022. [Online]. Available: https://www.caranddriver.com/research/a31875141/ electric-car-battery-life/
- [20] K. Mukhi, C. Qu, P. You, and A. Abate, "Distributionally robust aggregation of electric vehicle flexibility," 2024. [Online]. Available: https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.08232
- [21] Github. (2024). [Online]. Available: https://github.com/lunde77/Thesis
- [22] J. Luedtke and S. Ahmed, "A sample approximation approach for optimization with probabilistic constraints," *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 674–699, 2008.
- [23] A. Nemirovski and A. Shapiro, "Convex approximations of chance constrained programs," *SIAM J. Optim.*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 969–996, 2007.
- [24] N. Jiang and W. Xie, "ALSO-X and ALSO-X+: Better convex approximations for chance constrained programs," *Oper. Res.*, vol. 70, no. 6, pp. 3581–3600, 2022.